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ABSTRACT

This dissertation involves a case study in the application of job evaluation in the City Council of Cape Town. The purpose was to gain insight into the dynamics of the process in a local government environment from the point of view of principal actors - political office bearers, senior officials, trade unions, compensation specialists and employees at large. The methodology was that of "participant-as-observer" and "complete participant". Complementing this was extensive use of primary documentation. A survey using a structured questionnaire was administered to other major local authorities to identify job evaluation usage.

The introductory chapter provides an overview of the concept of job evaluation, its principles and practice and the different methods employed. The historical and contemporary usage of job evaluation both abroad and in South Africa is covered in the following chapter. The most prevalent systems are described including the Five Factor System applied in the City Council. Methodological issues are aired in the following chapter whilst Chapter 4 provides context to the study through an analysis of the structure and function of the constituent organisational parts and a review of policies and practices relevant to the personnel/remuneration process. In Chapter 5 the background to formal job evaluation in the organisation is traced by focusing on the salary and wage negotiating process "leading in" to the decision to introduce formal job evaluation. A review of an earlier evaluation of senior management posts using the Hay method is also presented.

Chapter 6 provides an overview of the principles and practice of Council's job evaluation programme, primarily from the perspective of the compensation specialists. It describes the rationale for the choice of procedures and provides further insight into the method adopted. Each phase is considered in the light of accepted practice.

Chapters 7, 8 and 9 are focal points in the study and deal with senior management response, union perspectives and employee reaction to the plan. The analysis oscillates between micro and macro issues, examining the interplay of system content, procedures and differing value orientations. Perspectives of senior management are critically examined and assessed where possible against objective evidence. Discussion of the issues brought forward by management is pursued in order to place these within a framework of principle and practice. The contrasting roles of the two trade unions provide the central focus in Chapter 8. One adopted a participative approach aimed at monetary benefit; the other showed a preference for negotiation based on results of the job evaluation, emphasising factors not included in the formal system. Chapter 9 examines employee grievances as an indicator of employee acceptance applying equity theory. Grievance factors are analysed and mini case studies of responses to perceived inequity are illustrated. In the concluding chapter some specific recommendations for improvement to the system and its application are made as well as conclusions applicable to job evaluation in general.

The overall conclusion reached is that deficiencies in systemic, procedural and value dimensions led to partial attainment of objectives - this attributable to an absence of commitment. The absence of organisational consensus created tension in the equilibrium of the organisation. With the new structure installed, secondary benefits of a more conscious corporate approach are being manifested through system maintainence.
"Consent to use the records of the City Council of Cape Town was given to the researcher on the basis only of scientific and historical interest, and the Council does not make itself party to or responsible for the choice of material, nor the confidentiality or accuracy of the material, fact or opinion, or its publication beyond the bounds of Council functioning.
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This Chapter attempts to provide an overview of job evaluation as a basis for equitable remuneration. An understanding of some fundamental aspects of job evaluation as a concept, what spirit its need for job evaluation and what particular objectives it can help attain is essential to the analysis that follows. The process of job evaluation will be briefly sketched and alternative methods of evaluation will thereafter be presented as a comparative perspective when later reviewing the application of the Five Factor System in the City Council of Cape Town. Finally its sociological relevance as a means of organisational stratification is explored, and its role in organisational change is examined.

1.1 TOWARD THE CONCEPT OF JOB EVALUATION

Establishing a hierarchy of jobs within an organisation is fundamental to the development of a salary system. Simplistically put, the job at the top of the organisational hierarchy is expected to attract the highest salary and that at the bottom, the least. It is further assumed that jobs of equal worth will attract equal pay while acceptable differences in pay will separate jobs of unequal worth. Pay differentials among jobs are the basis of salary and wage structures. Such expectation implies some method for ranking jobs.

1.2 THE CONCEPT OF JOB EVALUATION

The development of a salary and wage structure involves the determination of how
much each job should be paid relative to other jobs within the organisation.

Job evaluation is a method of comparing jobs by use of formal and systematic procedures in order to establish a rank order of the jobs (i.e. determine the relative position of one job to another) and thus provide the basis for an equitable pay system (Elizur, 1980:3).

The British Institute of Management has defined job evaluation as "the process of analysing and assessing the content of jobs, in order to place them in an acceptable rank order which can then be used as a basis for a remuneration system. Job evaluation is therefore simply a technique designed to assist in the development of new pay structures by defining relativities between jobs on a consistent and systematic basis" (Biesheuvel, 1985:9; Livy, 1975: 40). Two very important distinctions should be made at the outset:

1.2.1 Job Evaluation and Employee Evaluation

The first is that between job evaluation and employee evaluation. Job evaluation is concerned with jobs and not with individuals.

It is assumed that as long as the job content remains unchanged, the job may be performed by individuals of various levels of ability and proficiency. This concept permits separate evaluation (appraisal) of the performance of individuals carrying out the same job. "In its pure form" states Livy (1975: 40) "job evaluation eschews the contribution of an individual job incumbent in terms of his or her performance, potential or personal qualities".

1.2.2 Grading the Jobs and Pricing the Structure

The second distinction relates to that between the grading of jobs by which the
ranked jobs are grouped, and the assignation of monetary values to the resultant groupings or grades. In practice, no clear distinction is drawn between these two phases. Although job evaluation is indeed a means to assigning monetary value to jobs, it is desirable to conceptually distinguish these two processes. The former may more easily be handled on a technical level, but more importantly job structure is often not the only determinant of wage structure. Unions, for example, may succeed in demands that result in a tempering of job evaluation findings. Other factors determining wage structure include profitability, willingness to pay, prevailing market forces and an organisation's general compensation policy.

1.3 REASONS FOR JOB EVALUATION

Professor T.T. Paterson (1972: 1) in the introduction to his seminal work on the 'Paterson Method' states that "in those firms without job evaluation.....confusion of pay structure is rampant. The relativity of pay for one job to pay for another can seldom be explained other than 'it grew like Topsy', or was fixed arbitrarily, or negotiated with a strong trade union.....". In Robinson's (1961) study it was concluded "that wage structure develops through a series of *ad hoc* decisions in which one expedient is piled on top of another to raise earnings of timeworkers.....relative to those of pieceworkers" (in Paterson, 1972: 149). Eventually the wage becomes "a chaotic compilation of bonuses and allowances long after the circumstances for these allowances have gone" (Paterson, 1972:1).

The National Board for Prices and Incomes (1972) in a survey found in many companies that many apparent relationships between jobs and pay had been lost and further that "the distinct purposes for which the different components in individual pay existed had been obscured" (Livy, 1975: 15). The reason most commonly given by organisations for the use of job evaluation in the N.B.P.I. Survey was that it is a means for 'rationalising' pay structures through the
"removal of anomalies; simplification of the pay structure; introduction of order out of chaos" etc. (Elizur, 1980: 5). Other surveys have revealed similar responses namely that it provided the basis for determining the companies' wage structure and the means by which jobs could be rated in an equitable manner so that relative worth could be determined and equity in salary administration attained (Perold, 1984; Lanham, 1971).

1.4 OBJECTIVES OF JOB EVALUATION

From the above discussion it can be seen that job evaluation provides a measuring instrument that serves as a systematic basis for comparing jobs and determining the relative value of different jobs. Elizur, (1980) has made a notable distinction in identifying two basic objectives. The first is to compare jobs and determine their level WITHIN EACH OCCUPATIONAL GROUP whilst the second is to compare jobs BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS. The second is clearly a more complex activity and thus requires a system capable of ranking all jobs in an organisation. Such capability will subsume the rank order within each occupational grouping. A high degree of consensus exists concerning the more specific goals of job evaluation. These include:

- To provide a basis for a more objective and rational internal wage structure than the relatively chaotic structures that result from chance, custom, and such individual factors as favouritism, bargaining pressures and inconsistent ad hoc decision-making;
- To provide a means for the ranking of new and changing jobs;
- To minimise grievances over pay by reducing the scope of grievances and providing an agreed upon procedure for appeals, grievances and their treatment;
- To provide a means whereby realistic comparisons may be made of the
wage and salary rates of employing organisations;

• To provide basic information for wage negotiations and wage determination;

• To provide job information for use in promotion, career pathing, selection and training (Elizur, 1980; Belcher, 1974).

To retain perspective, it should however be pointed out that job evaluation as an aid constitutes one of the variables in the compensation scenario. Its success or otherwise, like most things, depends on the way it is implemented. It is not as Livy (1975:40) has summed it up "...a panacea or some divine device for the solution of pay problems..... but..... a formula for fairness".

1.5 THE PROCESS OF JOB EVALUATION

Paterson (1972: xi-xii) has outlined the process of job evaluation as comprising a complex of job analysis, the study of jobs, job description, the statement of the results of the analysis, upon which follows job grading, the placing of jobs in a sequence or ranking which is the basis of job assessment and the establishment of fair pay based on job grading. Belcher (1974) has formalised these in terms of requisite steps in the job evaluation process: The first step is a study of jobs in the organisation which is recorded in the form of a job description. The next step is determining which factor or factors place one job on a higher level than another. These compensable factors are the yardsticks that are used to determine the relative position of jobs. The third step involves either developing or choosing a system for evaluating the jobs in the organisation in accordance with the compensable factors selected in step two. Four basic methods have been developed: the ranking method, the classification method, the factor comparison method and the point method. These will be further elaborated in the following
section. The fourth step in the process is making use of the system to evaluate jobs to determine the hierarchy. Once the hierarchy or structure has been established, the final step involves the pricing of the job structure to arrive at the salary structure. As has been pointed out, conceptually this latter step does not form part of job evaluation per se, but is a vital element in making the results of any job evaluation operational and attaining its objective, and in this sense is therefore inseparable.

1.6 DIFFERENT METHODS OF JOB EVALUATION

It is useful at this point to examine briefly different methods of job evaluation in order to provide some comparative perspective on the particular method analysed in this study. It will also assist as a point of reference for recommendations which will be proposed in the final chapter of the study.

Job evaluation itself is a generic term which covers a number of techniques for deriving an equitable job structure. Conventionally, four main techniques have been developed: the relatively crude and simple non-quantitative methods of ranking and classification and the more sophisticated quantitative approaches of points rating and factor comparison which in essence involve quantifying qualitative judgements. Cortis' (in Taylor, 1983:155) conceptualisation of job evaluation methods as follows provides a useful matrix.

---

**TABLE NUMBER 1.1**

**AN ANALYSIS OF JOB EVALUATION METHODS**

| Comparison is between jobs against each other | Job Ranking Method | Factor Comparison Method |
| Comparison is made against defined factors | Job Classification/Grading Method | Points method |

---

The job is considered as a whole (non-analytical) | The job is broken down into a number of characteristics (analytical) |
A third category of method is characterised by comparing differences in decision-making. Various proprietary brands developed by consultants and academics fall into one of these above categories.

1.6.1 Non-Quantitative Methods

There are two non-quantitative methods of job evaluation - the ranking method and job classification.

1.6.1.1 The Ranking Method

Job ranking was one of the first of the conventional job evaluation methods to be devised. In this method, jobs are compared with one another on the basis of the whole job - and directly ranked from the highest to the lowest. It is non-analytical in the sense that jobs are not broken down into their component elements for evaluation as in the quantitative methods, but are compared as 'wholes' (Livy, 1975: 53).

Belcher (1974) has advocated a hybrid variation in which jobs are ranked on the basis of a selection of factors, arguing that this may be rightly classed as a ranking method provided that each factor is accorded equal weight in the process of ranking. Livy (1975) has dismissed this as constituting a vague points system without any tight or clearly defined controls. He asserts (1975: 57) that "ranking in its basic form simply requires taking a birds eye view of a range of jobs and making some perhaps rather perfunctory decisions about their relative worth from the angle of both vertical and lateral relationships". Administratively, it is a relatively cheap and easy scheme for an organisation and can provide an acceptable basis for negotiation. In large organisations with a large number of jobs it proves time consuming and cumbersome, and it is difficult to find raters familiar enough with all the jobs to rate objectively.
Typically, two methods may be used - the card sorting method and the paired comparison method. In the former, raters are furnished with a card for each job covering pertinent information about the job. Jobs are ranked from highest to lowest by sorting the cards. In the paired comparison method, the raters compare each job with every other job, arriving at a matrix for ranking. The major limitation of the ranking method is the absence of clearly defined and objective criteria for comparison. It is highly subjective and depends upon the experience of the people doing the ranking (Paterson, 1972: 41). Existing salary and familiarity with the job incumbent may also affect ranking. Livy (1975: 57) has pointed out that the interranking of jobs in this way will naturally tend to reflect the status quo situation if antecedent relationships were not too much out of alignment. Even if they were, he argues, "by virtue of deliberate decisions with regard to the intercomparison of jobs on a hierarchical axis, a fortiori, the same overall structure would emerge". Certain of the disadvantages of the ranking method such as lack of precise differentiation between jobs, are however to some degree eliminated in the grouping or grading process where jobs of comparable responsibility are banded together. Once so grouped, all jobs within the band are regarded as equal and are priced within the same monetary range. The main advantage of ranking is its simplicity. Compared to many of the more elaborate methods it is one of the easiest for employees to understand. Its maintenance is however problematic in that the lack of defined standards make it difficult to retain consistency over time.

1.6.1.2 The Job Classification Method

The Classification method (sometimes referred to as 'predetermined gradings' or the "grade description system") involves defining the number of classes or grades of jobs required and thereafter fitting the jobs into the created classes (Belcher, 1974). Each class is described on the basis of a definition which in broad terms reflects the differences in skill, responsibility and/or any other criterion considered
to be important by management and likely to have a bearing on compensation. This forms the formal yardstick against which jobs are evaluated (Biesheuvel, 1985). The system thus differs from the conventional process in that it uses as its starting point, predetermined grades and associated pay ranges, whereas in other systems determining the pay ranges would form the ultimate part of the exercise (Livy, 1975: 70).

Jobs are usually first classified into job series or like occupational groupings (families) and each job is thereafter slotted into the structure according to the degree of fit of the class or grade definition (Elizur, 1980: 21). Typically, the categories correspond to or mirror the shape and size of the organisational structure particularly where there is a clearly defined chain of command. In short, an idealised hierarchical structure is predetermined and jobs are slotted into the delineated categories according to the degree of fit on the basis of the chosen factors. Belcher (1974:149-157) has pointed out that many organisations after completing job evaluation by another method, classify jobs into grades to aid in wage administration. This approach has a common sense appeal since it may simplify and aid in the system maintenance of a scheme already well grounded in more elaborate and sophisticated techniques. This constitutes a major benefit of classification, particularly where the organisation has become so fine tuned that quick consensus decisions can readily be made on the grading of new or changed jobs. Only when agreement cannot be reached would it be necessary to use the formal job evaluation system.

Proponents of the classification method recommend it on the basis of its simplicity, flexibility and economy. It is particularly well suited to stable organisations where jobs are well known and general consensus exists regarding grading of most jobs. The General Schedule (GS) classification of the U.S. Civil Service is probably the best known system. Eighteen grades are defined on the basis of eight factors.
and as each new job is established it is assigned a GS level that determines the pay range (Treiman, 1979:2).

Livy (1975) suggests that it enjoys greater validity when part of an industry wide or national scheme where cross-organisational consistency can be attained. He also suggests (1975: 68) that it provides for planned organisation where the establishment strength can be prescribed for the predetermined grades. This facilitates manpower budgeting, particularly in the case of public organisations, and as a corollary, well-defined career development pathways and progressions can be built in. Biesheuvel (1985:28) has pointed out, however, that while valuable side benefits do derive from job evaluation, the main objective must be to facilitate the development of an equitable compensation system and since this is the criterion on which a system should be judged other methods may have greater strength for this. In this regard, it is suggested that one of the most fundamental drawbacks of such an approach is that it provides no real measure of the relativity of individual jobs and implicitly assumes that pay differentials between each grade are equal (Paterson, 1972: 60). In addition, if jobs have initially been classified separately in terms of job series or classes, it is difficult to reconcile the classes into one integrated system with cross-occupational equivalences, necessitating multiple discrete pay structures (Biesheuvel, 1985: 27; Paterson, 1972: 60). Like ranking, it focuses on the overall assessment of jobs as wholes, and thus suffers from the same disadvantage as the ranking method in this respect. Classification is however, more elaborate than ranking. The grade descriptions do in some vague way comprise some form of measurement which is not present in ranking and historically represents a link between ranking and the more sophisticated point system (Livy, 1975: 71). Writing grade descriptions poses a difficulty however, and the level of generality required may preclude clearly defined criteria of job comparison (Elizur, 1980: 23).
1.6.1.3 Limitations of Non Quantitative Methods

From the point of view of the objectives of job evaluation, the non-quantitative methods, although successfully able to achieve workable job structures with a minimum of time and effort, do suffer certain limitations which may serve to perpetuate existing inequities.

Elizur, (1980:23) summarises these as follows:

1. The lack of clearly defined and objective criteria for comparison of jobs;
2. The lack of detailed reporting to indicate what values were assigned to job characteristics and how the job levels were determined for enquiries and grievance treatment;
3. The need to find objective experts for all the jobs;
4. The enormous amount of comparisons between jobs to be done;
5. The need to deal with interjudge differences and to work out procedures for arriving at agreed decisions;
6. Existing salaries or familiarity with job incumbents may affect results.

1.6.2 Quantitative Methods

The quantitative methods differ from the non-quantitative methods in that the former provide numerical values for jobs in addition to a job structure. Broadly, this involves making separate judgements on each of a number of factors to which a numerical value is attached and finally these are summed to obtain an overall job value (Becher, 1974). Proponents believe this feature makes job
The two major methods employing numerical values to derive a job structure are the factor comparison method and the point method. In some instances, these two methods are combined (Belcher, 1974).

1.6.2.1 The Factor-Comparison Method

Factor comparison has an affinity with the ranking method in that jobs are compared directly. It however represents a refinement of ranking since the jobs are broken down into a number of factors which form the basis for comparison, the results of which are combined and assigned a numerical value. In its application, it involves reconciling two independent sets of ratings. The first set of ratings consist of the rank order of jobs under the various factor headings and the second consists of monetary values ascribed to each constituent factor of a job so that the money value of any factor is in alignment with its predetermined rank order (Livy, 1975: 90).

The comparison is carried out by subdividing jobs into five generic compensable factors. These are mental requirements, skill requirements, physical requirements, responsibilities and working conditions, and are considered to be universal factors found in all jobs. It has been found that more than seven factors renders the system unwieldy (Elizur, 1980; Paterson, 1972).

A first and fundamental step in applying the method is the selection of key or benchmark jobs for detailed analysis and description in terms of the factors. The selection of these key jobs is critical since they form the cornerstone of the comparison scale and because it is believed that their existing pay is regarded as being fair (Paterson 1972: 83). The next step involves ranking the jobs into levels of difficulty for each factor in turn.
For each job, each factor is in turn allocated a percentage of its importance in getting the job done. The process thus far concentrates purely on factor ranking. Thereafter the factor evaluation part of the process involves assigning monetary values to each factor by breaking up the pay for each job into the amounts that are considered to represent the importance of each factor. The percentages allocated are used as a guide in the monetary assignation of weights to the factors.

The next step is to reconcile the results obtained from the factor evaluation (monetary rating-M) with those from the original rating of factors (difficulty rating-D).

Should the two not agree, either the monetary values have to be adjusted or the key job is rejected. A job comparison scale is then devised where one column registers money in an appropriate scale of intervals and alongside are the columns...
of the factors. Into these columns are placed the key jobs. This is used as a standard for slotting in the remainder of the jobs in the organisation. The jobs are compared factor by factor to determine their rank order and thereafter the factor values are assessed in monetary terms. The sum of factor values equals the total pay for each job. These are however not placed into grades as in the other methods but represent an individual pay for each job (Paterson, 1972: 82-84; Livy, 1975: 90-95).

A major advantage of the factor comparison method is that it is constructed in terms of the jobs that exist in the organisation, and is therefore custom-built or tailor-made to suit the particular organisation applying it. The limitation on the number of factors to five tends to reduce the possibility of overlapping - the risk of double counting that may arise from co-variance between factors is thus avoided (Livy, 1975: 96).

Some see advantage in pricing the job as soon as the level is established, but it is questionable whether this advantage is sufficient to offset the obvious disadvantage of likely bias by use of existing monetary values. On the question of bias, Livy (1975:96) points out that “.....the technique is liable to considerable contamination from error variance and rating bias.” Further Livy (1975:96) states that “.....the criterion of present wage structure for a key job could be regarded as the most unholy crime of all” and “is clearly the worst potential source of invalidity”. “The outcome is therefore bound to remain rather arbitrary or deliberately geared to fit the existing system” (Livy, 1975: 91). Fundamental to this problem is the difficulty of selecting key jobs and assumptions concerning the correctness of the pay rate. Since these provide the yardstick, any inaccuracies or subtle changes will skew the measurement. There is general consensus in the literature that this method is extremely time-consuming, cumbersome and highly subjective (Livy, 1975: 90 - 91).
1.6.2.2 The Point Method

The point method is the first quantitative method to have been devised and appears to be the most widely used (Paterson, 1972: 62). In the same way that the factor comparison method can be viewed as a refinement of the ranking method, the point method may be seen as comparable to the classification method in that jobs are measured against a scale of defined degrees. Whereas one scale is developed for the classification method, a scale for each of a number of selected compensable factors is developed in the point method, and typically the scales are weighted differently (Belcher, 1974: 171; Paterson, 1972: 62). The point method thus involves breaking down the job into several factors or component parts, assigning each constituent part or factor a numerical value by measuring it against a carefully worded rating scale and thereafter summing these values (points scores) to obtain the total value of the job (Belcher, 1974: 171, Livy, 1975: 72). The greater the number of point scores, the more the worth of the job to the organisation.

While the application of a points method in the City of Cape Town will be analysed in greater detail in the following chapters, the main steps in the process can be itemised as follows:

1. Establish a Committee responsible for job evaluation.

2. Determine the jobs to be evaluated.

3. Collect the job information, analyse jobs and prepare job descriptions.

4. Select and define the compensable factors which are believed to be common to all the jobs in the organisation and are considered most critical in determining the relative degrees of difficulty and responsibility between
jobs. The factors selected usually fall under the headings of skill, effort and responsibility (Paterson 1972: 62). These constitute the broad categories which in turn are subdivided into two or more specific job factors (Livy, 1975; Paterson, 1972).

5. The factors then have to be defined and thereafter weighted to indicate the relative importance of each factor in terms of contribution to job performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE NUMBER 1.4</th>
<th>FIVE FACTOR SYSTEM IMPLEMENTED BY THE MUNICIPALITY OF CAPE TOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERIC FACTOR</td>
<td>SPECIFIC SUB FACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Qualifications</td>
<td>1 A Academic/Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 B Specialised Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 C Practical Training Period/Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decision making</td>
<td>3 A Level of Decisions taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 B Feedback on Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Time Span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severity of Consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervision</td>
<td>4 A Supervision Given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 B Supervision Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Relationships and Negotiations</td>
<td>5 A Internal Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 B External Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Nature/Level/Frequency)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Each factor is then divided into a number of divisions or degrees to enable determining the extent to which each is present in the job.

Steps 5 and 6 involve firstly determining a numerical range of points for each factor representing the scale between the minimum and maximum or total values. Secondly, this point range is subdivided into the number of degrees or gradations, and finally a points value is awarded for each degree so that the highest degree represents the maximum of the range and the lowest degree the minimum.
A differential series of ranges then exists for each factor and jobs are rated along these scales, the sum of which represents the value of the job. In determining the weighting of the chosen factors there is no scientific method or prescribed formula. The relative weightings will reflect the rank order of importance of the factors and likewise the sub-factors of the broader factor. These may be assigned statistically or by Committee judgements. In the former method salaries of key jobs are correlated into various weights assigned to the factors until the best fit is found, while the latter implies general consensus between members of a relative ranking of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>SUB FACTOR</th>
<th>SUB FACTOR WEIGHT</th>
<th>FACTOR WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neither are there any hard and fast rules in deciding the actual values to be used for each factor or sub-factor, having determined the relative weight in percentage terms. One rule of thumb that is useful however, is that the greater the number of factors, the higher should the points value be to enable greater room for scaling differences.

The sub-factors are then broken down into degrees with each degree representing a progressive increment in the demands of the job according to the sub-factors.
### TABLE NUMBER 1.6
**POINTS DISTRIBUTION · FIVE FACTOR SYSTEM · CITY OF CAPE TOWN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>SUB FACTOR</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS**

### FIGURE NUMBER 1.7
**EXCERPT OF THE FACTOR SCALE DEFINITIONS USED IN THE FIVE FACTOR SYSTEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>GRADE I</th>
<th>GRADE II</th>
<th>GRADE III</th>
<th>GRADE IV</th>
<th>GRADE V</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Standard 2 and lower</td>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Standard 10</td>
<td>More than 3 years</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Standard 6</td>
<td>Standard 10</td>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number and size of degrees is somewhat arbitrary because some factors lend themselves better to quantification than others. They must be wide enough however to create a meaningful dispersion. Too few are likely to inhibit differentiation. The number of degrees will influence the actual values ascribed to each degree step which can be determined by arithmetic or geometric progression or by variable percentage differentials. Arithmetic progression is the most common (Livy, 1975: 79).
7. It is essential at this point to undertake a test run or pilot project using a sample of key jobs to assess the effectiveness of the system. This would include the need to examine the relativities which derive from application of the measuring instrument devised, how these relate to the present order of differentiation and perhaps how this compares with results obtained by some other method (Livy, 1975: 74). A factor by factor cross check is also important to identify any glaring anomalies and ensure that some measure of reliability has been obtained in the ratings. As Livy (1975: 74) is careful to point out “although time-consuming, methodical and painstaking attention to groundwork will pay dividends later on”.

8. Satisfied that the system produces acceptable and equitable results, the next step is to evaluate all the jobs, often in job families to arrive at a composite numerical value for each job. To enable the process, the system requires to be documented in the form of a manual which is a consolidation of all the tools required to carry out the process. This may include a job description questionnaire, background and philosophy behind the choice of factors and justification for the system and the factor scale definitions and numerical scales.

This should be compiled in a format convenient to use as an instrument for measuring the jobs. The total point score derived indicates the relative position of each job in the newly established hierarchy - more precisely, the numerical relationship between one job and another (Livy, 1975: 82).

9. In order to make the results of the aforementioned steps operational, a grading structure has to be developed to which monetary values are assigned. The numerical relationship does not, however, indicate the precise differentiations in monetary value. The point scores are not the
sole criterion, but do provide a very powerful guide. The detail of how the conversion takes place will not be considered here but will be discussed in relation to the system described in Chapters 6 and 7. Suffice to state that a scattergram is drawn and points are plotted against pay which provides the basis for an organisational pay policy line. The grade structure is constructed by grouping similar jobs into grades defined by a points range or spread. The number of grades may vary according to the needs of the organisation and thus the size of the spread will vary accordingly.

Clearly, one of the reasons for its popularity is the quantitative analytical nature of the method which applies the same yardstick to compare different types of jobs and, in comparison to other conventional methods discussed, it reduces the AMOUNT of subjective decisions. It provides a hierarchy of jobs characterised by relatively fine distinctions unattainable in the other conventional methods. Belcher (1974) sees the major advantage of the point method in the stability of the rating scales - once developed, they can be used in the maintenance of the system. Continued usage also increases the accuracy and consistency. He also points out that the method makes use of the type of rating scales that are generally regarded as being most reliable and valid such as check lists and graphic rating scales. These are argued to reduce rating error and the influence of bias on ratings. A further point is that since the method makes use of a number of different items or factors, acceptance of the results is expected to be higher. Where an in-house system has been developed, these items would reflect the consensus choice of the job evaluation committee and therefore enhance acceptability of the results. The widespread use of the method, however, means that organisations do not really have to develop their own systems. The availability of point plans offered by consultants is seen as another advantage which also enhances comparison of pay rates with organisations using the same or compatible systems. Outside consultants also add the quality of neutrality and
for this reason could also contribute to higher levels of acceptability.

One of the greatest difficulties in the point method concerns the technical aspects in its construction. Paterson (1972: 77) argues, for example, the fact "that there is no consistency in factor weightings, or even in the choice of factors themselves, is, methodologically speaking, non-logical". There are no hard and fast rules for breaking down the factors or sub-factors into degrees or for determining that appropriate gradation exists between them (Livy, 1975). It is however, generally assumed that each degree of one factor represents a step equivalent to a degree in another, but once the factors are differentially weighted then the points assigned to each degree take on a different value as ordinate numerals (Paterson, 1972). The weightings (and thus point values) are also somewhat arbitrary assignations, often agreed upon through negotiation and consensus by participating parties (Belcher, 1974). Aggregating this series of arbitrary decisions can result therefore in making the system produce exactly what one wants, and according to Livy (1975), this could be argued to be the point method's major invalidity. The main point according to Livy (1975: 126) is that the separate job factors are not necessarily additive. Paterson (1972: 76-78) says it is no different to adding bananas, oranges, lemons and apples in order to arrive at the total collection of fruit, and then making comparisons between the various collections in terms of the total number in each collection.

From the complexity of the system a further disadvantage is its time-consuming nature. It takes time to understand and explain, time to execute and install, and a considerable amount of clerical detail is necessary in recording and collating the evaluations. It is also expected to suffer a certain amount of rater unreliability based on the different abilities in grading and varied orientations that raters bring to bear on the process.
One final point relates to the question of universalism. It has been argued by some that it is more suited to addressing job families or clusters since to find factors that are universal to all jobs is difficult in practice. Many of these aspects will be discussed in further chapters, in particular chapter 7, with special reference to the Five Factor System adopted in the City Council.

1.6.3 Other Methods

A third category of job evaluation schemes incorporates various proprietary brands, usually developed by consultants or academics, and more often than not, marketed by the former. These are often attempts to overcome some of the limitations of the conventional methods as described above. Some of these methods represent variations of the point method such as the Guide Chart and Profile method and the Castellion method, both of which will be referred to later in reviewing some of the systems most prevalent in South Africa today. Yet others comprise a combination of the basic methods. A number of methods have been developed which differ substantially from the conventional approaches (Belcher, 1974: 193-196). Some of these, such as the single factor methods represent attempts at a universal system that applies a common dimension for comparing all jobs at all levels which would provide a rational and acceptable explanation for differentials (Taylor, 1981).

1.6.3.1 Time Span of Discretion Method

One such method which differs radically from the conventional methods described so far derives from the theories concerning the nature of work, its organisation and compensation put forward by Elliot Jacques (Biesheuvel, 1985). According to this method, equitable payment is related to the "time span of discretion" of the job. It is a measure which indicates the period of time during which marginally sub-standard discretion could be exercised in a role before information about the accumulating sub-standard work would become available to the manager.
in charge of the role (Jacques, 1961: 99 quoted in Elizur, 1980: 27). Thus job level in terms of this concept is established by measuring, according to Jacques, the longest and most extended time span tasks.

Jacques claims that people have an intuitive awareness of their level of work and fair payment for it. He reports that persons having the same “time span” report similar levels of pay as proper for their job (Elizur, 1980: 28). The theory thus hinges on the relationship between the time span of discretion and what he refers to as the “intuitive norms of felt fair payment” (Taylor, 1981: 164).

The attraction of this theory from the point of doing job evaluation is that it appears to provide one unique but universal factor as the basis for measurement (Armstrong and Murlis, 1980). The question of measurement using the time span device is however crucial to the practical usefulness of the scheme. The process appears subjective and is achieved by the supervisor of the employee’s post which is being evaluated providing the critical information which in turn is checked by the manager. Together they decide on the time scale applicable to assigned tasks. Jacques claims that “managerial decisions of this kind are objective facts”. (Biesheuvel, 1985: 39) Secondly, the method in which he derived the relationship between time span and “felt fair” payment was by establishing a “social analytic relationship” with employees in which private aspects of their feelings judgements and attitudes were confidentially assessed. This therefore has to be accepted at face value. Once the longest time span task has been established, the monetary value of the job can be determined by means of “reading off an equitable work payment scale” which reflects the agreed “felt fair” payment of recipients as arrived at by the aforementioned procedure.

Application of the time span method has been limited (Belcher, 1974). It has not found acceptability with employees and Unions alike since its method preempts
the need for negotiation. Suspicion and insecurity are also likely in the minds of employees having their jobs evaluated in this way. The technique is seen to be radical since it ignores the traditional factors such as skill and experience required to do a job. Practically, it is regarded as a nebulous concept and difficult to apply objectively (Armstrong and Murlis, 1980: 40).

A number of additional single item methods have evolved from Jacques's thinking (Elizur, 1980: 28). The Paterson (1972) method based on quality of decision as a unitary factor in terms of which six decision levels or bands are identified, has become one of the two most popularly applied methods in South Africa, and shall be outlined in more detail in section 2.6.1.1 when considering the prevalent systems in South Africa at the present.

1.7 SOCIOLOGICAL RELEVANCE

1.7.1 Job Evaluation and the Principles of Stratification

It is suggested that there is a close affinity between job evaluation and certain sociological approaches to the analysis of social stratification. In the earlier part of the chapter it was stated that job evaluation was aimed at establishing a hierarchy of jobs within an organisation. Some would view its purpose as an attempt to arrive at a socially equitable distribution of income (Livy, 1975: 129). Both these aims are intent on a (fair) ordering of strata. The theme pursued in this section is thus to highlight that job evaluation as a system for ordering the occupational structure within an organisation impacts on the stratification system and that as a systematic process of deliberate stratification serves to reconfirm within the organisation the occupational status hierarchy.

In this context Hall (1975:229-241) provides one useful approach relevant to job
evaluation. Occupational structure is seen as a major determinant of the social stratification system. Occupations have become more dominant as status determinants than any other considerations. Occupation is seen not only as the most dominant indicator of status, but is also indicative of and closely related to other status indicators such as education. Table 1.8 provides an ordered distillation which can be constructed following the characteristics of occupations identified by Hall (1975: 242 - 244) that contribute to the various rankings given the spectrum of occupations.

**TABLE NUMBER 1.8**
**FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO DIFFERENTIAL STATUS OF OCCUPATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>RANK CRITERION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Specific Nature of Work Performed</td>
<td>Manipulation of Symbols&lt;br&gt;Manipulation of People&lt;br&gt;Manipulation of Physical Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prerequisites for Entry</td>
<td>Education&lt;br&gt;Training&lt;br&gt;Certification, Licensing&lt;br&gt;Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whether tasks are Individual or Group Based</td>
<td>Individual Task Performance&lt;br&gt;Group Based Task Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Place in Interpersonal Relationship Structure</td>
<td>Give Supervision&lt;br&gt;Received Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Responsibility</td>
<td>Amount Type for Symbols&lt;br&gt;People&lt;br&gt;Physical Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Work Situation and Characteristics of Work Performed</td>
<td>Institution Setting of the Work (eg, factory, office, research laboratory etc.)&lt;br&gt;Type of Industry Sector (eg, electronics (and automated vs non-automated) railways, university)&lt;br&gt;Nature of Employment (eg, public, private, self-employment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Hall 1975: 242 - 245*

Noteworthy is the marked similarity between these characteristics and the factors prevalent in the majority of job evaluation systems. In making this observation it is also interesting to note the prevalence of a variety of techniques developed to measure and scale the status of various occupations, and designed to demonstrate the existence of a system of ranking (Hall, 1975: 244).
Approaches outlined by Hall (1975) include the prestige dimension of social stratification which deals directly with the status accorded occupation. One such study carried out by the National Opinion Research Centre (NORC) was designed to "secure a national rating of the relative prestige of a wide range of occupations" to determine the standards of judgement people use in evaluating occupational status, and to investigate the standards used in determining the relative desirability of various occupations (Hall, 1975: 245). The findings of this survey became a major scale of occupational prestige. Interestingly, the survey laboured under analogous methodological problems to those that characterise the conventional rating process in job evaluation methods. For example, a major problem among the national sample of 2920 respondents was the varying amount of knowledge the respondents had about the occupation they were asked to rate. Differences in the ability to rate were related to various factors such as the degree to which an occupational title was known, educational levels, socio-economic status etc. of the respondents. The original findings have been extrapolated to include many more than the ninety occupations analysed in the original study. This aligns closely too to the concept of using benchmark jobs in job evaluation methodology and the NORC survey has in itself become a benchmark in analyses of occupational status (Hall, 1975: 252).

The findings purely reflect an ordering of occupations however since intervals between the ratings cannot be demonstrated to be equal.

Yet other approaches to measure and describe occupational status have been reported. These include a combination of education and income into what Duncan calls his "socio-economic index" containing variables reflecting both the social and economic components of the stratification system (Hall, 1975: 253). These techniques could in many ways be related to job evaluation methodology. Whereas they are descriptive - i.e. they attempt to reflect the basis for
occupational ordering - job evaluation is determinative in the sense that it employs those self same factors found to be valued by society as determinants of occupational status and prestige as factors to differentiate jobs within the firm. The process of job evaluation therefore may be construed as both "validating" the stratification system, while at the same time having an influence on the determination of income levels and rewards.

The concept of an occupational situs or family offers an additional useful approach to occupational status. This refers to a set of occupations whose status system may be viewed as a unit (Hall, 1975: 254). The concept of situs groups the occupational systems into a series of relatively parallel status systems. Examples of situses include professional, business, political, agriculture, manual work, finance etc. Mobility is expected to occur primarily within a situs. This aligns very closely with the idea of job clusters within organisations. Different situses will have different lengths of hierarchy and the entry points and pinnacles of situses will differ. Superimposing the above concept upon the notion of a status hierarchy determined by occupation, comes close to the idea of job evaluation - namely to derive a job hierarchy as determined by a set of universal factors. Taking this a step further, according to the functional theory of stratification as put forward by Davis and Moore (1945), considerations of the differential importance of positions in society, variations in the requirements of these positions and differences in the kinds of abilities necessary to fill these positions result in positions being differentially rewarded in order to ensure their occupancy. These differential rewards thus lead to the stratified society. (Hall, 1975: 258). It is by applying these principles that job evaluation is used in the organisation in order to fix the reward structure. As Belcher (1974:7) has stated it, organisations create status structures of jobs, and status differences are measured by both individuals and organisations by differences in pay.
Flowing from the discussion above, it is pertinent to pose the question as to whether job evaluation, in so far as it has the potential to "re-order" the existing organisational status (job) hierarchy, may be conceived as possessing all the characteristics of an agent of change within the organisation.

1.8 JOB EVALUATION - POTENTIAL FOR CHANGE?

It is suggested that the question of change in this respect can be considered on three different levels - change in status structures within the organisation; as a medium for organisational improvement; and finally with regard to its potential impact on a local or regional labour market.

1.8.1 Change of Status Structures

It has been noted above that the objective of job evaluation is to determine the relative worth of one job to another which provides a hierarchy from the highest to the lowest in terms of the criteria applied.

The reasons for introducing job evaluation have also been noted, namely to rectify the arbitrary way relationships between jobs evolve over time. Job evaluation provides therefore the test as to the correctness or otherwise of such relationships. In this sense therefore, it may be argued that whereas change in status structures may indeed come about following the application of job evaluation, job evaluation per se is not the instrument of change but merely identifies it. Having been implemented, it however cements a new order of relationships. There also exists a strong viewpoint that job evaluation may in fact rigidify and impede the process of change by underwriting the status quo (Livy, 1975:129; Biesheuvel, 1985:117; Lawler, 1987:41).

This view is based on the assertion that formalising job descriptions and laying
down rigid job patterns tends to anchor relationships. The need to revise job
descriptions and re-evaluate jobs provides a disincentive to organisational change
and re-organisation. Giving up responsibilities impacts on pay and thus individuals
become reluctant to tamper with existing relationships. Livy (1975:129) has
quoted Wootton (1955) who states that job evaluation "respects in practice the
boundaries set by convention to which in theory it might offer serious challenge".

The view subscribed to here is that a distinction should however be drawn
between job evaluation as a first time installation and its continued maintenance
once installed. In the former situation its application indeed raises questions about
existing relationships, and it has power to uncover inequities and anomalies, thus
elevating job evaluation beyond formalising change to a point where it identifies
need for organisational reform.

1.8.2 Management Development

The second aspect of change relates to the opportunity for management
involvement. It provides the opportunity for reviewing structures and the
relationship of jobs within the organisation. Writing job descriptions and
participating in job evaluation focuses on management accountability. It
necessitates developing improved communication skills, team-building and
management of inter-personal conflict. In this sense therefore job evaluation can
be conceived as facilitating a higher level of management functioning.

1.8.3 Impact on Local Labour Market.

In Chapter 2 reference is made to the influence of the War Labour Board in the
United States, and the national job evaluation plan arising out of government
policy in Holland. In both these instances job evaluation had an impact on a
broad economic front. In the case of large employers, such as the City Council
of Cape Town, its own wage rates have an important influence on local labour
markets. Any shift in pay policy is likely to have an impact on the economy of the region, whether it be in the level of minimum rates, or with regard to closing the wage gap. In both these examples, the installation of job evaluation could have a profound effect.
Job evaluation is by no means a recently developed technique. It has been practised in organisations for about half a century.

2.1 IN THE UNITED STATES

Job evaluation first originated in the United States where it gained momentum during the 1930's and 1940's. Historically it developed out of civil service classification, job analysis applied to time study and selection, early employer wage and salary classification practices as part of personnel programmes, and U.S. government negotiations of wages during World War II (Belcher, 1974). According to one source, the first attempts at the evaluation of jobs were made more than a hundred years ago when experimentation in evaluation approaches was initiated by the United States Civil Service Commission in 1871 (Patton, Littlefield, and Self, 1964 quoted in Livy, 1975). As early as 1911, job analysis was implemented by the Chicago Civil Service Commission and the first known job evaluation plan in industry was installed by the Commonwealth Edison Corporation in 1914 (Nash and Carroll, 1975).

Job Evaluation as understood today was born in the 1920's (Patten, 1977). In 1925 Merrill R. Lott devised the first point method of job evaluation. It was however the rise of the American industrial unions in the 1930's which sparked the need for job evaluation in that employers gave more attention to rationalised wage structures and improved wage administration as unionism advanced (Livy, 1975; Belcher, 1974; Elizur, 1980). According to Belcher (1974), the greatest
impetus to job evaluation in the United States flowed from the policies of the War Labor (sic) Board which endorsed the concept and encouraged companies to install systems of job evaluation as a means of bringing order out of the chaotic job structures that existed at the time and to control wage rates and settle disputes (Belcher, 1974; Patten, 1977).

Surveys undertaken in the late 1940s indicate that almost 90% of all job evaluation systems existing at that time had been established between 1940 and 1948 and over 60 percent of firms having 1000 or more employees had such plans (Nash and Carroll, 1975). Later surveys indicate that job evaluation techniques became widely used in the United States (Elizur, 1980). The Bureau of Labour Statistics in 1956 found that 90% of the production workers in the machinery industries in Milwaukee, and between one half to two thirds in Baltimore, Chicago, Houston and three New England areas were covered by job evaluation (Belcher, 1974). A Bureau of National Affairs (BNA) survey in 1955 found formal job evaluation plans in six out of every seven firms (Belcher, 1974). Yet another survey carried out in 1960 revealed that 65% of the employees of over 500 responding companies were covered by job evaluation programmes (Belcher, 1974). It has been estimated that by the mid-sixties some 50 million American employees, i.e. about two thirds of the labour force, were graded under job evaluation schemes of one kind or another (IPM Information Report, 21, 1976). A national survey of job evaluation practices in 1970 found that 75% of organisations maintain job analysis programmes and more than 95% of them were used for job evaluation purposes (Elizur, 1980).

More recent surveys were carried out by the Bureau of National Affairs (BNA) in 1972 and 1976. In the 1972 survey 60% of small and 75% of large organisations reported the use of formal job evaluation. It also revealed increased application in the case of clerical, technical, professional and managerial jobs. Indeed, about
75% of responding organisations reported the use of job evaluation for such occupations and about 50% reported using job evaluation for plant and sales jobs (Elizur, 1980). In the 1976 survey, 75% of small organisations and 74% of large organisations reported the use of formal job evaluation plans. Again a high proportion of organisations reported application of job evaluation methods to technical, clerical, professional and managerial jobs (Elizur, 1980).

While these surveys enable an assessment of the tendencies in the application of job evaluation, Elizur (1980) has pointed out that it is difficult to estimate how representative this sample is for organisations in the USA as a whole, as it may well be that those organisations using job evaluation tend to respond to the survey more readily than those who do not apply such methods. A recent estimate suggests some 50% of employees in the USA are covered by some form of job evaluation plan or another (Cogill, 1984:59).

2.2 JOB EVALUATION IN BRITAIN

At about the time of the rise of industrial unionism in the U.S. in the 1930's and the subsequent influence of the U.S. National Labour Board, job evaluation came to Europe, although it is reported that the first incidence is attributed to the Swiss shoe company of Bally as early as 1918 (Livy, 1972). Evidence contained in a large scale national survey of practice in Great Britain carried out by the now defunct National Board for Prices and Incomes (NBPI) in 1968 based on 5000 manufacturing organisations, revealed that job evaluation was used to determine the pay grade of 23% of the six and a half million employees covered in the survey (Elizur, 1980). It further established that 30 percent of organisations with over 500 employees and 54 percent of organisations with over 5000 employees used job evaluation (Belcher, 1974). Overall however, only 9 percent of the 16244 establishments covered in the survey used job evaluation (Husband, 1976;
Clearly it was prevalent mainly amongst the larger organisations.

Despite this relatively lower incidence, the NBPI survey also showed that almost as many organisations as were then using job evaluation, were considering introducing it (Husband, 1976). In view of the large number of establishments which were considering introducing a scheme, the Board predicted that the rapid growth of schemes in the sixties would continue.

Since the Board's enquiry, a number of factors may well have contributed to growth of job evaluation in Britain, not least the passing of the Equal Pay Act in 1970. The Act as amended by the Sex Discrimination Act of 1974 specifically considers job evaluation in determining comparisons between male and female jobs. The Act is even as specific as to make clear that only analytic job evaluation systems utilising factor comparison or points rating can be used (Cogill, 1984:59). (This was superseded by the Equal Pay Amendment Act of 1984 which provides for job evaluation to be used as a means for settling claims to equal pay on the basis of its role in determining work of equal value) (Mathewman, 1984).

The extent to which job evaluation fulfilled the NBPI's predictions about the future growth is reflected in a survey carried out by the Institute of Personnel Management (Information Department, 1976) revealing that 78.8% of responding organisations had a scheme in operation, and 4.6% were about to introduce one. However, 14% of the respondents never had a scheme, while 2.3% had discontinued operating their schemes. Of the companies operating schemes, some 32% had introduced job evaluation more than ten years before the study while a further 36% had introduced job evaluation between 1969 and 1973, in some cases specifically arising from the impetus of the Equal Pay Act of 1970, (IPM Information Report 21, 1976). In contrast to the USA however, it is
estimated that between 25%-33% of employees are currently covered by a job evaluation plan (Cogill, 1984:59).

2.3 OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

As far as other European countries are concerned, Sweden has a number of industry-wide job evaluation schemes covering at least 20% of blue collar workers (Belcher, 1974; Paterson, 1972). West Germany has both industry-wide and regional job evaluation plans while Holland is an oft quoted example of a national job evaluation plan first installed in 1948 for unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled employees (Belcher 1974; Paterson 1972). The plan was installed to implement national wage policy and as originally conceived, represented an attempt to base wages entirely on equity without regard to economic forces (Belcher, 1974; Cogill, 1984). Although today no longer an instrument of government pay policy, most firms still utilise some form of job evaluation (Cogill, 1984).

Reports at an international Job Evaluation Conference in 1969 indicate that job evaluation is used in other countries such as France, Switzerland, Poland and Czechoslovakia (Elizur, 1980). Belcher (1974) reports that Russia has had an inter-industry grading scheme since 1955 which could be categorised as a job evaluation employee classification system. Personal correspondence with Dov Elizur (1986) and interviews with the Head of the Job Analysis Unit of the Productivity Institute in Israel (1987), have revealed that job evaluation point systems are used in some public institutions in Israel.
2.4 SUMMARY

From existing survey data the available evidence suggests that job evaluation is widely used by organisations in the USA, to a lesser degree in Britain, and in numerous other countries. Job evaluation usage appears to be growing both in terms of the number of firms installing systems, and also in its application to wider groups and occupational classes. Interestingly, the passing of the Equal Pay Amendment Act in Britain in 1984 has had the effect of increasing the power of job evaluation in the resolution of claims against pay discrimination in industry. The pioneering case of Julie Hayward, the Cook from Cammell Laird, illustrates quite convincingly the impact such techniques have in settling pay equity disputes (Wainwright, 1985).

2.5 HISTORY AND CONTEMPORARY USE OF JOB EVALUATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

2.5.1 Past Developments

Contrary to the American experience, which saw job evaluation evolve out of civil service personnel systems, job evaluation in South Africa took firm root in the mining sector when Anglo American Corporation (AAC) installed the first formal system in 1961 consisting of three separate 16 factor plans, one each for non-supervisory jobs, supervisory jobs and clerical jobs. This "triple" system remained in use until 1971 (Perold, 1985:72). This according to the above author heralded the first "stage" in the use of job evaluation systems in South Africa, the second occurring in the manufacturing sector.
During this ten year period, AAC experimented with other systems in other areas and between 1971 and 1973 a unitary 26 factor system developed by W Hudson was implemented in all of AAC's gold mines. Resistance from mine managers to a unitary system perceived as discriminating against white clerical workers inter alia, prompted AAC to look for a new job evaluation system. Other reasons included strong opposition from the white Mine Workers Union (MWU) to the installation of a job evaluation system which would provide for a "unified" wage structure thereby challenging traditional wage bargaining on the basis of job reservation and classification by race. Secondly, a dispute with the Chamber of Mines that AAC cornered the black labour market by paying rates above market, pointed to the need for a standardised system to be used throughout the industry which was acceptable to all members of the Chamber. In addition, having by 1973 diversified its operations into other sectors of the economy, AAC required a standardised job evaluation system which could be applicable throughout the Corporation. The 26 factor system was unsuitable in view of its specificity to the type of jobs found in the mines.

The Paterson System (discussed later in this chapter) was found to satisfy the above criteria in addition to enjoying international recognition and a high correlation with the 26 factor system, which meant a minimum of changes in those establishments where the latter had already been implemented. By 1975 the Paterson System had been installed throughout Anglo American and by 1982 the whole of the mining industry was using the Paterson System. Its provision for a "unified" pay structure did not however find favour with the MWU (Perold, 1985:73-74).

The second "path" in the use of job evaluation in South Africa was rooted in the pioneering work in factor analytic job evaluation undertaken by the National Institute of Personnel Research (NIPR) in the early 1950's, although it was only
a decade later that the basis of the NIPR Q-Method and Fixed Grade Method
was laid with a job evaluation study done within certain areas of the CSIR
(Vian, 1985; Biesheuvel, 1985).

The Castellion Method dates back to the development in the 1950's when the
NIPR was engaged in job evaluation research for the SA Iron and Steel
Corporation (ISCOR) and African Explosives and Chemical Industries (now
AECI) both among the largest industrial enterprises in South Africa (Biesheuvel,
1985). The system was initially researched by Prof S Biesheuvel of the NIPR
who together with Dr L Cortis later developed and tested the system for the
South African Breweries Group, deriving its name from the Beer Division's two
top products, Castle and Lion Lager (Biesheuvel, 1985; Perold, 1985).
Together with the Sanlam Group the Castellion method was implemented in
various companies within and outside these groups. The number of systems
used grew to the extent that a salary survey (the Castellion Survey) was
initiated to complement the job evaluation system. In the early 1970's the
system and salary survey was taken over by the Peromnes Company under
which name the system and the survey have been marketed in a slightly
modified form. In 1982 Peromnes was marketed by Fine Spamer and
Associates (FSA) group of management consultants (Perold, 1985).

In the public sector, the Public Service Commission (as the Commission for
Administration was previously known) undertook an evaluation of posts falling
under its control by way of a self-developed system (Vian, 1985). In more
recent times, the state has favoured a different approach - what it has termed
occupational differentiation which represents an alternative to universal
integrated (unified) job evaluation systems in that SEPARATE grading structures
are designed for different occupational groupings that have been identified on
the basis of substantial differences in job content (Robson, 1984).
2.5.2 Present Usage

Available data suggests that contemporary usage of formal job evaluation systems in South Africa is extensive. Perold, (1985) whose survey, carried out between June and September 1982, specifically aimed at determining the extent to which job evaluation is being used in South Africa amongst Johannesburg Stock Exchange listed companies, found that 78 out of 152 respondents (51.3%) were using or in the process of implementing a formal job evaluation system. These represented in large part companies in the mining and manufacturing sectors. A further 17 (11.2%) were considering implementing a formal system. The survey also revealed that the majority of job evaluation users were the large employers. If the 10 respondents who did not disclose their workforce size are excluded, 55 out of the remaining 68 respondents (81%) were companies with more than 1,000 employees (Perold, 1985:79). FSA (Pty) Ltd (1984) reported that 76% of companies participating in their salary surveys had a formal system of job evaluation. P.E. Corporate Services (1987) reported that 58% of participating clients have a formal system for their top executives and 65% for their other staff. Yet another survey undertaken by Wegner and Tromp (1985) whose target population was very similar to that of Perold (1985) reflected the same high degree of usage.

The surveys also revealed that whereas during the 1970's a slow but gradual increase in the implementation of job evaluation systems took place, it was in the early 1980's that an upsurge in the implementation of job evaluation systems was experienced to the extent that 68% of companies in Perold's survey installed systems in the 1980's (adapted from Table 2:78) while FSA (1984:25) reported that only 40% of companies had their systems in use for more than two years, thus reflecting that 60% of companies had installed systems after 1982. It is also possible to deduce from the P.E. Corporate Services Report (1987:13) that of the
systems most dominant in the field, the vast majority had been implemented in the 1980’s.

The findings of a very recent questionnaire sent to members of the Institute of Personnel Management in the Western Cape revealed that 77% of respondents (138) were associated with companies using job evaluation systems. Of the 23% who responded negatively 40% were members employed in companies employing less than 100 employees (University of Cape Town Student Research Paper, 1988).

2.5.3 Local Government Usage

As has been noted, the above surveys focused almost exclusively on private sector organisations. Public sector participants in the FSA and P.E. surveys represent less than 5% of participating organisations. It was felt therefore that in the context of this study, local authorities warranted independent focus. To this end a survey was undertaken to determine the format and extent of usage of formal job evaluation systems in compensation practice in local government.*

A questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent in April 1987 to 39 of the larger local authorities in South Africa. These were selected on the basis of a fifteen grade classification applicable to local authorities. Those graded 9 or higher were included. Of these, 29 responded, representing a very satisfactory return rate of over 74%.

The overall finding was that the prevalence of formal job evaluation systems in local government is high. Of the 29 respondents, 24 (86%) use formal job evaluation systems, 2 (7%) are in the process of initiating a formal system while a further 2 (7%) do not have any formal procedures for evaluating and grading jobs.

In the Transvaal, all white local authorities with the exception of Johannesburg and Pretoria are members of the Municipal Employers Organisation, and as such form part of the Industrial Council for the Local Government Undertaking in the Province of the Transvaal. Since 1978, job evaluation has been carried out by a committee administered by the Industrial Council, having since that time evaluated more than 50,000 posts within more than 100 local authorities of varying size (Secretary MEO; Town Secretary, Germiston Municipality).

A similar approach has been adopted in the Cape Province where immediately following the establishment of an Industrial Council in January 1986, a Job Evaluation Committee was established and subsequently decided that the job evaluation system as applied in the Transvaal Industrial Council would also be used in the Cape. The implementation of this decision is presently in progress, with the evaluation of posts having been completed in almost all member municipalities (Interview Assistant Secretary CPMA; IMP Forum No 5, 1986). Job evaluation in local government has also been further extended through the process of grading Town Clerks in accordance with the Remuneration of Town Clerks Act (Act 115 of 1984). Table 2.1 reflects the number of years job evaluation has been in operation in larger local authorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF YEARS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above it is evident that the majority of local authorities who have job evaluation systems, installed these over the past decade which conforms to the general trend in the private sector. The longest operating system according to the survey had been in operation for 14 years.
2.5.4 Municipalities in the United States

An interesting comparison is possible with American municipalities through a survey carried out by the Bureau of Business Research at the University of Texas. This was a replication of one of eight surveys carried out between 1950 and 1954 to determine job evaluation practices and procedures in various organisations throughout the United States. The target group comprised 75 scattered municipalities each of which had a population of at least 125000. Of the 68 (87%) respondents, 51 (75%) had formal plans of job evaluation in effect (Lanham, 1971). One more was currently installing a formal plan while another was definitely planning to install one in the near future. Only seven respondents stated that they neither had a plan nor had any intention of installing one. Eight municipalities used informal methods for determining job worth.

A more recent survey of public sector job evaluation practices was undertaken in 1976 by Suskin (1977:428-441). It covered 46 usable returns from 50 states and 31 returns from 70 of the largest county government employers. All participating organisations used at least one form of job evaluation method. The most revealing aspect of the survey was that whereas non-quantitative methods of job evaluation continue to predominate in the public sector there is clear evidence of a movement towards increased use of quantitative methods, chiefly factor point methods. While the traditionally used position classification method continues to be used for most or all occupations, both states and counties were found to frequently use different methods to evaluate different occupational groups. Typically associated with this approach is the use of separate pay structures for the different groups. Occupations most frequently singled out for separate evaluations were found to be medical, professionals and executives, managers and supervisors. This aspect is briefly referred to in section 6.4.8.2 of chapter 6.
2.6 CONTEMPORARY SYSTEMS

A synthesis of the findings of the above quoted local surveys is contained in the Table 2.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>Percentage Users in Stated Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wegner and Tromp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSA All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hourly Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferommes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAY MSL</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castellion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/In-house</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principally two systems are most commonly used in South Africa, namely the Paterson System and the Ferommes System. Numerous in-house hybrids have also been developed, in many instances derived from one of the above systems. Historically, the NIPR system was originally designed to grade administrative posts and later adapted to meet industrial needs. It has tended to feature more prominently in the public sector. The Hay-MSL method which was developed by E N Hay and Associates published in a series of papers from 1951 to 1954, enjoys a considerable amount of success in the U.K. and the system is used widely for international comparison in America, Europe, Australia and Africa (Paterson, 1972). In South Africa, the method has been applied predominantly to managerial positions.

2.6.1 Features of the Prevalent Job Evaluation Systems

It is worth presenting an overview at this juncture of the most prevalent abovenamed systems in South Africa both for the benefits of illustrating the
current approaches as reflected in the methodologies of the respective systems, and more importantly for comparison with the job evaluation system installed in the Cape Town City Council.

2.6.1.1 Paterson’s Decision Band Method

Like the Time Span Method of Jacques, outlined in Chapter 1, the significant difference between jobs according to Paterson, is indicated by the quality of decision. This approach to job evaluation was developed by Paterson from his empirical observations in a number of countries. Jobs are evaluated in terms of a single factor namely the type of decisions. As a unitary factor it gives the system universality. Six decision levels or bands are identified which represent the broad generic categories of work according to the type and level of decision made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION BANDS</th>
<th>CO-ORDINATIVE FACTOR OR OTHERWISE</th>
<th>SUB-GRADINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F Policy (Top Management)</td>
<td>Upper F - Co-ordinating</td>
<td>F5,F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower F - Policy Making</td>
<td>F3,F2,F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Programming (Sen Management)</td>
<td>Upper E - Co-ordinating</td>
<td>E5,E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower E - Programming</td>
<td>E2,E2,E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Interpretive (Mid Management)</td>
<td>Upper D - Co-ordinating</td>
<td>D5,D4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower D - Interpretive</td>
<td>D3,D2,D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Routine (Skilled)</td>
<td>Upper C - Co-ordinating</td>
<td>C5,C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower C - Routine</td>
<td>C3,C2,C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Automatic (Semi-skilled)</td>
<td>Upper B - Co-ordinating</td>
<td>B5,B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower B - Automatic</td>
<td>B3,B2,B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Defined (Unskilled)</td>
<td>Lower A only - Defined</td>
<td>A5,A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2,A2,A1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bands as have been indicated represent broad generic groups within which are found considerable subdivision of function. Each decision band is divided into two levels or grades, upper or lower; except for Band A giving 11 grades. The upper grade is a supervisory grade and such a job incumbent co-ordinates
co-ordinates the the work of incumbents in the lower grade of the band. The exception is Band A whose supervisors are in Band B.

These eleven hierarchical grades indicate the relative value of work to the organisation. They may be further broken down into sub-grades with three sub-grades suggested for the 'substructure' grade and two subgrades recommended for each ‘co-ordinating’ grade. Paterson (1981:116) states that ... "no one criterion specifies sub-grade" and has suggested a number of criteria to consider in the subgrading, for example variety of tasks, pressure of work, alertness, experience and that this can be done by comparing jobs with each other. This procedure tends to contaminate the pure decision making basis, since it introduces other factors in order to establish subgrades.

Le Roux (1985:85) reports that many South African organisations using the Paterson system make use of four major criteria in sub-grading, namely variety of tasks, length of cycle of a task, pressure of work and tolerance or precision. This need for sub-criteria has led to the development by FSA Management Consultants of the TASK System which as a Paterson derivative is designed specifically to improve the fine tuning of the sub-grading or as Zimmerman (1985:4) has put it "to iron out some of its crinkles".

Paterson has found that when, in any organisation, CURRENT rates of pay for jobs are plotted on a logarithmic scale on the Y-axis and the equidistant grades on the X-axis "... the line of best fit which emerges is usually straight" (Livy, 1975:111). The gradient however tends to vary between industries and between firms. Larger and higher paying firms tend to have steeper gradients. Labour scarcities can cause departures from the straight line and likewise poor industrial relations and disputes can cause deviations. From a wide variety of applications over a range of organisations in different countries including
Europe, India and South Africa,

"taken as a whole, the total sample shows that the general theory holds that differentials tend to be based upon a decision-making grading from unskilled jobs to the board-room, with an exponential increase from grade to grade" (Paterson 1972:).

The straight line relationship is interpreted by Paterson as a measure of fairness in the pay system and since he found that most pay slopes approximated a straight line, he suggests this implies that most existing pay systems are fundamentally fair. This parallels Jacques's idea that intuitive felt fair norms are often manifested in pay structures. The fact that the method does not therefore result in radical pay change is used as a motivating argument in its acceptability to management. Others would argue this to be a disadvantage since it may be criticised for underwriting the status quo (Livy, 1975:111). Livy (1975:112) has summarised this problem succinctly when he writes that "because the outcome conforms with existing pay rates, it does not mean to say they are the right ones. They do not validate the scheme".

The value of the Paterson system in the South African context should not be underestimated since jobs in the lower bands are held predominantly by black workers. The relatively high rate of increase in pay from Band A to C is a reflection of both an oversupply of unskilled labour and discriminatory pay and work policies. If equitable rates are to be found in the straight line relationship, then it represents an important guideline against which Black pay scales can be adjusted in order to give effect to the principle of "equal pay for work of equal value" (Taylor, 1984:167).

2.6.1.2 The NIPR Q-Method

Although there is currently not a very high incidence of usage of the NIPR in South Africa, it is historically important in the context of the development of
home grown job evaluation systems. The Q-Method derived its name from the introduction of a questionnaire to obtain job information in order to circumvent the laborious and time-consuming interviewing procedures for drawing up job descriptions (Biesheuvel, 1985). The Q-Method can be regarded as both a Points and Classification/Grading System. Points are obtained from factor scale ratings which increase progressively in complexity. The three factors used by the Q-Method are:

* **THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS** which concentrates very largely on the problem-solving aspects of job requirements and covers identification of the causes of a problem through the solution to the feedback and consequences of the decision within certain limits. Account is taken of the nature of the work, the education and experience demands and consequences of error.

* **CONTROLS** refers to the degree of freedom enjoyed/supervision exercised over the incumbent's functioning and takes cognisance of the assistance available and the restraints placed on the individual's functioning.

* **CONTACT WITH PEOPLE** concerns the NATURE of the interface with supervisors, subordinates, peers and persons outside the organisation. The contacts are scaled from routine operational contact through to advisory and strategic (Biesheuvel, 1985; Taylor, 1983). Biesheuvel (1985:47) rightly points out that the contact factor provides a further dimension to the decision-making process by elucidating on the degree to which decision-making is shared with others and the range of impact of his decisions.
From the above description it can be seen that the factors included in the Q-Method are largely influenced by Paterson's Decision Band System and Jacques' Time Span of Discretion concept (Biesheuvel, 1985:46).

The factors are rated on scales defining ten degrees of each of the requirements. The sum of these gives a final rating, which total places the job into one of sixteen grades defined in terms of a point range distribution (Biesheuvel, 1985:46; Taylor, 1983).

2.6.1.3 The Castellion Method

Historically the method dates back to the early NIPR research mentioned earlier and refined by Cortis and Biesheuvel for use at South African Breweries (Biesheuvel, 1977:1985). The system is a Point Method and is based on three variables considered to be universal differentiating elements between all jobs (Biesheuvel, 1985:1977). Each variable is broken down into two elements, giving a total of six sub-factors. The method uses scales to measure these factors which indicates the points to be awarded for defined levels at which the factor can be observed to be operating (Taylor, 1983). By adding the sub-factor scores and products, the total points value for the job is obtained. Grades are empirically established by means of cut-offs on the distribution of points resulting from the application of the system. The points range runs from 4-1248 points and is divided into 15 grades from labourer to top executive (Biesheuvel, 1977:22).

The first variable EFFORT is seen as the outcome of complexity of DECISION MAKING and the time stress subject to which decisions have to be made ie PRESSURE OF WORK. The second variable RESPONSIBILITY is broken down into two sub-factors CONTROLS AND CHECKS and CONSEQUENCES OF ERROR. The former assesses the extent to which the availability of manuals or other specific instructions to guide action, closeness of supervision
or sharing of responsibility with others can lighten the burden imposed by a job. Consequences of Error assesses the possibility of losses (human, material or organisational) resulting from inadequate exercise of vigilance as well as from errors of judgment and failure in the exercise of skills (Biesheuvel, 1985:76-77).

It is pertinent to note at this point that an underlying aspect of the Castellion system which enters in the assessment, particularly in the responsibility sub-factors, is Jacques’s concept of the time span of discretion.

The third and final variable is that of COMPETENCE which covers the qualifications and experience considered essential for job performance.

Biesheuvel (1985:22) says that although many argue that the above factors are implicit in the complexity of decision-making in that it is not possible to make the decisions without the requisite qualifications and experience, these factors are regarded as so important by organisations that it would be "inadvisable to omit them even if there is an overlap with decision-making." In point of fact, he later demonstrates that the overlap is slight since "complexity of decisions may or may not depend on particular qualifications and when it does, it must be recognised as an additional job requirement..." (1985:28). He also regards the face validity afforded by inclusion of qualifications and experience as vital to acceptance of the system.

The validity of the system, according to the architects, rests primarily on its demonstrated practical usefulness. This is achieved by measuring the value of all jobs by means of a common set of criteria through its use of universal psychological factors (Biesheuvel, 1977; Taylor, 1985).
The Peromnes Method

The Peromnes System grew out of the Castellion System and is currently marketed by a South African firm of Management Consultants, FSA (Pty) Ltd. South African Breweries introduced job evaluation in their salary surveying procedure in order to assist participants to equate jobs. A simplified form of their Castellion System was used for this purpose. When their survey was taken over by FSA (Pty) Ltd the job evaluation method was retained and further modified (Biesheuvel, 1985:53-54). The Peromnes Survey and its evaluation method was named after a model firm designed to define the key jobs used in the survey and their organisational relationships (Biesheuvel, 1985:54).

The system is a point rating method based on eight universal factors which revolve around the key element of decision-making (Le Roux, 1985; Taylor, 1984; FSA Surveys, 1984). These factors are:

* **PROBLEM SOLVING:** the quality and complexity of decision processes (including those required in formulating recommendations) that are demanded in the jobs, in terms of the kind of information available in the presentation of a problem, the accessibility of that information, and the nature of the alternative courses of action that are possible.

* **CONSEQUENCES OF ERROR OF JUDGMENT:** the effects of wrong decisions on the activities, well-being and prestige of the organisation (or any of its parts), taking account of controls and checks that may exist to prevent such errors or their re-occurrence. In extreme cases, consequence of error can extend beyond the organisation itself.
• PRESSURE OF WORK: the amount of "stress" inherent in a job, as reflected in the volume and type of work and the time available for necessary activities.

• KNOWLEDGE: the level of knowledge required, in operational (NOT formal qualifications) terms, to perform the job competently.

• JOB IMPACT: the extent of influence that the job has on other activities, both within and outside the organisation.

• COMPREHENSION: the requirements of the job in understanding written and spoken communications.

• EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS OR INTELLIGENCE LEVEL REQUIRED IN THE POST: the essential requirements are considered, NOT the merely desirable ones.

• SUBSEQUENT TRAINING/EXPERIENCE REQUIRED: the period necessary to achieve competence in the job by the shortest possible reasonable route of advancement.

Each factor is scaled on the basis of prescribed definitions of progressive complexity into nine sections with an arithmetical points progression. The summation of scores assigned to each of the eight factors gives a total points value for the job which is then graded into one of 19 grades according to a conversion scale which reflects the points ranges for the respective grades (FSA Management Consultants, 1984).
### TABLE NUMBER 24
PEROMNES JOB EVALUATION SYSTEM GRADING STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>SKILLS CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1++</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>The most senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>Other Top Management and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Very Senior Specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Senior Management and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>High Level Specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Middle Management/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Superintendents/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Low Level Specialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Supervisors/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>High Level Skilled/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Lower level skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Very low skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: FSA (Pty) Limited*

The job grades, as well as reflecting the job hierarchy within an organisation also have external reference in their comparability on a nation wide basis between different organisations using the system. Although criticism has been levelled at the system on the choice of factors, their weighting, simple summation of points as opposed to indexing etc. its usefulness is well demonstrated in the above regard.

#### 2.6.1.5 HAY MSL Guide Chart Profile Method

The Guide Chart Profile Method was developed by E N Hay and Associates and in its present form is marketed by Hay/MSL management consultants and is applicable mainly to managerial, administrative and executive jobs, although it has also been applied in some shop floor situations (Paterson, 1972 quoting from notes received from Younger of Hay/MSL). It is a detailed, analytical, quantitative method. It constitutes a modified points rating system and bears
an affinity to both time-span and decision banding (Livy, 1975). Paterson (1972:115) regards this method as important "...because of its basic premises which reduced to their simplest, imply that kind of decision is a fundamental criterion for differentiating jobs". Biesheuvel (1985:52) in analysing the factors used in the method writes that "...despite differences in terminology, they come very close to the factors used in the Castellion job evaluation method".

The three main factors are:

* ACCOUNTABILITY: There is a measure of accountability in any job. A job is seen as having a purpose and objectives can be seen in relation to organisational goals. A job incumbent is thus answerable for actions and for the consequences thereof. Accountability is thus concerned with results obtained and the value of resources controlled.

* KNOW-HOW: refers to the sum total of knowledge and experience needed for satisfactory job performance.

* PROBLEM SOLVING: refers to the complexity and importance of problems prescribed by the tasks involved in the job, and what alternative courses of action are open for their solution. This is the nub of the decision-making activity.

These three aspects are considered key elements and when evaluated a profile of each job can be constructed for the purposes of inter and intra-organisational comparison. Guide charts developed for client companies by the consultants indicate the graduated standards for evaluation and constructing profiles.
Each of the three factors is analysed under two main headings, each sub-divided with points value being assigned to the ultimate sub-divisions. The main component which an incumbent brings to the job, Know How, is measured according to two broad aspects - the first covering skill, education and training, and the second, breadth of managerial know how. Problem solving is similarly measured in terms of the constraints and practices imposed by policies and procedures of the organisation and the intellectual effort demanded by problem solving (Biesheuvel, 1985:51). In the case of Accountability it is divided into the two broad headings of freedom to act and magnitude of accountability (Biesheuvel, 1985: Livy, 1975). A Profile of each job is constructed which reflects the structure of the job and interrelationship between the dimensions of the particular job and between other jobs within the organisation.

2.6.1.6 Job Evaluation Scheme: Industrial Council for the Local Authority Undertaking in the Transvaal Province/Province of the Cape of Good Hope

The above system is important in the local authority context in the light of its prevalence amongst authorities in the Transvaal and the implementation thereof presently underway in the Cape. The system is a five factor points rating system developed at the University of the Orange Free State for use by local authorities (Interview Assistant Secretary, CPMA). It displays all the classical characteristics of a point method comprising five main factors each differently weighted. Points are allocated by applying factor scale descriptions, the number of degrees of which vary from factor to factor. The following table summarises the structure of the system.
2.6.1.7 The Five Factor System Implemented in the City of Cape Town

The Five Factor System will not be described in great detail here as its application will be practically illustrated in forthcoming chapters. In chapter 1 elements of the system have been displayed in illustrating the point method of job evaluation.

As a points rating system it comprises five main factors with subdivisions in all but Factor 2, giving a total of ten sub-factors. Developed by Dr L Fick and Stellenbosch University academics it is intended as a universal system applicable across-the-board on an industry and organisational-wide basis. The factors employed, their respective weightings and the number of points...
allocated to each factor scale have been illustrated in Tables 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 respectively and integrated into Figure 6.1 which provides a concise summary of the features and structure of the system as applied in the City of Cape Town.

The system is an eclectic one, its design having being influenced by the NIPR Q-Method and the Castellion System as described above. It has been suggested by Fick that its lesser emphasis on decision-making makes it eminently suited to the local authority committee-based decision-making structures. This point will be further elaborated on in section 6.4.2, in outlining the structure of the method. The factors as briefly described below will illustrate the similarities with the aforementioned systems as well as the Peromnes System with which it has common roots.

1. QUALIFICATIONS: A. ACADEMIC: refers to the minimum formal academic or technical qualifications that are essential to perform the job.

   B. KNOWLEDGE: covers the level of knowledge required in operational terms to perform the job, such as technical, legal, professional, managerial, or the level of literacy required in say a lower level occupation.

   C. PRACTICAL TRAINING: refers to the minimum reasonable amount of practical training and experience that is required to perform the job competently.

2. NATURE AND VARIETY OF WORK

   This is the most heavily weighted factor and attempts to measure the complexity level and degree of diversity of job function.

3. DECISION-MAKING: A. NATURE AND SCOPE OF DECISIONS MADE: This sub-factor focuses on the highest level of decision-making that typifies the problem-solving requirements inherent in the job function having due regard for the prescriptions, precedents and guidelines that are available as a
4. SUPERVISION:  
A. SUPERVISORY CONTROL OVER OTHER STAFF: relates primarily to the supervisory elements of the job, specifically the complexity level of work being supervised. The number of staff under the incumbent's control has marginal influence on the rating.

B. SUPERVISION RECEIVED: This sub-factor assesses the system of checks and controls imposed upon the job incumbent and this focuses upon the degree of freedom allowed for independent functioning.

5. RELATIONSHIPS AND NEGOTIATIONS  
A. INTERNAL CONTACT:

B. EXTERNAL CONTACT: This factor assesses the extent of influence that the job has on other functions both within (sub-factor A) and outside (sub-factor B) the organisation. The focus is directed at three elements - the frequency of contact, the hierarchical level, and most pointedly, the degree of influence exercised in such interface.

The breakdown of the factors into a scale of degrees and the factor scale definitions have been illustrated in Chapter 1 Figure 1.7. These are further discussed in section 6.4.3. of Chapter 6 and the full evaluation rating schedule is depicted in Figure 6.2 of that Chapter in the context of the application of the system. The Job Description Schedule which is an integral and fundamental cornerstone of the system is discussed in section 6.4.5.3.
Unlike the more institutionalised systems such as Paterson and Peromnes which have developed empirically justified grading structures, the approach of the Five Factor System is more loosely grounded in the needs of the organisation. Fick explains that the grading structure would be influenced by natural breaks in the sequence of points ratings and by preferred statistical models. The final grading structure as adopted by the City Council is reflected in Table 6.9 of Chapter Six and the features are discussed in section 6.4.11.4.

2.7 SUMMARY

This chapter has attempted to provide an overview of the prevalence of job evaluation as a discipline by tracing historically the development in the United States and other European countries, and reporting available survey data indicative of present usage. The development in usage in South Africa has also been traced and the prevalence of different systems in the private sector and local government has been reported as a result of a survey undertaken of major local authorities in South Africa. A summary of the features of the major systems reported above has been outlined for comparative purposes.
Chapter Number 3

PAST RESEARCH AND THE PRESENT APPROACH

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The present chapter reviews the direction taken by researchers in the field of job evaluation and identifies the point of departure of the present study. In so doing the methodological orientation deemed appropriate is discussed.

3.2 PAST RESEARCH

Academic research to date has been conducted predominantly by psychologists who have produced a series of research findings having little impact on organisational issues emanating from job evaluation as it is currently practised. These research efforts can conveniently be categorised into three distinct areas of concern. The first relates to the comparability of results produced by applying different job evaluation systems; the second involves issues in the construction of job rating scales; and the third covers studies examining various aspects of rater behaviour. Other research as relates more specifically to analysis in the case study, such as that pertinent to union attitudes for example, will be discussed in the appropriate context.

3.2.1 Comparability of Different Job Evaluation systems

Job evaluation procedures per se were the subject of fairly lively research at the time when they were first gaining prominence in the period just after World War 2. For example, in a series of studies published between 1944 and 1949,
Lawsche and Associates factor analysed the results of various point and factor comparison job evaluation systems which led to the development and successful testing of abbreviated scales of three to four items and the finding that different methods of job evaluation yield similar results (Elizur, 1980:34; Belcher, 1974:196). Chesler (1948) in comparing the results of several point and factor comparison job evaluation plans, found that essentially similar results were produced by the different job evaluation methods. The intercorrelation between the results of the various methods ranged from 0,89 to 0,93. Generally scholars have accepted, on the basis of these findings, that most job evaluation systems will lead to approximately similar results (Elizur 1980).

Later studies, one by Boshoff (1969) and another by Peters and McCormack (1966) revealed evidence consistent with the findings on the commonality between job evaluation methods. A more recent study undertaken by Robinson, Wohlstrom and Mecham (1974) determined the extent to which five different methods of job evaluation resulted in approximately the same classification when rating the same job series, obtaining correlations ranging between 0,82 and 0,95. In a local study, Snelgar (1982) determined the extent to which a number of job evaluation methods differing in methodology and presently in use in South Africa would supply similar classifications. Correlation coefficients of between 0,93 and 0,99 indicated a remarkably high level of agreement among the 16 organisations in assessing point values to the 24 jobs and a good deal of commonality among the methods. It is interesting to note that despite the overwhelming evidence reflected in the above findings the proliferation of new systems has continued, attributable to both academics and consultants alike, the latter having a distinct commercial interest in newly marketable products.
3.2.2 Rating Scale Construction

A second area of research has revolved around issues related to the construction of job rating scales. The aforementioned studies of Lawsche found that abbreviated scales yielded essentially the same results as lengthier ones. The testing of abbreviated scales arose through prior research in which they found that factor comparison and point plans studied all gave heavy weight to skill, and that in all installations two or three factors carried most of the weight, although the mix of factors was found to vary amongst organisations (Belcher, 1974:196). In testing the reliability of different scale formats, a series of studies found that scales constructed of job task benchmarks could normally be used with greater reliability than scales constructed of numerical benchmarks for rating job activities in the form of job-task statements (Peters and McCormack, 1966:95). In another study of nine variations of a rating scale using the same group of raters, it was found that ratings were affected significantly by the rating scale format (Madden and Bourden, 1964). Without answering the question of which rating scale is best, these studies have attempted to show that rating scale format can have an influence on the outcome of the ratings.

3.2.3 Rater Behaviour

The third major area of research has focused on rater behaviour. Belcher (1974) has reported on a number of studies in this regard. These relate generally to rater reliability, consistency and bias. Hazel (1966) undertook a study to determine whether reliability increases as a function of time spent by the rater in providing job evaluations, and found that "there was no indication of a substantial trend for reliability of job ratings to increase as a function of time spent on evaluation" (1966:18).

With the burgeoning of the comparable worth debate, recent studies have focused on sex or gender related error in job evaluation. Schwab and Grams (1985)
investigated the effects of the dominant sex of job incumbents, pay level of a job and evaluators' sex on job evaluation scores among 103 compensation practitioners. While no evidence was found that the dominant sex of job incumbents or the sex of the evaluator influenced evaluations, strong evidence was however found that the pay level associated with the job influenced evaluators in their judgments of job content. In earlier studies by the same authors (also published in 1985) little evidence was found to support the hypothesis that gender composition of the jobs influenced evaluations. Pay level on the other hand was found to consistently influence evaluations. A later study undertaken by Maul and Ellis (1987) confirmed the findings of Schwab and Grams concerning the influence of pay level although the effects were smaller than those reported in the former study. However, their results did indeed reveal some evidence of pro-female bias in the job evaluation ratings.

These findings have two important implications as far as this study is concerned. The obvious first question that arises is to what extent should job evaluation then be seen as formalising or reinforcing the status quo. But more importantly, in so far as market pay already reflects gender (and racial) bias, fore knowledge of pay can thus be expected to produce under evaluation of such categories without any need to identify gender (or racial) bias directly. Further elaboration of these issues will emerge in later analysis.

3.3 SHORTCOMINGS OF PAST RESEARCH

The above examples illustrate two important shortcomings of past research. The greatest weakness, it is suggested, has been in its isolationist approach in ignoring the point that job evaluation as a technique in the compensation planning process of personnel management takes place in organisations which are characterised
by environmental variables that can be identified, examined and then changed or rearranged to be compatible with organisational goals. Sociological concepts in this sense become particularly relevant in analysing pay administration. While the psychologically orientated approach has certain value, I do not believe it allows for an holistic approach on the organisational plane. It has tended to concentrate on aspects of job evaluation as discrete subjects for their own sake. While this does indeed better lend itself to the demands of the scientific method, it has contributed to restrictive research on job evaluation as it is intended to be, namely a tool in regulating the employment exchange. This reasoning coincides with the conclusion of Orpen (1985:118), that because of its dominant role the scientific method encourages attention to be focused on those problems which are most amenable to investigation according to its principles at the expense of others which appear less amenable. "The trouble is" writes Orpen (1985:118) "that these problems are often of less concern to organisations than those that are less amenable to such investigation because of their "messy" and "untidy" nature. What is notably missing in the academic literature is the treatment of job evaluation as part of an applied discipline conducted by practitioners whose aim is to improve the performance of individuals and organisations. Patten (1982:XII) has described personnel management as "an applied action orientated field in which ideas about planning and administration take precedence over theory building in the social and behavioural sciences". This is not to suggest that the latter be relegated, but that arising out of the primary concern of the researcher for solutions to practical problems, will develop as a natural course principles of wider applicability and theoretical significance.

3.4 TOWARD A MORE HOLISTIC APPROACH

3.4.1 Motivation for the Study

The City Council of Cape Town took a decision in principle to proceed with the
introduction of formal job evaluation in the organisation. To myself as participant it became evident that objectives amongst the different groupings in the organisation were at variance - councillors, management officials, the Municipal Service Commission and labour unions. (The structure of the City Council will be discussed in the forthcoming chapter). As the steps in the process unfolded it became clearer that the reality of such a project elicited expectations and responses from individuals and groupings in the organisational structure which were likely to have a profound impact on the equilibrium of the organisation as a whole and the outcome of any meaningful result from the implementation of such a project in particular. Management's apparent ambivalence towards a tool designed to enhance its own functioning and administration, highlighted the value of following the process through in a naturalistic way in an attempt to document for analysis the impact which such a "change agent" had upon the organisation, and thereby reveal insights that could prove of practical value and be helpful for future research with the aim of providing answers to preconditions in the environment and strategies under which such an application could be successfully managed particularly in an organisation as large and diverse as that of the City Council.

3.4.2 The Current Approach

The approach adopted in this dissertation reflects an attempt to study in holistic fashion the path of job evaluation in greater depth in its "natural" setting. The aim was to understand the dynamics of the process from the point of view of those involved in it, focusing on the perspectives and motives of the participating groupings. In this respect the dominant methodology employed was that of participant observation. This particular approach afforded the best opportunity for such an holistic analysis.
3.4.2.1 Participant Observation

The term "participant observation" however covers several types of research activity (Becker and Geer, 1960). Phillips (1985:295) has defined it as "a method of data collection in which the researcher notes and records ongoing social phenomena with his own behaviour constituting part of the phenomena". In view of the likelihood of differing degrees of involvement as participants, Phillips, following Gold (1958), has differentiated four types of participant observation.

The COMPLETE PARTICIPANT is an observational role involving entrance into the situation being studied as thoroughly as possible. Those being studied are unaware of the research being done so as to avoid altering the naturalistic situation. By contrast, the PARTICIPANT-AS-OBSERVER is an observational role involving the revealing of that role as well as thorough entrance into the situation of study. Thirdly, the OBSERVER-AS-PARTICIPANT is an observational role revealed to others with a very limited time for data collection. Immersion in the situation is therefore limited. Finally, the COMPLETE OBSERVER is an observational role in which the researcher's behaviour is not part of the phenomena studied and subjects remain unaware of the study.

Having regard to the above typology, as an employee of the City Council charged with co-responsibility for the operational aspects of the job evaluation process and as a member of the Central Evaluation Committee, the Central Grading Committee, and chairman of one of the evaluation panels, I have conceived of my observational role as a combination of the complete participant and the participant-as-observer. The characteristic of the latter is applicable only in the sense that certain parties in the organisation involved in the process of job evaluation were made aware of the research at the time when authority was sought to undertake the research. Authority was granted on the basis of a report submitted to the standing committees of the City Council entrusted with the
delegated powers to authorise the use of confidential data. Various officials involved in the staff administration process were thus in a position to study, and if necessary, offer comment on the request. It is however felt that this knowledge has had little or no effect and as Phillips (1985:295) has pointed out, many observers claim that others soon forget that one of the group will be recording what occurs for research purposes. In addition a certain amount of "defocusing" was used by describing the research project in general terms without detailing any specific goals and limited to identifying envisaged procedures with brief reference.

The advantage of being a natural member of the organisation has further enhanced the ability to overcome some of the difficulties and disadvantages associated with the observation process. In the first instance the problem of "gaining entrée" was limited to permission being granted to undertake the research as described above. Coupled to this, the question of researcher acceptance into the group being studied did not arise; particularly since authority was sought well after the respective roles of officials had been entrenched. Another of the accepted problems concerns the effect that the act of observation has on the observed. Classical or Newtonian physics emphasised the detached position of the observer in any physical experiment. Allowance could be made for any disturbance in the calculation relating to the experiment that may have been created by the form or act of research itself. Kaplan (1964:137) illustrates the case where the thermometer inserted into a liquid to measure the temperature of the liquid changes that temperature itself; but the thermometer can first be heated or cooled so as to minimise the effects - and there are even ways to measure temperature from a distance. In the human sciences the classic Hawthorne studies are an example of the way in which the effects of the process of observation altogether masked the effects of the other variables initially discriminated (Kaplan, 1964:136).
supplement with more formal interviews was taken mindful of the allowances which would be required to be made. While the interview method weights great reliance on what people say they do or believe, the preference for observation in this study enabled studying actions in a live situation, which afforded the opportunity to infer meanings from the organisational context to a degree not possible to attain by a formal method of questioning.

The shortcomings of such reliance are exemplified by a case study on the introduction of the Paterson system in a factory in Cape Town (Mathews, 1985). Management's one-sided perception was such that reliance on an interview with the Personnel Manager who expressed an obvious interest, would have resulted in an inaccurate account of the effects of introducing the system. The views expressed were clearly aimed at seeking legitimacy for management actions in the name of science. In the event Mathews concluded that rather than eliminating conflict, the introduction of the Paterson system increased the terrain of disagreement between management and the union (1985:28).

Indeed, Becker and Geer write that:

"The most complete form of sociological datum, after all, is the form in which the participant observer gathers it: An observation of some social event, the events which precede and follow it, and explanation of its meaning by participants and spectators, before, during, and after its occurrence. Such a datum gives us more information about the event under study than data gathered by any other sociological method...." (quoted in Phillips, 1985:313).

This highlights the importance of observation for yielding the context of any given occurrence, not easily attained in other procedures. It is suggested that the value of such data may be further enhanced by complementary historical and documentary contributions.

In addition to the difficulties of role separation in respect of employee-researcher, the likelihood of the reactivity of officials also weighed in favour of limiting use of
the formal interview or survey method. Observation was considered suited to minimising such reaction and formed an umbrella under which the informal method was employed whereby "respondents" were engaged in discussion on relevant issues without declaring this to be a formal research interview. "Interviewees" were thus unaware of this interview situation.

In returning to the question of observer effect it should further be stated that an undertaking given to the City Council "not to proceed with any work which would in any way unduly influence the progress or path of the (job evaluation) project" represented a conscious effort at being alert to any action which would alter the natural cycle of the process. This naturally cannot control for any unconscious actions or effects. On the other hand it is necessary to declare my commitment to the successful implementation of job evaluation, and for which I was remunerated by the organisation. This vested interest was constantly retained in my awareness in order to limit contamination of scientific interests. This demanded strong reliance on a reflexive approach and allowances made on the interpretation of data.

Phillips (1985:530-531) advocates in favour of including the research effort itself in the study - i.e. investigating the research situation so that the researcher becomes the object of research along with whatever else is under investigation. In this way researchers have the opportunity to learn about their biases and how they affect the research process. In short, the observer is required to observe his own actions and interpretative processes and to try to assess their effect on his conclusions (Open University Part 1 1964:13). Phillips (1985:309) also points out that including one's own research effort not only secures a better understanding of the phenomena under investigation but is also based on obtaining a better understanding of oneself and as a consequence, the researcher's ability as an observer.
Yet a further point on this thought trend is the question of how the researcher verifies whether or not the interpretation assigned is the correct one. Validation of the observational procedure poses a difficult problem. An important technique, according to Phillips (1985:315) is to enlist the aid of those under observation to react to those interpretations. One helpful approach employed in the study was to engage other actors in the situation in a discussion on the interpretation of particular perceptions or points of view. In this way, participants were used as a sounding board in order to verify or otherwise the researcher’s interpretation of a set of events. This is also closely allied to the concept of the informal interview noted above. It served also to reinforce a position that the observation and interpretation thereof was uncontaminated by any factors save those common to all observers. In some instances this approach was taken a step further by "circling back" to key persons who were requested to verify the interpretations recorded. This approach is closely related to the methods outlined by Becker and Geer (1960) who have proposed a helpful model for overcoming some of the problems of observation. They advocate the need to present the context of what they term the "perspective" which is customary for the group under investigation (1960:278-289).

3.4.2.3 Primary Documentation

Further to the above approach the observation procedure was complemented by the analysis of all documentary primary sources. This included all committee agenda and minutes relating to all aspects of the project. It also covered recourse to all internal and external correspondence, and all confidential reports generated either by affected and interested parties within the organisation or by consultants where applicable. These records which comprised a substantial collection of files of both historical and contemporary significance provided, in addition to the wealth of information on its own merits, the basis upon which observations could further
be verified. For example, the recording of the minutes of proceedings at committee meetings by an independent secretariat, could be compared against the notes and observations recorded by the researcher. The written correspondence in turn served to validate the point of view taken by departmental managers in committees or small groups and formalised the position of those whom they represented. This was particularly pertinent in the case of the Departmental Heads who collectively, under the chairmanship of the Town Clerk and Chief Executive, constitute the Corporate Management Team (CMT) of Council. Furthermore, these records provided the data for those situations in which the researcher as employee was not required or able to be present. Certain meetings of the Executive Committee of Council fell into this category and therefore a greater degree of reliance was placed on the official record in addition to feedback provided by those officials who were in attendance.

As far as supplementary "Union" material is concerned publications including the annual reports and newsletters were consulted in which both editorial comment and membership correspondence was perused. In this particular regard a limited number of discussions were held with Union officials. Although mindful of role separation difficulties outlined above, these discussions were conducted upon the termination of critical events in the process in an effort to facilitate eliciting of information which could no longer be construed as "risk charged" given the researcher's role as employee. In an effort to "evaluate" the information it was tested against official positions taken by the Union as reflected in its correspondence and representations to the Council in Committee and in its stance taken before the wider membership. In the case of the South African Association of Municipal Employees (SAAME)-(discussed in chapter 4) the termination of office of certain office bearers further enabled less politically considered and more direct responses in the interview situation.
3.4.2.4 Survey Method

Fourthly, the survey method was employed in order to determine the format and usage of job evaluation in the local government sector. To this end a questionnaire, the "Job Evaluation Usage Survey Questionnaire" was constructed, designed to elicit information on four categories of information viz. prevalence of formal job evaluation and degree of satisfaction therewith; representation in the grading process; usage of formal job descriptions and features of the pay structuring process. The questionnaire was pre-tested on members of the City Council's Personnel Office, including officials both engaged and not engaged in job evaluation directly. The survey was directed at the large local authorities in South Africa and those were therefore selected on the basis of the gradings of local authorities as contained in the Remuneration of Town Clerks Act (Act 115 of 1984) and as published in the Government Gazette No 9462 of 19th October 1984. This covered 39 local authorities including a small number of Divisional Councils. Part of the results of this survey have been discussed under Chapter 2 and will be further discussed in forthcoming chapters.

3.4.2.5 Note on Ethical Considerations

It is opportune at this point to add a note with regard to certain ethical considerations. A code of ethics developed by the American Sociological Association (1982) provides important guidelines on appropriate professional behaviour. In the context of the methodology of the study, two interrelated principles are of particular importance. The first relates to the principle of anonymity and confidentiality both individual and organisational, and the second the obligation to report findings fully and without omission of significant data. Both of these need to be appreciated in the context of research in a public institution where accountability to a broad spectrum of stakeholders renders information availability particularly sensitive. The proviso for authorisation of the research was
thus based on guarantees of anonymity and confidentiality. Avoidance of exposure to risk (career risk) or harm to individuals has thus been paramount and resulted in the need to remove from the data certain identifiers to ensure protection and adherence to the undertaking. Compliance with the protection of the identification and sensitive 'public information has the potential to create conflict with the second principle, namely full disclosure of findings.

The code of ethics of the ASA deals with "work outside of academic settings". It states that

"sociologists in business, government, and other non-academic settings should be aware of possible constraints in research and publication in those settings and should negotiate clear understandings about such conditions accompanying their research and scholarly activity" (ASA 1982).

As employee of the organisation in question, the above situation is particularly relevant.

In the study an attempt has therefore been made to find middle ground between the aforementioned conflicting obligations. Whilst this no doubt must of necessity lead to certain accommodating, it is considered that the research was adequately accomplished and the findings described without limitations.

3.5 CRITERIA OF RIGOROUS RESEARCH

The research orientation of this study is not only descriptive but evaluative. In terms of its objective it displays certain characteristics of applied research aimed at understanding organisational response arising from an exercise that by its nature questions the status quo. In so doing, its conclusions may be used in the formulation of a set of guidelines both for future research and be of practical application in the field of compensation management. In this sense it assumes
many features of the applied research model as elucidated by Orpen (1985) in his critique of the scientific model's applicability to management research. Some pertinent differences of focus as highlighted by Orpen are summarised in Table 3.1.

Orpen (1985:117) argues that research which follows the applied research model "frequently does more justice to the complexities of the real world than research conducted according to the 'ideal' described in the scientific model". Applied research as conceived by Orpen is characterised by the advantage of describing "what is" (1985:117). Indeed he has pointed out that it is becoming increasingly more prevalent to apply differing approaches within one research effort which contain elements satisfying both applied research goals and the elements of scientific rigour. He has noted that "there has been a tendency of late to de-emphasise complex factorial designs for multiple base-line longitudinal studies that are better suited for applied research in single organisations" (1985:118).

Preoccupation with the scientific model has tended "to reduce the positive aspects of conducting research in actual organisations engaged in the real life struggle of survival or death" (1985:118). "It is because applied research deals with the 'messy' and 'untidy' world of organisational life as it is instead of as it 'should be', that applied research frequently fails to meet the criteria laid down by the scientific model" (1985:118). For Orpen, the signs of modification to the scientific model which are presently evident will however prove insufficient, and in so arguing, he suggests that if genuine progress in research on organisations is to be experienced, a model more closely based on that used by applied researchers is indicated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARAMETER</th>
<th>IDEAL SCIENTIFIC MODEL/ ACADEMIC RESEARCHERS</th>
<th>APPLIED RESEARCH MODEL/ APPLIED RESEARCHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Concern</td>
<td>Development of law-like generalisations applicable to a variety of situations</td>
<td>Helping a particular organisation to solve an immediate problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Research</td>
<td>A Theoretical issue that interests the researcher</td>
<td>Something that concerns the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Step</td>
<td>Initially design the research so that hypotheses can be tested and thereafter seek an ideal setting to conduct the experiment or survey</td>
<td>Analyse the organisational context, especially constraints and opportunities. Design a research study after full support of organisational leaders having determined prior flexibility and utility of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Research</td>
<td>Have to satisfy criteria of rigorous research. Subjects randomly assigned experimental conditions. Use standardised instruments of measurement. Surveys/experiments provide investigator with a measure of control over what happens.</td>
<td>Forcéd to take into account complex reality of setting in which they are working. People are studied in real-life situation. Subjects can provide own interpretations of what things mean to them. Less control enabling less simplified responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters</td>
<td>Work for independent body.</td>
<td>Work for the organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts research</td>
<td>Conducted by outside Academics</td>
<td>Usually conducted by persons who belong to the organisation whose problem they are investigating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Rely on interpretation of results of experiment or aggregate responses. Reliance on cross-sectional data at a single point in time.</td>
<td>Attain intimate grasp of setting. In a position to take repeated measures over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation for Research</td>
<td>Theory generates a particular piece of research</td>
<td>Research generates theory through addressed concrete problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Well-established procedures are automatically followed</td>
<td>Procedures are more like strategies that can be revised or altered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Observer</td>
<td>Observer attains neutrality</td>
<td>Investigator is integral part of what he is studying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches</td>
<td>Unwilling to deviate from established techniques</td>
<td>Willing to employ techniques which allow scope for interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting of Results</td>
<td>Concern with conventions for reporting results. Continued to doing research and reporting findings.</td>
<td>Concern both to report results to scientific community and sell results to organisation. Usually involved in helping to implement solutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 SUMMARY

To summarise, it should be reiterated that an attempt has been made to counterbalance any disadvantages associated with the observational procedure. While the study lends itself to observation, complementary methods have been adopted, particularly in the form of primary documentary sources which have carried equal weight. Observation has given context and meaning to the latter. Informal interviews have been conducted as integral to the observational procedure.

By its nature the subject lends itself to an in-depth real life study of an holistic nature. This approach makes the precise reporting of methods somewhat under-specified and the possibility of replication ordinarily demanded by the rules of scientific rigour more difficult.

Kaplan (1964:127) has however pointed out that repeatability is in many instances a mistaken specification since "many important scientific observations take place on special occasions whose occurrence is incidental to their scientific significance". Indeed, this provides a case study with a unique virtue. Kaplan sees the criteria of repeatability better stated as intersubjectivity, and in so far as attempts have been made in this study to "sound out" interpretations by other actors, it has attempted to satisfy this criterion as well. Human (1986:9) has highlighted the point that reality also includes qualitative components; that some phenomena are at times unique (situationally-bound) and at times extremely unsystematic and chaotic. The observational technique has indeed demonstrated its ability to produce such complete and qualitative information which is likely to include relevant variables which could very well be overlooked in other methods. Many of the factors which do not form part of a preconceived notion can be uncovered and interpreted.
Finally it should be pointed out that one of the major difficulties experienced was the lack of control over the duration of the research process. Here I refer to the need to follow the full cycle of the job evaluation process which became characterised by severe protraction. While reasons for this are in themselves an important feature of the research findings it produced an uncertain time scale which was beyond the influence of the researcher.
Chapter Number 4
THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF CAPE TOWN CITY COUNCIL’S MUNICIPAL ORGANISATION

4.1 BACKGROUND

The Municipality of Cape Town was established on March 3 1840, although at that time the municipal area was delineated into 12 districts and sub-divided into four wards each, covering what today would be called central Cape Town. Cape Town was constituted a City in terms of Letters Patent granted by Writ of Privy Seal in 1847 and in 1867 achieved fully fledged municipal status. It is not however the oldest municipality in the country, as Beaufort West was proclaimed a municipality in 1837.

By the early twentieth century, Greater Cape Town consisted of the municipalities of Cape Town, Green Point, Sea Point, Woodstock, Maitland, Mowbray, Rondebosch, Claremont, Kalk Bay and Wynberg. The development of motor transport, and the growth of population required the construction of roads, stormwater drainage, water-borne sewerage and water supply on a large scale as well as slum clearance and the provision of electricity to meet increasing demands from the population (Newall, 1984:58). In 1913 Ordinance 19 was promulgated in terms of which the above municipalities were unified into ‘Greater Cape Town’ which provided the framework for meeting the needs of the growing population. It had become apparent that smaller municipalities had neither the financial nor human resources to meet the growing needs. In 1927 Wynberg Municipality which had originally chosen to remain separate was also incorporated.
4.2 FUNCTIONS OF THE CAPE TOWN CITY COUNCIL

Local authorities are required to perform specific legislative and governmental functions (the functions of elected councillors) as well as executive and administrative activities (the functions of appointed officials) to provide specific goods and services for the inhabitants of urban areas. Legislation provides for the regulation of affairs of municipalities and lists the matters entrusted to them. This takes the form of general and specific ordinances. Councils may then make their own by-laws on such matters entrusted to them (Cloete, 1984:173).

The Cape Town City Council is a large public organisation providing diverse services to a community of about one million people. These services include engineering services such as water supply, roads and drainage, sewerage, generation and distribution of electricity, refuse removal and cleansing services, health services, traffic control, housing, libraries, fire brigade, ambulance service, parks and recreation facilities, community halls and stadia, land survey, town planning, approval of building plans, business licensing, transportation planning, valuations, civil defence and security, and abattoir and produce markets. The provision of these services is attained through the organisational structure shown in Figure 4.1. Many of these services extend beyond municipal bounds and are provided on a metropolitan basis.

4.3 CORPORATE MANAGEMENT TEAM (CMT)

Each of the six departments is managed by a Departmental Head who, together with the Town Clerk as Chief Executive Officer, collectively form the Corporate Management Team of Council.
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Ancestry and Health
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STAFF MATTERS

CITY ENGINEERS

1. Administrative
2. Architectural
3. H & D Production
4. Building Survey
5. Clerking
6. Land Survey
8. Housing, Tenure, Housing
9. Parks & Forestry
10. Quality Survey
11. Roads
12. Scientific Services
13. Sewerage
14. I.H.S.
15. Notes Housing
16. Waterworks

CITY ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS

1. Administrative
2. Assistant Power Station
3. Development
4. Distribution
5. Districts
6. Institution
7. Street Power Station
8. System Control
9. Tech. Services
10. Test & Testing

CITY ADMINISTRATION

1. Administrative
2. Administration
3. Newch Services
4. Building, Facilities
5. Chief Buildings
6. Estates
7. Fire Brigade
8. Housing
9. Libraries
10. Markets
11. Traffic Police

CITY TREASURER

1. Administrative
2. Finance
3. Revenue
4. Data Processing
5. Audit (Internal)
6. Housing Finance
7. Community
8. Health Care
9. Health Inspection
10. NIB Control

MEDICAL OFFICE OF HEALTH

1. Employment
2. Internal Evaluation
3. Personnel Records
4. Training and Development

PERSONAL OFFICE
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4.4 STAFF ESTABLISHMENT

In order to ensure provision of these services, the municipality supports a staff 'fixed establishment' of 16901 permanent positions. ('Fixed Establishment' refers to the number of posts authorised by Council from time to time for the normal and regular requirements of the service in the occupations specified in the Grading Schedule). As at the end of 1988, 15471 of these positions were filled. The services outlined in section 4.2 and the organisation chart displayed in Figure 4.1 provide some idea of the diversity of disciplines represented. Indeed, most professions and occupations are represented among Council employees - these cover over 800 occupational titles listed in the Grading Schedule. (The 'Grading Schedule' is the document containing the scales of pay and their special conditions which apply to the various occupations in the Council's service). About 2500 employees are located at the Civic Centre, whilst the vast majority are dispersed throughout the municipal area and located at the decentralised field depots, power stations, community halls, libraries etc.

Salaries and wages absorb by far the single largest slice of the City's budget. For the 1989/90 financial year the salary and wage budget stands at R389 million which represents 39.1% of the estimated operating expenditure (Budget Speech 1989/90). This exceeds the City's rates income of R251,8m which is the major source of revenue for services rendered, by 54.5%.

4.5 THE PERSONNEL SYSTEM

The staff management function in the City Council comprises four broad components.
4.5.1 The Town Clerk and the Directorate of Personnel

The Town Clerk as Chief Executive Officer is charged with responsibility for the administration of all provisions relating to the management of staff and acts as the official channel of communication between the other components namely the Staff Associations, the Executive Committee and the Municipal Service Commission (discussed below). The personnel function is managed on behalf of the Town Clerk by the Director of Personnel who as the 'Senior Staff Officer' in terms of By-Law 1994 (Powers and Duties of the Municipal Service Commission and Management of Staff) is responsible to the Town Clerk for the administration of staff matters and the management of the central Directorate of Personnel. Many staff functions are performed in the branches of the departments who co-ordinate these functions through their own staff sections located within their respective Administrative Branches. The Director of Personnel plays a co-ordinative role at a corporate level in respect of these activities in the name of the Town Clerk.

4.5.2 The Municipal Service Commission

The Municipal Service Commission is a statutory body appointed by the Administrator of the Cape. It derives its powers from By-Law 1994 and is designed as an independent body charged with ensuring that all employees receive fair and objective treatment by monitoring Council's labour practices. The MSC was borne out of the findings of a 'Commission of Enquiry into the System of Local Government which applies to the City of Cape Town' (the Slater Commission, 1960). Presently it comprises a Chairman appointed by the Administrator and three Commissioners each being a nominee of the Council and the two Staff Associations respectively. The Cape Town City Council is unique in that it is the only local authority in South Africa where its employer/employee relations are partly managed by an outside body appointed by the Administrator. It is also the only municipality to have its own ordinance - Municipality of Cape Town Administration Ordinance No 24 of 1965. Section 19 stipulates the functions
"FUNCTIONS OF MUNICIPAL SERVICE COMMISSION"

19. (1) From a date determined by the Administrator and communicated to the council in writing, the council shall not appoint any person to its service or promote any employee to a post carrying higher emoluments or, on the grounds of misconduct, dismiss or impose any other penalty on any employee, before it has obtained and considered the recommendation of the commission in connection therewith: provided that the foregoing provisions of this section shall not apply in respect of-

(a) the town clerk or a head of department, and

(b) such employees or classes of employees, or such appointments, such promotions or the imposition on the grounds of misconduct of such penalties, as the council may after consultation with the commission and with the approval of the Administrator designate.

(2) The council shall also consult the commission and obtain its prior recommendation before the council amends the scales of emoluments or the conditions of service or the grading of the various posts of employees.

(3) The commission shall submit its recommendations in terms of sub-sections (1) and (2) to the council with all reasonable dispatch.

(4) The commission may submit to the council reports and recommendations on any matter concerning employment under the council and the organization and working of the council's departments or sections thereof and shall report any discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment by reason of religious beliefs.

(5) The commission shall have access to all documents and records of the council relating to staff and the organization and working of the council's departments and sections thereof, and the council and its employees shall render the commission all the assistance necessary to enable it to perform its functions effectively.

(6) The council shall provide the commission with suitable office accommodation and such staff as it may reasonably require.

(7) The council shall, unless otherwise authorised by the Administrator, give effect to any recommendation of the commission obtained in terms of subsection (1).
(8) The council may make regulations approved by the Administrator:

(a) for regulating the procedure to be followed by the council's administration in respect of the functioning of the commission;

(b) delegating specified powers to the commission;

(c) constituting machinery for the investigation of grievances of employees;

(d) constituting machinery for consultation between representatives of the council and of its employees, respectively, with regard to conditions of service, emoluments and any other matter affecting the welfare of the council's employees;

(e) providing for any other matters necessary for or incidental to the control, organization and welfare of the council's employees.

(9) (a) If the Administrator considers it necessary or desirable, he may direct the council to make a regulation specified by him on all or any of the matters contemplated by subsection (8) and if the council fails to comply within a period of three months with his direction, the Administrator may himself make such regulation in accordance with the provisions of this ordinance as if he were the council.

(b) Any regulation made by the Administrator in terms of paragraph (a) shall for all purposes be deemed to have been validly made by the council.

From the foregoing it can be seen that as a consultative body, all staff matters are required to be channelled through the MSC. The Municipal Service Commission also constitutes the forum for consultation between the Council and its employees. Section 26 of By-Law 1994 relating to the Powers and Duties of the Municipal Service Commission and the Management of Staff provides for the convening of special meetings to consider and investigate any grievance emanating with regard to conditions of employment. In terms of the procedure laid down in the By-Law "a meeting of the Commission shall be held within..."
fourteen days of a request being made therefore by either the Council or the appropriate Staff Association". In practice, it is the Unions that make regular use of this provision.

4.5.3 The Executive Committee

The powers and functions of the Executive Committee are also laid down in Ordinance 24 of 1965.

The Executive Committee within the context of the Personnel System, is the Council’s Staff Committee and all major staff items are referred to it for decision in instances where such powers have been delegated to it in terms of Section 6 of the Ordinance. Where such powers have not been delegated, the Executive Committee submits a report with its recommendations to the Council for approval.

The Executive Committee is Council’s negotiating body and deals directly with the two Staff Associations over salary and wage demands. In recent times the concept of a 'negotiating team' has been introduced which provides for greater participation by officials in the salary and wage negotiation process. Authority however remains firmly in the hands of EXCO who require ratification by Council for any salary and wage settlement finalised with the Union. Greater detail on the salary and wage negotiation process is covered in the forthcoming chapter.

4.5.4 Representative Staff Associations (Unions)

There are two registered Unions representing the employees of the Council. These are the South African Municipal Workers Union (Cape Town Branch) SAMWU, and the South African Association of Municipal Employees (Cape Town Branch), SAAME. Both Unions are old established Unions with roots going back at least 50 years.
4.5.4.1 Closed Shop Agreement

The Cape Town City Council has possibly the most highly unionised work force of all City Councils in South Africa (Financial Mail Aug 1985:88). All permanent members of staff are obliged to join one or other of the Unions. Paragraph 5 (2) (b) (ii) of the Conditions of Service of Employees of the City of Cape Town (1974:6) which regulate the terms of employment of all employees: states that

"(b) No employee shall be eligible for confirmation in an established position unless the Town Clerk is satisfied that : - (ii) he has applied, if eligible, to become a member of either the South African Association of Municipal Employees (Non Political) Cape Town Branch, or the South African Municipal Workers Union (Cape Town Branch); provided that

(A) the obligation to be a member of either Association shall not apply to the Town Clerk nor a Departmental Head, the Senior Staff Officer or their deputies..."

Although the above proviso (A) exists, in practice all permanent members of staff, holding 'fixed establishment' positions, are members of one or other of the trade unions. In this regard it should be noted that the possibility of management being members of a trade union is a distinctive feature of local authority employer-employee relations. This stems from the fact that senior managers and officials in the public sector are not their own masters - they are subject to the control of elected representatives who are the top decision makers - and therefore can justify the need for collective protection (Clegg, 1976:24).

Yet another important feature peculiar to local authorities is that since they are regarded as "essential services", employees may not legally strike, nor employers legally lock-out. This means that if a dispute remains unresolved after it has been referred to an industrial council or a conciliation board, as the case may be, it must be referred to arbitration - employees have no recourse to a legal strike in terms of current industrial legislation.
4.5.4.2 The South African Association of Municipal Employees (Non-Political) (Cape Town Branch) (SAAME)

The Cape Town branch of SAAME has its origins in an association of employees who came together to establish a pension fund (Newall 1985:60, FM Aug 85:98). The association then known as the Cape Town Municipal Employees Association later affiliated to the national body of SAAME which was established in 1921. It presently has a countrywide membership of about 50,000. It is a conservative union. Its philosophies are reflected in the By-Laws and Rules (1988:2) of the Cape Town Branch which state in section 3 (1) that: "membership of the Branch shall be open to all white employees of the Municipality of Cape Town ..."

SAAME has until recent times resisted the employment of non-whites in posts vacated by their members. Protection of the "traditional labour pattern" was ensured by Council's obligation to consult with the appropriate Union whenever a member of one race group was to be replaced by another in a vacated post (FM Aug 1985:98). SAMWU refused to participate in this process and claimed that it was "...not unusual to find that SAAME's objections on the grounds of race were upheld, when in the view of SAMWU merit selection would have assured another appointment" (FM Aug 1985:98). SAAME claimed their resistance to a "change in the labour pattern" was not a racially motivated one but merely one of protecting the interests of its members. It was based on an argument that as non-whites became employed in a particular designation the salary scale tended to fall behind in relation to what had previously been equivalent grades.

Currently membership of the branch stands at 4130 members representing roughly 27% of Council employees. Comparable membership bases are discussed in section 4.5.4.4. The Union also offers a variety of benefits to its members including a group life insurance scheme, which is subsidised by the Council, favourable car insurance rates, financial support and a recreation and sports club.
4.5.4.3 The South African Municipal Workers Union (Cape Town Branch) SAMWU

SAMWU which was established as national union in 1987 is affiliated to the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU). The Cape Town Branch, formerly the Cape Town Municipal Workers Union (CTMWA), originated in the 1920's and is thus the oldest of the COSATU affiliates.

Membership of SAMWU is open to all workers in local authorities and in local and regional government and related undertakings (SAMWU Constitution 1987:3). Although non-racial, in practice it represents coloured and black employees. Of a total of 11 306 members, there are fewer than 200 black employees in the City Council however as a result of the government's so-called “coloured preference area policy” which applied in the Cape Peninsula up until the mid 1980's.

Among SAMWU's principal aims are:

"1.1 to join forces with workers and other sections of the working class everywhere in the struggle against exploitation and oppression;
1.2 to fight for a decent standard of living;
1.3 to build a democratic, just and non-racial society;
1.4 to struggle for the fair redistribution of wealth...
1.15 to fight for the right to strike...”

The Cape Town Branch (the then CTMWA) underwent substantial changes from the early 1960's to the present. Mr John Ernstzen, the general secretary of the CTMWA since 1965 and presently the general secretary of the national body of SAMWU, in an interview published in the South African Labour Bulletin (Oct/November 1984:44-54) described the Union in the early sixties as hardly worthy of the name. The Union and its funds were maladministered, the
leadership was characterised by gangsterism, elections were rigged, and the total lack of concern with workers' interests was evidenced by the apparent collusion between union and employer. This situation prevailed due largely to a lack of interest in union affairs among rank and file members.

In the mid 1960's a change in leadership took place which began a process of democratisation and member participation. The Union placed a lot of emphasis on "bread and butter" issues. Today the Union is generally considered to be among the more progressive and democratic trade unions in South Africa (SALB 1984:44). The union became active in the union unity movement of the 80's culminating in the formation of COSATU and in the subsequent formation of the national municipal workers union.

The Union has over 100 elected shop stewards. Ernstzen (SALB 1984:54) states that they "... have a shop steward in every single depot in every branch". This structured shop steward representation provides the bridge between the membership and the leadership and is an essential part of effective operation of the Union. The Council officially recognised these shop stewards in 1984.

SAMWU, like SAAME, offers other benefits to its members. These include an autonomous medical benefit fund (partly subsidised by the Council), a bursary scheme, and various forms of financial assistance.

4.5.4.4 Union Membership Bases

The great majority of SAMWU members fall into the lower paid unskilled and semi-skilled category. SAAME, on the other hand, has few members in this category, with a large representation of their members in skilled, professional and management positions. Significant SAAME constituents are the clerical workers and artisan groups. Table 4.2 below reflects the respective membership
distribution of the two Unions. This is graphically depicted in Figure 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME CATEGORY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF MEMBERS</th>
<th>SAAME</th>
<th>SAMWU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than R10 000</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>7 092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 000 - 15 000</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>2 762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 001 - 20 000</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 001 - 25 000</td>
<td>1 074</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 001 - 30 000</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 001 - 35 000</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 35 000</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MEMBERSHIP</td>
<td>4 130</td>
<td>11 365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.6 POLICIES AND PRACTICES

4.6.1 Relevant Policy Statements

The City Council has been conscious of the need for equal and fair treatment of its employees (FM Aug 1985:96). There are two important policy statements which have an important bearing on the concept of job evaluation. Firstly, in October 1946 the Council laid down as a cardinal principle that

"... throughout the service there shall be equal pay for equal work regardless of sex or race, and that within the limits of practical consideration, there shall be equal opportunity for all servants to qualify for the highest posts in the Administration."

Secondly, the most recent in-principle policy resolution adopted in December 1977 reaffirmed the Council's "opposition to all forms of racial discrimination" and expressed its support for the Code of Employment Practice formulated by the Urban Foundation and the S A Employers Consultation Committee on Labour Affairs (SACCOLA). The implication of these statements in the context of job evaluation will be analysed in Chapters 7 and 8.

4.6.2 Remuneration Practices

The remuneration system, prior to implementation of job evaluation, was managed in terms of the "Grading Schedule", containing the scales of pay for the over 800 occupations in the Council's service. These scales were defined by a minimum and maximum "notch" with the range expressed in terms of a successive number of key scale notches which comprise the increments or steps up the scale.

Appointment is normally made on the commencing notch of the scale, but subject to a policy of notching upward for relevant qualifications and experience. Employees may advance up these scales of pay by receiving an annual increment on their anniversary date (termed incremental date), which is subject to satisfactory service, as provided for in the Conditions of Service; or by way of a merit
increment for above average performance as provided for in the conditions of the 'Grading Schedule'. Individual scales also contain provisions for advancement upon the fulfilment of specified criteria. The 'Grading Schedule' prior to the implementation of job evaluation contained some 225 such scales of pay and was sub-divided into a number of 'Divisions' distinguished by occupational grouping.

The 'Schedule' makes no reference to sex or race and in this sense is an expression of Council's non-discriminatory policy outlined above. All like-designated employees were remunerated on the same scale of pay. Since designation was the basic criterion, there was no guarantee however that employees of unlike designation although performing similar work were necessarily remunerated equally.

Revisions to the scales of pay of the 'Grading Schedule' were implemented by one of two ways. The most comprehensive adjustments arose out of the increases awarded as a result of negotiated settlements between the Council and the representative trade unions (See Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion of the salary and wage negotiation process).

The second way in which changes were effected was by way of upscaling individual posts or groupings of posts; or a realignment of a conglomerate of groupings. These changes arose either through submissions initiated by specific departments or through demands made by one or other of the trade unions. Since the relative pay of one job to another was not based on a formally applied system, upscalings could be motivated based upon any number of reasons and effected in ad hoc fashion. In many instances the upscaling of posts was motivated by the desire to award individual employees more money rather than justifying this on the basis of increased responsibilities and job growth. Subsequent appointees to these posts automatically inherited the former
incumbent's 'halo'. Regroupings were also subject to the relative negotiating strengths of the Trade Unions. In the case of SAAME their approach in resisting employment of non-whites in posts previously occupied by whites directly resulted in the promulgation of Work Reservation Determination No 4 of 1958 which applied to personnel in the Council's Traffic, Fire Brigade and Ambulance Service. This in effect created exclusive occupational groupings within the 'Grading Schedule'.

The conventional wisdom ascribed to the traditional approach was illustrated by one senior manager who, in rejecting the job evaluation proposals, stated that

"sight should not be lost of the fact that the existing Grading Schedule ... has evolved and been refined over many years as a result of regular reviews based on practical experience" (Dept Communication 1985-06-24).

As has been demonstrated above, these reviews were ad hoc, and it was therefore difficult to ensure that proclaimed policy pronouncements were followed. These factors contributed in certain measure to the establishment of the Municipal Service Commission and are supported by the evidence led before an Industrial Court hearing in 1984 as described in the forthcoming chapter. Paterson (1972:2) summarises the general problem when he states that "much of the argument about relativities or differential payments is based on the concept of equal pay for equal work but, in the absence of job evaluation, there is no way of establishing what is equal work".
Chapter Number 5

BACKGROUND TO FORMAL JOB EVALUATION
IN THE CITY COUNCIL

5.1 AN OUTLINE OF THE PROCESS OF SALARY AND
WAGE NEGOTIATIONS IN THE CITY COUNCIL

5.1.1 Trade Union Demand as a Determinant of Pay Structures

It was pointed out in an earlier chapter that pay is a central factor in the employment exchange. A point was also raised that conceptually it is useful to separate job evaluation per se from the pricing of the pay structure since the job structure is often only one consideration in pay structure determination. A major influence in this respect is Trade Union wage demands.

5.1.2 Key features of the Salary/Wage Negotiation Process

It has been traditional for one or other of the employee represented Unions to submit to the Council salary/wage demands. With burgeoning inflation in recent times, this has occurred on an annual basis, although the agreements reached do not stipulate any particular time period, and recent attempts by the Council to regularise wage/salary review intervals have met with the Unions endorsing their rights to submit salary/wage demands at any time.

Both the effective date and the actual amount are negotiated with the EXCO of Council, and often retrospective and split awards have been concluded. Although increases are generally the result of negotiated agreements with these parties, disputes between SAAME and the Council in 1964, 1965 and 1972 and between SAMWU (then CTMWA) and Council in 1966 resulted in arbitration awards. In
1976 a conciliation board agreement was reached between the Council and SAAME. Again in 1984 a dispute between the SAMWU and the Council was settled by the Industrial Court (Mr J Adams in Proceedings of the Industrial Court in the dispute between SAMWU and CCC 1984).

The EXCO generally negotiates with each Union in a separate forum rather than together, but because of the non-discriminatory policy which it maintains, any agreement reached with either trade union is implemented on a uniform basis regardless of union membership. In this respect, a turning point in the revisions of the Grading Schedule was reached in 1965 and 1966 as a result of the double arbitration which arose. There were two awards, one effective from 1st October 1965 for SAAME and one dated 29th April 1966 but binding from 1 November 1965 in respect of the SAMWU (Adams 1984:3318). Council at this point integrated the awards by examining the differences of the two awards and in each case adopting the higher allocation.

Mr J.G. Adams, past City Administrator, who had been involved in wage negotiations for over twenty years, stated in evidence before proceedings of the Industrial Court in the dispute between the SAMWU and the Council in 1984 that

"this became the basis of what I consider to be the Council's most important Grading Schedule of all because each Union had the opportunity to present its case on behalf of its members. And that gave the Council, I would say, a fairly good base from which we were able to start de novo with our policy of - of (sic) doing the occasional checks around the Republic to see whether we were still in step" (1984:3318).

5.1.3 Basis of Adjustment

The pay structure has traditionally been adjusted either on the basis of a percentage "across-the-board" increase or on the basis of awarding one or more salary/wage notches in the key scale, each equivalent to roughly five percent of
the salary of that scale. Of the two, the latter has been favoured by the SAMWU on the grounds that the notch size at the lower end was slightly higher than 5%, thus resulting in a proportionately higher award to its membership.

5.1.4 Basis of Council’s Approach

In the absence of a formalised graded structure, the Council adopted a mixed approach in determining its own wage recommendations. Principally, Council was guided by the belief that ".....there should be no difference in pay based on colour or sex" and considered this synonymous with "equal pay for work of equal value" (Adams in Proceedings of Industrial Court Vol 20 1984 : 3206). Although the Council did indeed offer equal pay to personnel of like designations, there was no use of any method by which to determine the comparable worth of jobs of unlike designations. The criterion of like destination however overlooked the fact that diverse tasks were performed by persons of like designation or conversely that differently designated employees were in certain instances performing similar and comparable work, but where pay was determined according to designation. An illustrative example is provided by the ongoing efforts of SAMWU for the regrouping of clerical assistants who are wholly SAMWU members, as Administrative Assistants who they perceive are performing identical clerical functions but remunerated on inferior pay scales.

In operational terms, a system was used of comparing bench-mark posts with other major local authorities such as Port Elizabeth, Johannesburg, Durban and Pretoria based on comparable job content. State departments were consulted in respect of professional personnel. As inflation became an issue, the Consumer Price Index also became a reference point in pay planning. Council also looked to the local market with regard to clerical, typing occupations, unskilled and skilled workers. As Mr Adams (1984:3310) stated
"we also had regard to what was the going rate here because that is where we would have to recruit our staff - so we had to be sure that we were competitive in the local market - and in fairness to the employees of the Municipality also competitive on a municipal basis."

Skills shortages were addressed by implementing additional emoluments or upgradings either within a general revision of the Grading Schedule or ad hoc on the basis of need.

5.1.5 Uneven Salary Movements

Mr Adams, (1984:3324) in his evidence before the Industrial Court described the period of 1976 - 1979 as the 'dead period' in Council salary movement although by 1980 he suggested that the structure once again aligned with the market place. This view is illustrated by the drop in real terms in the earnings of labourers as reflected in the Figure 5.1 below.

Taking account of the fact that during this period increases were awarded predominantly on the basis of notch adjustments in the key scale, the position of labourer improved relatively better than other occupational groupings in council, save those that were addressed by special ad hoc adjustments, such as artisans in 1981. It was precisely during this period that the momentum of formal job evaluation as a basis for salary structure began gaining impetus in the City Council. This aspect will be explored in the forthcoming pages in some detail in order to provide a backdrop to the job evaluation process in practice in the City Council.
5.2 SEEDS OF FORMAL JOB EVALUATION IN THE CITY COUNCIL

5.2.1 Point of Departure

Although job evaluation is popularly regarded as a recent phenomenon in Council, the idea has constantly reappeared for over a decade. The roots of formal job evaluation in fact can be traced back as early as 1975 when the Executive Committee as part of its negotiation with SAAME and the SAMWU in response to submissions by the associations for pay increases, undertook on its own...
instigation, to institute a complete and detailed evaluation of all posts in Council. On 1975-04-29 Council so resolved that

".....immediate steps be taken to proceed with a detailed evaluation of all salary/wage scales in the Grading Schedule, such revised schedule of salary/wage scales to come into operation with effect from 1 January 1976" (Council-in-Committee 1975-04-29).

This recognition of the need for a detailed evaluation reflected an attempt by the EXCO to move away from the customary notching or overall percentage increases system in dealing with the periodic revisions to the Grading Schedule which merely served to perpetuate perceived imbalances in the structure. The EXCO was clear however that this evaluation did not carry the promise that all employees would benefit. It was expected that the evaluation could reveal that some employees were already adequately remunerated for the work they were doing, and that some were being paid more than their jobs merited. The percentage across-the-board approach was also opposed by the SAMWU on the grounds that it disadvantaged the lower paid employees who received only small absolute increases as compared to higher level earners.

5.2.2 Internal Evaluation vs Outside Consultants

The Council resolution was given impetus when consultations were held with the then P.E. Consulting Group SA (Pty) (Ltd) in June 1975 to discuss job evaluation for the Municipality. Prior to this event, the National Institute of Personnel Research (NIPR) of the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) was also approached with the view to possible application of the newly developed Q-Method. During the course of Conciliation Board proceedings between SAAME and the Council, established on SAAME's application following deadlock on ongoing pay negotiations, the Council introduced the idea of evaluation to be carried out by both parties together with the option of calling in outside expertise should this be necessary as a means of resolving the deadlock. However with
pay negotiations still in deadlock the parties then agreed to proceed to the Industrial Tribunal for arbitration (Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 23rd July 1975 Conciliation Board SAAME vs CC of C.T.).

In a further attempt to draw SAAME into the evaluation path, Council indicated its preparedness to engage a firm of outside consultants to undertake a detailed evaluation of salary scales in the Grading Schedule to be completed by 31st March 1976. Although the Association withdrew its claim for a pay rise in response to the Government's plea for restraint in its fight against inflation, the Council nevertheless proceeded with its initiative for a systematic job evaluation and the P.E. Consulting Group was invited to present its proposal for a job evaluation programme.

There was a reluctance however amongst senior officials, the Municipal Service Commission and the representative trade unions to employ outside consultants ostensibly on the grounds that the major input would have to be internally generated and that sufficient knowledge and expertise was available for the task to be carried out in-house. In large measure, this reflects an unwillingness to subject the organisation to external assessment, the results of which would not be so readily accessible to influence as was possible by an internally managed approach. The Union's reluctance could be undoubtedly attributed to their own desire to retain such evaluation within their own sphere of influence. In the light of apparent consensus, the Executive Committee so resolved that the evaluation be undertaken internally.

5.2.3 Adherence to the Traditional Approach of Comparative Study

In contrast to the more sophisticated techniques of job evaluation as originally envisaged, the Council undertook what was in essence a comparative study of the grading schedules of the other large local authorities using as a basis certain
selected posts (benchmarks). More particularly this suggests the lack of readiness at that time as far as the officials were concerned for a more systematic and sophisticated evaluation process. Each Division of the Grading Schedule was dealt with independently suggesting a line of thinking analogous to the occupational differentiation approach later adopted by Central Government. Following the use of bench-marks in each division, the balance of scales were determined by interpolation (Report 1976-03-02).

5.2.4 Protracted Nature of Negotiations

During the ‘evaluation’ process the Council found itself placed under pressure by the Associations and SAAME challenged the Council’s undertaking that an evaluation would be completed by 31st March 1975. It was critical of the fact that it was “never consulted or requested to take part in any evaluation of the posts and to the best of the Association’s knowledge, the Municipal Service Commission was not consulted by Council in any way” (Letter 1976-04-02).

Further demands for an increase of 19% on basic salaries with effect from 1st January 1976, were submitted in addition to recommended adjustments to the Grading Schedule, pertaining to the introduction or amendment of certain special conditions as well as a regrouping of some posts. At such time, the President of the Cape Town branch of SAAME made a statement to the press alleging that “...council had not kept an agreement to let the branch know by March 31st what salary improvements it was recommending” (Argus 1976-04-09). In a parallel statement to the press Mr J H Ernstzen, Secretary of the SAMWU, stressed that the matter was much bigger than a quest for higher wages and that “...a proper evaluation is required of the work performance by the Council’s labour force, and salary scales should be adjusted accordingly” (Argus 1976-04-14).
EXCO released a statement to the press rejecting any breach of faith and reaffirming its willingness to implement the findings of its evaluation with effect from 1st January 1976. It reiterated its position that it was not prepared to agree to an outright percentage increase but had undertaken to conduct an evaluation of posts, the object of which was “to determine that employees are paid a fair rate for their job in line with comparable posts in other municipalities”. EXCO further stated that “the evaluation did not necessarily carry the promise that all employees would receive a further increase” and that the results of its evaluation would shortly be passed on to the Union (Cape Times 1976-04-20).

At the Annual General Meeting of the Cape Town branch of SAAME held on 21st April 1976 employees voted by an overwhelming majority to authorise its Executive Committee to proceed to arbitration if necessary on the demand for a 19% wage increase (Cape Times 1976-04-22). Mr A J Uys, President of SAAME, criticised the Council for having kept the proceedings over the evaluation secret despite its offer that the Association would be welcome to attend all meetings called to investigate a re-evaluation of posts in the municipal service (Argus 1976-04-22). On 7th May the Unions were furnished copies of the Executive Committee’s proposed scales of pay in substitution for the 1974 Revised Grading Schedule (Letter 1976-05-07).

5.2.5 Union Rejection

The Unions both rejected the proposals. SAAME asked for a meeting to discuss these with EXCO, failing which it would proceed to arbitration in view of the wide discrepancy between its demands and the Council’s proposals. (Letter 1976-05-13). The SAMWU, in rejecting the proposals submitted a ‘memorandum’ dealing with job evaluation and pay increases as part of its demand (Memorandum 1976-05-13). SAMWU stated that
"allied to the question of pay increases is the matter of a proper job evaluation. For a number of years now the Association has pressed for a proper evaluation of jobs, hoping that a proper and serious investigation would be undertaken. In spite of its undertaking, the Executive Committee of the City Council has failed to deal with the matter adequately. This has the effect - as in the past - of a number of employees being grossly underpaid, taking into consideration the duties performed by them" (Memorandum 1976-05-13).

A major part of the demands covered a regrouping of posts which were supported by job analyses of the relative families and applicable industry comparisons.

A number of meetings ensued between SAAME and the EXCO as well as the SAMWU and EXCO. EXCO reiterated its position to SAAME that its current proposals was an attempt to move away from the customary notching or percentage increases system in dealing with periodic revisions of the Grading Schedule and it was for this reason that it was decided with the concurrence of both Staff Associations to attempt an internal evaluation of salary/wage scales. The Council viewed the demand of SAAME for 19% across-the-board of all wage and salary scales as "..... abandoning the original intention of the parties to evaluate such salary/wage scales and this had served to confuse the whole issue" (EXCO Minutes 1976-06-02). In the submission of the Council to the Divisional Inspector of the Department of Labour in response to the declaration of a dispute between SAAME and the City Council, in regard to the evaluation of the scales of pay, it stated that

".....the Council was motivated by the conviction that it was completely unsound to increase salaries year by year by a percentage as this had the effect of compounding the emoluments of employees with no regard whatsoever to the rate of the job in the private or public sectors or to the impact on the Council's wage bill" (1976-07-01).

SAAME's insistence on an across-the-board demand irrespective of whether this exceeded market demands was seen by the Council as departing from its agreement to settle on the basis of a re-evaluation of salary and wage scales. SAMWU in turn opposed the concept of an across-the-board adjustment as
favouring the top structure.

SAAME amended its application to have the dispute settled by the Industrial Tribunal to the establishment of a Conciliation Board meeting. Following from this the EXCO reached a settlement with SAAME in November 1976 which settlement was extended to all employees of the Council.

5.2.6 A Framework for Negotiation

The protraction of these negotiations as illustrated above, began a process of crystallisation in the perspectives of the participating parties. It became increasingly evident from this point in time of the need for the Council to find a mutually acceptable basis upon which to build its pay structure and a framework within which to negotiate with its two Unions. While the Executive Committee favoured an evaluation procedure which awarded employees a "rate for the job", apparent too was a lack of clarity between the concept of job evaluation and employee evaluation. The officials on the other hand were concerned with the more traditionalist approach of salary comparison with other local authorities. SAAME'S fear of disturbances in the then grading structure later became more evident. For the SAMWU, with the vast majority of membership in the lower levels, the call for a "proper job evaluation" on the basis of work performed gathered increasing momentum and became the object of repeated calls in successive wage demands. Further discussion of the development of attitudes of both Unions in this regard will be discussed in the chapter on Union perspectives.

5.2.7 Provision for a Future In-House Job Evaluation Function

Further evidence in communications of Council revealed growing interest in the subject of job evaluation. Intermittent contact was maintained with other organisations around the country and abroad concerning information on respective
evaluation systems and their application. A rethink in the role of the personnel function resulted in the creation of a number of new posts with job evaluation in mind for the future. The motivation read as follows:

"The Estimate of Expenditure on the Council's Staff Establishment for 1978 was approximately R55.5 million. Jobs are graded and remuneration administered in terms of a grading scheme developed over the years. It is felt that the time has arrived for the systematic analysis and assessment of the value of all posts in the Council's service and it is with this in mind that the above positions have been recommended. While Job Evaluation activities have as their main origin and purpose the implementation of equitable remuneration practices relative to responsibility levels of jobs and the value of such jobs to an organisation, many incidental benefits can be derived from them. Analysis of jobs results in an understanding of workloads and organisation structure while the job descriptions produced are valuable for employment and training purposes."

5.2.8 Focus on Senior Management Posts

This groundswell of interest at the instigation of the EXCO became more sharply focused on Council's Senior Management Personnel as the EXCO had for some time given thought to the question of a remuneration policy for its senior managers (Reference Memorandum 1979-05-18). The EXCO had come to the realisation that its regrading procedures, as outlined in the aforementioned sections, precluded the Council from making an independent evaluation of the responsibilities of its top management staff, and therefore committed itself "...to subjecting the Council's top management posts to job evaluation....." (RM 1979-05-18).

In May 1979, the EXCO reported to Council that HAY Services Division of MSL Southern Africa was to carry out an evaluation of the 66 senior management personnel occupying 50 designated jobs in the top structure using the HAY Guide Chart and Profile System as described in Chapter 2. The system was selected by the EXCO having considered both the Peromnes and a Paired Comparison system of the Ranking Method proposed by P.E. Corporate Services.
5.3 THE HAY MSL EVALUATION

5.3.1 The Brief
The brief of the consultants was to advise the Council "....on the relative status and remuneration of senior officials of the Municipality". (MSL Report 1980:1) The overall objective was to halt loss of senior staff and improve the Municipality's ability to attract new talent into the service.

5.3.2 Objectives
The specific objectives laid down by the Executive Committee were as follows:

- Establish the relativities between the top (66) jobs in the Municipal structure of the City of Cape Town.
- Indicate any anomalies and suggest a possible course of corrective action.
- Examine the current pay practice of the City's senior staff in the light of market conditions.
- Examine the possibility of compensating employees for performance.
- Provide authoritative advice on the premia currently payable to certain job categories due to market scarcity.

(MSL Report 1980:1)

5.3.3 Key Steps in the Procedure

5.3.3.1 Job Descriptions
The top 13 personnel (Heads of Department, Deputies and Senior Assistants) were interviewed and their jobs described by the Hay Consultants. The remaining job descriptions were prepared by a team of analysts trained by the consultants in the HAY techniques of job interview and analysis. The descriptions were subsequently agreed (subject to any necessary amendments) by the incumbent
5.3.3.2 Evaluation of the Posts

The evaluations of the posts were carried out by two teams. The evaluation of the post of Town Clerk was discussed and agreed between the EXCO representatives and the Consultants. The posts of Heads of Department, Deputies and Senior Assistants were evaluated by a panel consisting of the Town Clerk, the Executive Committee representatives and the Consultants. For the evaluation of the remaining jobs below the level of Senior Assistant the above panel was augmented by the Heads of Department.

5.3.3.3 Non Participation of Unions

In the context of the framework outlined in the previous chapter with regard to the consultative machinery available for Union participation in Staff Administration, this exercise was conducted exclusive of Union participation notwithstanding the fact that the SAAME submitted demands to be represented on the evaluation committee. The Council took the position that it was a top management exercise and the evaluation of these top posts should be regarded as an exploratory exercise and on no account to be construed as negotiations between employer and employee. The request of the Union was therefore not acceded to. Both Unions were however invited as observers to the briefing session. In the event, the SAAME declined the invitation and warned "...that on no account can it be construed that it is a party to the exploratory exercise that is taking place between Council and the MSL Group" (Letter 1979-10-179). This statement should be understood in the context of earlier requests by the SAAME for representation in which the Council informed the Union that it was "regarded as a pilot assignment". Union fears about any consequences were met with an assurance by the Council that "an understanding has been given to the employees concerned that the salary of an individual would not be cut" (Letter 1979-08-10). The Council...
indicated its preparedness for Union participation should the evaluation be
extended to the remainder of posts within the organisation (Letter 1979-08-10).
As far as the SAMWU was concerned, the absence of membership within this
category precluded direct interest, although any radical change could have been
expected to elicit a consequential response in regard to effects on lower strata
of the organisation.

5.3.3.4 Review of Completed Evaluation
On completion of the evaluations the total result was reviewed for consistency
in terms of rank order, promotional gaps and relativity - firstly within each
Department (with the appropriate Department Head) and then between
Departments (with all Department Heads). Any necessary corrections were
made at that stage (MSL Report 1980).

5.3.4 Results
The results of the evaluation were made known in a report from the
Consultants in January 1980 (MSL 1980). Table 5.2 reflects the ratio of
computed median salaries for corresponding HAY units as recommended by the
consultants to existing salaries. Since the City Council did not have a formal
grading structure the then current salaries provide the measure for the then
existing rank order of jobs. On the basis of a comparison of pre-evaluation and
post-evaluation proposed salaries, the degree of deviation between the
pre-evaluation and post-evaluation structure can be determined. It will be seen
from the ratios of change that a number of significant deviations in job status
arose. Clearly, similarly titled and graded jobs did not rate equally in job size.
This is particularly apparent at the Departmental Head level where substantial
differences were shown to exist between the highest evaluated post (1788 Hay
Units) and the lowest one (1262 HAY Units). Indeed, some Deputy posts in
terms of job size were found to be bigger than some comparative Departmental
Head posts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>RATIO CHANGE</th>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>RATIO CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEADS OF DEPARTMENT AND DEPUTIES</td>
<td>Post D4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post A</td>
<td>1.7196</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post B</td>
<td>1.6483</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post C</td>
<td>1.5529</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post D</td>
<td>1.4767</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E</td>
<td>1.4590</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post F</td>
<td>1.3934</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post B2</td>
<td>1.7196</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post C2</td>
<td>1.5272</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post D5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post D2</td>
<td>1.1581</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post D6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post F2</td>
<td>1.2940</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post F3</td>
<td>1.1074</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E2</td>
<td>1.1241</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E3</td>
<td>1.0788</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Heads of Department/</td>
<td>Post D7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Heads</td>
<td>Post B16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post B3</td>
<td>1.4390</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post B4</td>
<td>1.6984</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post C3</td>
<td>1.5425</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post D3</td>
<td>1.4917</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post C4</td>
<td>1.4470</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E4</td>
<td>1.3201</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post B5</td>
<td>1.7679</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post B6</td>
<td>1.7309</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post B7</td>
<td>1.6994</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post F4</td>
<td>1.5721</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E5</td>
<td>1.4216</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E6</td>
<td>1.1241</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E7</td>
<td>1.1241</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post E16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E8</td>
<td>1.1241</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post B22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: 1. Posts are grouped according to "pre" Hay salary grouping.
2. Alpha Symbol denotes same Departmental affiliation.
5.3.5 Organisational Response

As has been revealed above, the exercise emphasised that not all jobs thought to be equal were in fact equivalent. It created in the ranks of senior management a deep sense of loss of status. Indeed the view was held that entire disciplines had been relegated (MSC 1980-03-24). Two departments, namely the Treasury and the Engineers Departments, accepted the results initially. The Consultants attributed this to the structure of those departments being more definitive and logical than the others, rather than the general perception that the HAY system 'favoured' engineering and accounting disciplines.

5.3.5.1 Management Criticism

Senior Management (principally represented by the remaining departments) response to the outcome can be conveniently classified into 3 basic concerns. In the first instance the standardised nature of the job description format was seen to overlook the context in which jobs operate in the Council departmental structure (Memorandum 1980-07-11). In this respect, notwithstanding the process of cross-checking which took place in the writing up of job descriptions, the view was expressed that some job descriptions were not factually accurate with particular reference to the Accountability Factor (Memorandum 1980-02-14). This was substantiated by the consultant's observation which highlighted certain discrepancies that suggested an overlap of accountabilities in some areas and no clear definition of the accountable job in others (MSL Report 1980: 15).

Management's assumption of the correctness of existing structures thus resulted in transference of the identified causes for deviations in the existing status order as inadequacies in the HAY system. More specifically the system was seen as favouring jobs which could be expressed in quantitative terms and rejected as failing to come to terms with disciplines whose functioning resulted in non-quantifiable consequences - such as in the public administration or medical fields (Memoranda 1980-02-11; 1980-02-14). There is a school of thought which supports the view that traditional point evaluation systems, such
as the Hay System that were developed in the 1940's and 1950's, are too tied to the well defined structures that existed at that time and thus inappropriate for modern day value systems (Lawler, 1987; Candrilli and Armagast, 1987).

Thirdly the system was seen as lacking in accuracy of measurement and subjective both in regard to the job analysis on the one hand, and the rating of jobs on the other, again, further complicated by the latter being dependent on the job description (Memoranda 1980-02-14; 1980-02-14; 1980-03-03).

5.3.5.2 Lack of Acceptance

The organisation was thus faced with a lack of acceptance of the results by the Senior Management. Arising out of this, numerous requests were submitted for a review of the evaluation ratings to the point where the consultants stated that were they to accede to all the requests "..... we would run great risk of bringing the system into disrepute almost immediately" (MSL 1980-02-22).

The difficulty in reaching consensus precluded achieving any decisive point and prompted the consultants to call for "..... some action in order for the system to retain its credibility" (Ferguson 1980-02-22:5). As a consequence of the above, the objectives of the exercise were progressively diluted to the point where jobs in the one department were removed from Council's general Grading Schedule and aligned with posts in the Provincial Administration. This prompted a similar request by another department to "be removed from the ambit of the HAY system of evaluation and be dealt with separately" (Memorandum 1980-02-14). A belief prevailed that the local government sector in general and the municipality in particular was so unique in structure and function as to render the application of systems developed in the private sector unsuitable for application.
5.3.6 Toward Compromise - Moving away from the Defined Objectives

The dissatisfaction resulted in a movement away from the original proposals for individual salary ranges based on HAY units toward a grouping of posts. The grading process coupled with the subsequent adjustments which took place with numerous evaluation results emanating from appeals, brought in itself new consequential imbalances. In terms of time scale, it took over a year for agreement on the final rankings to be reached, notwithstanding the acceptance of the original results of the evaluation by the EXCO in February 1980 (EXCO Minutes 1980-02-07). This outcome reflected a move closer to the status order prior to the application of the HAY system. There is presently in the organisation clearly still a bitter taste of what is described by a number of present Senior Managers as the "HAY MSL debacle".

It is evident that the introduction of the HAY system was resisted by officials unprepared for the application and consequences of systematic analysis to the point where the subsequent grading scheme adopted by the Council which contained the adjusted HAY MSL recommendations, diluted the objectives set for the application of a new remuneration policy in the first instance. Little evidence existed of a preparedness to use the evaluation results as a warning system for organisational review.

5.4 PROLIFERATING JOB EVALUATION - TOWARD THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM

As has been noted, the evaluation of the Senior Management posts was seen as a pilot exercise, the outcome of which could influence to a large degree the extension of job evaluation procedures to the rest of the organisation. Accordingly, the consultants mooted the proposal for a 'HAY Extension
Assignment' in terms of which a carefully chosen sample of jobs representative of the size, range and functional variety of monthly paid staff jobs below the level of branch head would be evaluated (Report and Proposal MSL 1980-02-13). This was intended to provide guidance to the Council in determining competitive salary levels as a counter to Union claims. Key steps envisaged were the selection of a benchmark sample of about 40 jobs strategically selected to facilitate intermediate jobs within families being slotted in, this to be undertaken internally. The job description and evaluation phase was envisaged to approximate that adopted for Senior Management posts. At the invitation of the EXCO the Heads of Department submitted comment which in the light of experience with the Senior Management posts, did not elicit optimism. One Head of Department stated that ".....the assessments were quite uniformed, wholly subjective, and merely insulting" and that he had ".....no confidence in this HAY system, or in these consultants, to assess .....posts in the context of a large municipal administration" (Memorandum 1980-06-04).

5.4.1 Increasing Momentum: Toward Extension of Formal Job Evaluation

The concurrent consideration of demands by the Union for revisions of the 1979,1980 and 1981 Grading Schedules in the ensuing years revitalised at each instant by the SAMWU on the one hand and the EXCO on the other the need for a proper evaluation of all posts in the service, although each adopted its own interpretation of what this meant (Memorandum 1979-10-16; 1980-03-17; 1980-02-08). SAAME, however, was particularly wary of any adjustments which were likely to disturb the traditional relationship between posts (Memoranda 1980-11-28; 1981-01-07; MSC 1980-12-09). This position should also be understood in the context of its role in work reservation as described in Chapter 4. The loss of professional staff also highlighted the need for a pay structure suited to the retention and attraction of key personnel. During this period, the Council in addition maintained liaison with other local authorities and quasi-public

Despite the reluctance of officials, it is possible to trace a thread of inevitability in formal job evaluation given impetus primarily by the EXCO, brought to the fore with each successive wage demand. On a number of occasions, the value of written job descriptions was recognised by Council officials, the Municipal Service Commission and Unions alike. The writing of job descriptions, it was acknowledged, would lead logically to a formal evaluation of all posts within Council and ad hoc ‘evaluations’ of certain occupational groupings did take place (Memorandum 1981-07-08). The evidence suggests that the EXCO saw this as a necessary solution to pay problems and a rational countermeasure to Union demands. The impetus of demands for reviews on an annual basis, constant comparison with competing sectors and the pressure for ad hoc changes to selected occupational groupings such as professional staff and artisans which resulted in a 40% hike for the latter in 1981, brought into focus on each occasion the need as far as the EXCO was concerned for formal evaluation.

5.4.2 Adoption of Formal Policy Objective

In early 1981 the EXCO reported to Council that it freely subscribed to the principle of amply rewarding staff according to the local market place, and to the job content and job size, and believed that any revision of the grading structure should include provisions to motivate and retain staff. The objectives to which the Committee subscribed were enunciated as follows:

"to improve efficiency; improve the quality of service; improve productivity; reward staff fairly; reward for excellence; weed out
"sleepers" and improve morale" (Ordinary Council-in-Committee 1981-01-29)

The Executive Committee went on to say that it considered Council's policy should be geared to more competitive rewards so as to ensure that the higher performers and achievers are rewarded fairly and rationally in relation to their output and productivity.

5.4.3 EXCO Initiates Formal Job Evaluation

As an expression of its awareness of the need for competitive rates, the Executive Committee, early in 1982, took the unprecedented step of initiating proposals for a salary/wage increase for effect from July of that year. This initiative had been influenced by salary increases that were to be awarded to Post Office personnel and the South African Transport Services. At its meeting on the 16th March 1982 the EXCO resolved that the Town Clerk and Director of Personnel report urgently on the

"immediate introduction of job evaluation of all posts in the Council’s service as well as proposals for an adjustment to existing salary/wage scales" (EXCO Minutes 1982-03-16).
Chapter Number 6

STEPS IN THE COUNCIL'S JOB EVALUATION PROGRAMME - AN OVERVIEW OF ITS PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE

As was discussed in the previous chapter, the EXCO of Council, came to the realisation that some systematic basis was required by which to manage the Council's salary/wage structure, and provide a frame of reference in terms of which Union demands for pay increases could be negotiated. Job evaluation was perceived as the appropriate mechanism by which to achieve this.

6.1 SETTING OBJECTIVES

The planning stage of any job evaluation programme involves a series of identifiable steps. These steps following Elizur (1980) involve preliminary planning, gaining support and co-operation, choosing the evaluation method and basic decisions as to the scope, timetable and responsibility for the plan.

The Director of Personnel, in responding to the directive of the Executive Committee reported that "job description, job evaluation, and a resulting revision of the general remuneration structure of Council is absolutely essential to obtain internal consistency in the job ranking structure and to rationalise the number of job designations (presently 830) and the number of salary scales (presently 203)". Reference was also made to external consistency with the labour market as a further objective. While this need was abundantly evident it is apparent from the perspective of the EXCO outlined in the preceding chapter that a comprehensive
remuneration plan was envisaged. What appears unclear therefore is the extent to which objectives attainable by job evaluation were tested against the declared policy objectives pursued by Council.

On the other hand the contribution which job evaluation could make in realising the principle of 'equal pay for equal work' was not exploited. In this vein, noteworthy was the absence of a comprehensive statement of objectives to guide the job evaluation exercise and against which subsequent decisions could be tested. It is significant too that no separate additional monetary provision was made to cover the cost of the introduction of the subsequent job evaluation proposals when implementation appeared imminent (Departmental Circular 1983-03-17).

At this early stage the Executive Committee requested a proposal on the choice of method and a modus operandi for its execution. It should be pointed out that one of the fundamental requirements found to be necessary for the successful implementation of any job evaluation system is attainment of consensus on the principle of need by all parties affected and agreement on objectives. Livy (1975:43) states that "people affected should be involved at the very inception of any plan to introduce change or systemise an existing situation" and that "not until then does it become apposite to debate the relative merits, demerits and relevance of a particular scheme."

6.2 UNION DEMAND FOR PARTICIPATION

Initially excluded from discussions, SAAME, demanded participation on the basis of the argument that success depended upon all parties being intimately involved at all stages (Letters 1982-06-01; 1982-06-14). Although it was not originally envisaged that the Unions would be members of the yet to be created Central...
Evaluation Committee, the Municipal Service Commission, Heads of Department and the Executive Committee came to the conclusion that the support of the Association was fundamental, particularly given the history and nature of labour relations in Council. It has been pointed out that no matter how systematically the job structure is derived, it is only one determinant of wage structure. The Union is through participation thus able to influence not only the job structure itself but bring extraneous factors to bear in shaping the final outcome. The attitude and approaches of the Unions in the City Council were expected to, and did indeed differ markedly and the mix of differing bargaining style and perceptions was anticipated to add unique flavour to the evaluation process.

While experience has shown a number of different permutations of Union participation, unilateral action on the part of managements is in the present South African context unlikely to stand any chance of success (Mathews, 1985). The Unions were thus accepted as full and permanent members of the job evaluation committee and appeal committee. Certain provisos were stipulated relating primarily to adherence to the principle of confidentiality and that nominees should carry full delegated powers to act on behalf of their Associations and accept majority decisions taken by the Committee (EXCO minutes 1982-08-05). Shortly after the question of participation arose, the Unions were consulted on the proposed system on the understanding that any scheme must be implemented in a manner "so as to keep as many employees informed as possible" (Memoranda 1982-06-16; 1982-06-17).

While the SAAME supported the proposals "subject to the proviso that the existing rights of employees will not be prejudiced", the SAMWU , "whilst offering no objection at this stage", indicated that final acceptance would depend upon future developments. It became evident from the outset that the latter's approach reflected a desire to negotiate on the basis of the findings of the plan in
preference to involvement in the process itself (MSC Reference 1982-06-18). It is significant that the decision to proceed with job evaluation was however taken independent of Union input and prior to the agreement on the nature of the participation of the Unions in the evaluation process. This fact, coupled with the fact that the Unions were not included in the originally proposed evaluation committee, highlights a fundamental contradiction vis-a-vis one of the original motivations, namely that of developing a basis for conducting salary and wage negotiations with the Unions in the first place.

6.3 THE CONCEPT OF STAGES - THE PILOT PROJECT

The EXCO's cautious position in its approach to the project reflected an ambivalent attitude. This approach is seen as consistent with the role of political office-bearers. An in-principle decision was taken to proceed with job evaluation, this however to be in stages, and to this end senior management was directed to formulate a suitable modus operandi with a view to completing the full project within a time scale of 12 months (EXCO minutes 1982-07-15).

Of major concern was the possibility of incurring considerable cost, while many potential benefits to the organisation remained unquantifiable and intangible. In the interests of better founded decision-making, an initial pilot project was embarked upon in terms of which a number of benchmark posts (42 in the event) embracing a cross-section of occupations were selected for description in order to set a standard. Exercising a monitoring process, the EXCO perused a sample of the 42 job descriptions prior to authorising the evaluation process.
The Pilot Evaluation Process - Constituting an Interim Central Evaluation Committee

The functioning of Committees in evaluation will be focused on in detail in a later chapter, suffice to say at this point that the effectiveness of the Committee will depend largely on the degree to which consensus can be reached. Variables of representativeness and size have been found to play a major role (Livy 1975; Belcher 1974). The Central Evaluation Committee in Council was constituted initially of 10 members comprising 3 personnel specialists, one of whom acted as chairman, (the Director of Personnel or his nominee) a representative from each of the Council's then five departments, and a representative from each of the two trade unions. In accordance with its initial response, the SAMWU assumed observer status and reserved the right to its own independent viewpoint (Memoranda 1982-12-29; 1983-02-24). Although this position was in violation of the pre-condition to participation stipulated by the EXCO (see section 6.2) the Union quite clearly did not regard this as binding on itself. The Council in turn did not invoke the pre-condition.

The pilot evaluation brought to the fore a number of warning signals. While the report of the Director of Personnel recognised the presence of negative attitudes toward the concept of job evaluation on the part of certain senior managers, the learning process of the pilot phase was nevertheless perceived by the Director of Personnel as resulting in one of unanimous support on the need for introducing job evaluation in the organisation and the particular point system proposed (Report 1985-04-25:22). This contrasted sharply with the independent viewpoint expressed by the Heads of Departments who recommended to the EXCO that it was uneconomic for the Council to go ahead with the plan (EXCO Minutes 1983-05-29). Subject to certain changes to the system covering both substantive and procedural elements, which came about in part response to certain specific objections raised by the Heads of Department in their rejection of the plan, the EXCO took a decision (subsequently ratified by full Council) to proceed with job
evaluation (Council-in-Committee 1983-07-28). Although the "Pilot Report" projected a conservative time scale of nineteen and a half months, the EXCO directed that "...no time limit for completion thereof be imposed ..." (Council-in-Committee 1983-07-28).

The EXCO steered a middle course and favoured maintaining a measure of control and directed that progress reports on the project be submitted to it at quarterly intervals. The EXCO's acceptance was based on a concept then termed the 'Progressive Approach to Job Evaluation' with final approval subject to resolution of an outstanding issue on anticipated 'red circle incumbents'. (NOTE: Red circle posts refer to those whose current salary exceeds that which is justified by job evaluation.)

Key elements in the "progressive approach" which extended the concept of stages, will be discussed below.

6.4 THE FIVE FACTOR SYSTEM AND ITS APPLICATION

6.4.1 Communication

Once a decision has been taken to introduce job evaluation, it is imperative that communication channels are set up in order to advise and explain to organisation members the objectives and procedures for the programme. As a first step in the City Council, a notice was sent to all employees outlining certain aspects regarding the Job Description/Job Evaluation Project (Appendix B). These aspects related to the purpose and procedures involved, and were directed primarily at the employees' role in the compilation of job descriptions.

Union organisation provided further information channels incorporating formal media such as newsletters, and informal labour networks. Other official Council
publications such as the Municipal Bulletin and the City Libraries In-House Journal provided coverage to the proposed project. In addition an elaborate system of briefing meetings were conducted with staff, the modus involving information flow from the top structure downward to a level where sufficient breadth of the organisation was covered for the information flow to follow recognised reporting lines through to the lower levels.

6.4.2 The Structure of the Method

In Chapter One the features and main steps in the application of a point method of job evaluation were outlined and the Five Factor System was further described in Chapter Two. Tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 illustrate the factors and sub-factors comprising the system, their relative weights and point allocation respectively. These features are summarised in Table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>FACTOR DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF INTERVAL DEGREES</th>
<th>POINT BETWEEN DEGREES</th>
<th>TOTAL POINTS PER DEGREES</th>
<th>WEIGHTING PER FACTOR</th>
<th>WEIGHTING PER SUB-FACTOR OF TOTAL POINT</th>
<th>TOTAL POINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Qualifications Academic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Qualifications Knowledge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Qualifications Experience</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nature and Variety of Work</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 - 12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Decisions Taken</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Feedback on Decisions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Supervision Exercised</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Supervision Received</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Relationships and Negotiations Internal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Relationships and Negotiations External</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system which is an eclectic one was developed by Dr L J Fick and associates while at Stellenbosch University and was implemented in the Divisional Council of the Cape where he was Personnel Manager, prior to its application in the City Council. As the then Director of Personnel, Dr Fick...
proposed the scheme to the City Council on the strength of its suitability to local government. Although the system borrowed heavily from the NIPR Q-Method and Castellion Methods, its lesser reliance on the decision-making factor was argued to enhance its applicability to a committee-based decision-making system characterising local government, since only one of five factors was directly related to decision-making. Moreover, because of the nature of the decision-making process, recommendations formulated for consideration either by an immediate superior or a standing committee for final decision were accorded decision-making status on the basis of a job incumbent working through the problem solving process to arrive at a particular conclusion (the Factor is so entitled "Nature and Scope of Decisions, Recommendations, Obligations and Conclusions"). This centralised decision-making structure, thus it was argued, coupled with the wide diversity of occupational disciplines being practised in the organisation, necessitated other non-decision orientated evaluation factors.

6.4.3 Definition of the Factor Degrees - The Measuring Instrument

A crucial aspect of any point method is the division of the chosen factors into degrees so that raters can estimate the "amount" that each factor is present in the job. These are the unit marks of the measuring instrument, like the inch marks on the ruler (Belcher, 1974; Paterson, 1972). Figure 6.2 depicts the 'factor scale definitions' as employed in the Five Factor System.

As a result of the pilot project, some changes were effected to this instrument, with specific reference to Factor 2 in which the conception of a functional area in grade 8 was redefined to refer to a branch of the organisation e.g. Sewerage, Parks and Forests etc. and the scale and factor scale definitions were extended somewhat, resulting in an increased weighting. Similarly, improvements were
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>GRADE I</th>
<th>GRADE II</th>
<th>GRADE III</th>
<th>GRADE IV</th>
<th>GRADE V</th>
<th>GRADE VI</th>
<th>GRADE VII</th>
<th>GRADE VIII</th>
<th>GRADE IX</th>
<th>GRADE X</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1.1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1.1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE NUMBER**

**FACTOR SCALE DEFINITIONS**

**FACTORS**

**GRADE I**

- 1: Little or no special knowledge or instruction is required to perform the work.

**GRADE II**

- 2: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and simple arithmetic and filing skills are expected. Specialized knowledge of a specific field is required on a regular basis.

**GRADE III**

- 3: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and specialized knowledge or instruction is required to perform the work. Specialized knowledge of a specific field is required on an occasional basis.

**GRADE IV**

- 4: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and specialized knowledge or instruction is required to perform the work. Knowledge of a specific field is required on a regular basis.

**GRADE V**

- 5: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and specialized knowledge is required to perform the work. Knowledge of a specific field is required on a regular basis.

**GRADE VI**

- 6: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and specialized knowledge is required to perform the work. Knowledge of a specific field is required on an occasional basis.

**GRADE VII**

- 7: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and specialized knowledge is required to perform the work. Knowledge of a specific field is required on a regular basis.

**GRADE VIII**

- 8: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and specialized knowledge is required to perform the work. Knowledge of a specific field is required on a regular basis.

**GRADE IX**

- 9: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and specialized knowledge is required to perform the work. Knowledge of a specific field is required on a regular basis.

**GRADE X**

- 10: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and specialized knowledge is required to perform the work. Knowledge of a specific field is required on a regular basis.

**TOTAL**

- 11: Knowledge of reading and writing is necessary, and specialized knowledge is required to perform the work. Knowledge of a specific field is required on a regular basis.
## CONTACT WITH PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>GRADE I</th>
<th>GRADE II</th>
<th>GRADE III</th>
<th>GRADE IV</th>
<th>GRADE V</th>
<th>GRADE VI</th>
<th>GRADE VII</th>
<th>GRADE VIII</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5a With whom does the incumbent have contact within the organisation and what is the nature of this contact?</td>
<td>Direct operational contact with a few persons performing the same tasks. Contact with superiors is limited to receiving routine information (e.g. instructions).</td>
<td>Operational contact (e.g. exchange of routine information) with senior and junior employees not necessarily doing related work. Contact with supervisor limited to giving and receiving routine information (e.g. to notify or to refer problems).</td>
<td>Contact based on exchange of information is still at low level, but extends to others in the organisation (not necessarily doing the same work). There is wider contact with superiors outside the section (e.g. processing of work for superiors).</td>
<td>Authority over junior subordinates and/or equals on basis of informal guidance and supervision. Exchange and discussion of information of specific nature with superiors and equals within the organisation.</td>
<td>Supervises subordinates in a specialised field and has authority based on specific aspect which may affect others (not necessarily doing the same work). Discussions with superiors and colleagues in related fields (e.g. regarding co-ordination of work in his own section).</td>
<td>Has influence within a specific group of units in a wider and/or specialised field. Contact downwards is on basis of coordination. Active participation (in an advisory capacity) at meetings involving equals and superiors, singly or in small groups.</td>
<td>Noticeable functional authority at organisational level. Sapiential influence (based on extensive knowledge and experience) at senior management level involving senior subordinates, equals and superiors in various functional areas.</td>
<td>Strategic influence on activities of the whole organisation on an executive level. Dynamic directive relationship with senior management in terms of strategic incorporated planning and development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5b With whom does the incumbent have contact outside the organisation and what is the nature of this contact? | Limited personal contact outside the organisation occasionally takes place, but may be in the form of routine enquiries. | Personal contact with equals and/or superiors outside the organisation increases but is still limited to giving and receiving information of a specific nature. | Contact outside normal with equals and sometimes with superiors. Contact may be based on liaison or public relations and gaining of information in a specific field. | Contact with public to give and/or to receive information of a specialised technical or administrative nature. Conducts discussions of professional and/or high-level administrative nature at a senior level. | Contact with public to give and/or to receive information of a specialised technical or administrative nature. Conducts discussions of professional and/or high-level administrative nature at a senior level. | Influence is sapiential and/or strategic at senior executive or professional level (e.g. finalisation of contracts, etc.) normally on the basis of senior management, within his own area of specialised knowledge. | Extensive sapiential influence in wide areas outside own organisation. Has significant influence at top management level which may affect national trends (e.g. the economy, etc.). |
| ASSESSMENT | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
made to Factor 1C and Factor 4A. Later in the project more definitive guidelines were developed for the application of Factors 1A and 1C in particular with regard to the weighting of academic and technical training and the status of professional registration and trade tests. This particular form comprised the scoring sheet and the source record of each evaluation undertaken.

Aside from the changes in the measuring instrument as outlined above, and some further amendments to the structured ‘Job Description Schedule’ (to be discussed below) arising out of specific criticisms levelled by departmental representatives, little consideration of the merits and demerits of alternative and other available systems by senior management or the Executive Committee was evident, with the result that the Five Factor System was accepted by the Executive Committee as a "given".

6.4.4 Estimating the Costs of Job Evaluation

It is difficult to estimate the costs of installing job evaluation since there are many indirect costs that are incurred. In addition it is virtually impossible to estimate the costs of doing without job evaluation and conversely many of the benefits to be derived are non-quantifiable and intangible.

The costs may be divided into two broad categories, the first relating to those costs involved in the installation procedures, and the second relating to the effects that the results may have on the payroll (Belcher, 1974). The former may be further subdivided into direct expenditure for designing and introducing the plan, printing and stationery costs, etc. and secondly the time spent on the project by organisation members and/or consultants. While both categories are difficult to estimate, payroll effects can be measured. Since decisions about the shape of the final pay curve will be influenced by cost considerations, cost becomes transformed into an independent variable in so far as the availability of funds
influence the form and shape of the final structure.

Increase on the salary and wage bill in Council was projected at between 1.5 and 2.5 percent (EXCO Minutes 1983-05-29). Cost implications associated with installation procedures were given some expression where in one department for example, the man hours logged to complete one job description ranged from 15 to 40 hours, with the average being 26 hours (Memorandum 1982-12-29). This was corroborated by another estimate where it was stated that the average time involved in the production of a job description for engineering staff in the Department was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>20 hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Branch Head</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typist</td>
<td>30 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in producing a job description of 30 pages (Memorandum 1983-02-02). It was largely this time demanding aspect which motivated the revision of the job description format.

A further cost component relates to the upholding of the principle that an employee's pay should not be reduced should the position which he occupies be downgraded. The retention of ranking to "present incumbent only" was embodied in the Council's conceptual "progressive approach" although final application of this concept was deliberately left open. This stimulated constant pressure particularly from SAAME on the safeguarding of employee rights (Memoranda 1983-12-21; 1984-03-02; 1984-03-15; 1984-08-28).

6.4.5 The Job Describing Phase

6.4.5.1 Clarifying Concepts

The starting point for any job evaluation programme is to gain knowledge about the jobs concerned. This job information is attained through a process known as job analysis which can be defined as "a systematic procedure for gathering
Before studying a job it is necessary to know what a job is. Clarification and distinction of certain terms would therefore be useful at this point.

The basic unit of work, a task, comprises the component elements of a work role which has to be accomplished (Livy 1975). A position exists when an aggregation of tasks, duties and responsibilities justify the services of an individual worker (Belcher, 1974). The number of positions in the organisation is equivalent therefore to the number of workers in the organisation (Elizur 1985). In the City Council there are the 17260 fixed establishment posts each of which finds a formal place in the organisation chart. Many positions are however identical. A job may be defined as a group of positions that are identical with respect to their major tasks (Elizur, 1980; Belcher, 1974). For example, there are ±200 positions of Cleansing Truck Driver in the Cleansing Branch, each employee performing identical tasks. This comprises one job designated Motor Vehicle Driver. There may however be Motor Vehicle Drivers operating completely different vehicles, thus constituting different positions and jobs. In the City Council, where positions have an affinity to one another in terms of type of work, the positions are like designated. Each designation may therefore comprise numerous positions and/or jobs. At higher levels in the organisation, each position tends to be unique, and in this respect each position is also a job. The heads of major branches are an example.

6.4.5.2 Methods of Job Analysis Employed in the City Council

From the above it is clear that job analysis does not require studying every position. A number of methods are used in obtaining job information. These include such techniques as interviews, observation, questionnaires, technical conferences, checklists, or combinations thereof. While many organisations employ specialist job analysts, frequently employees and/or their superiors play
a major role in the collection of job information. Tables 6.3 and 6.4 reveal the findings of the survey of major local authorities.

### TABLE NUMBER 6.3
**METHODS OF COLLECTING JOB INFORMATION IN MAJOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview of Job Incumbent</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Interview of Several Incumbents</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire - structured</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- open ended</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Conference 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Incidents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total responses add up to more than the number of respondents due to the fact that in practice a combination of these methods is employed.

### TABLE NUMBER 6.4
**WHO COMPILES THE JOB DESCRIPTIONS IN MAJOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compiler</th>
<th>FREQUENCY %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyst and Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor and Incumbent</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyst and Incumbent and Supervisor</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above it can be seen that three agents are used in the compilation of job descriptions at an occurrence rate of 65% for supervisors, 57% for incumbents and 52% for analysts.

The City Council founded its job information collection programme on a number of principles. Two approaches were employed - one in respect of salaried employees, and a second applicable to hourly paid employees. It was assumed in the first instance that the incumbent is the one who knows his job best. A point of departure in regard to this principle gave rise to the different approach adopted for hourly paid employees, based on the second assumption that not all
employees are however able to conceptualise and articulate their tasks, or envisage repercussions of certain actions, or the failure to take others. It was further assumed that the incumbent would require guidance in the performing of the job analysis role and therefore both structured guidance and professional advice was provided.

6.4.5.3 The Job Description Schedule

The major part of the job analysis process is the compilation of a job description. The object of this document is to obtain an accurate, detailed and systematic account of the many tasks involved in the job and the relationship of the job to others in the organisation (Biesheuvel, 1985:18). The job description is therefore the written statement of the duties and responsibilities of the job and states what is done, how it is done and why it is done. This document is fundamental to the entire personnel system and to the process of job evaluation since it provides the source document upon which the evaluation of each job is based. One distinction that should be drawn here is between the job description and the job specification, the latter of which refers to the set of criteria in terms of personal attributes, skills and qualities which the individual incumbent requires in order to successfully perform the job.

Job descriptions also provide a vehicle by which to mobilise the participation of the wider cadre of employees in the organisation. This is precisely the approach which was adopted by the City Council. Based on the assumptions outlined above, the compilation of job descriptions involved a four party cycle. The incumbent as the key source was responsible for the drafting of the job description. This was done in collaboration with the immediate superior who was responsible for verifying the information and reaching agreement with the incumbent on the contents. The Head of Department or his nominee, usually the Branch Head, was the third signatory of this document. It was thus conceived
as a document of consensus in which three parties, namely the incumbent himself/herself, the immediate superior and the branch head concurred.

Coupled with this approach was recognised the need for co-ordination and consistency. The central personnel office performed this role through a team of analysts who provided guidance and assistance to incumbents through scrutiny of draft descriptions and the conducting of interviews.

A key element in the procedure and part of the communication process as a whole was what was termed the 'briefing' programme. Based on the idea that communication should take place through a filtering process from the top of the organisation down the line, a series of briefing meetings were conducted by the central personnel office with senior managers, systematically moving down an organisational step with each successive meeting until such point as sufficient managers and supervisors were briefed for them to become the agents for continuing the filtering down process. Coupled to this communication style was the principle that job descriptions should also be described in such sequence so that any incumbent would always have an immediate superior as resource person who had gone through the process of already having described his own job.

The basis for the job description was the 'Job Description Schedule' which provided detailed structured guidelines in questionnaire format for the completion of the Job description form. The Job Description Schedule as an integral part of the Five Factor System, was structured in accordance with the ten sub-factors of the job evaluation system with the intention that all critical information was presented in a standardised format. The Job Description Schedule provided the focal point for the briefing meetings which were directed largely as training sessions in the completion of the Schedule.
One final important principle adopted by the Council was that every job in the City Council was to be described. This meant that every incumbent either had to describe his job individually or be a signatory to an integrated (or representative) job description, where a job involved numerous positions of virtually identical tasks. Notwithstanding this provision, an individual was afforded the right to submit his own job description if he believed his job was so unique as to not form part of the integrated job. Biesheuvel (1985:18) has pointed out that this aspect of worker participation is important particularly in regard to his major concern, namely that all aspects of the job will be taken into account and therefore the opportunity to play a key role in writing his job description provides a form of assurance that this will be done.

As was mentioned above, as regards the hourly paid employees, a departure from the above procedure took place in that superiors completed their job descriptions for signature by the incumbents. In addition, because of the number of incumbents in this category, a simplified 'Job Information Sheet' was developed, which was based on the 'Job Description Schedule' and reflected the ten job evaluation factors. When evaluation of hourly-paid occupations took place, the information was transcribed on to the standardised 'Job Description Schedule'. This approach was in retrospect seen by some as inadvisedly discriminatory, and as will be later discussed, was one issue raised by SAMWU.

It is worth mentioning at this point that a firm of management consultants called in by the EXCO to advise on certain aspects of the job evaluation programme (to be later discussed), criticised the Council for undertaking the job describing phase in a 'least efficient way' and in so doing recommended that all jobs be analysed and described by trained analysts (P.E. Corporate Services 1985:3). While this is an ideal formula, it had been considered as impractical given the constraints imposed by the sheer size of the organisation. In addition, as will
also be later more comprehensively apparent, the limitations placed on participation through such a formula could be postulated to have had greater disadvantages than that created by the chosen formula, having regard to typical character traits such as insecurity and mistrust as identified by Deal and Kennedy (1975:119-121) in the 'process culture' of corporate life.

In terms of time scale, the job description phase as described above suffered severe protraction, extending over a period of a year i.e. from August 1983 to September 1984. This may be interpreted as a manifestation of the organisation's ambivalence toward the task, stemming in large part from a lack of motivation as a result of the absence of commitment from senior management. The sheer enormity of the task created in itself bottlenecks in the idealised model outlined above in section 6.4.5.3. This indicator of senior management's attitude will be more comprehensively discussed in Chapter 7. Moreover, the individual's need to document in minute detail every aspect of his job resulted in excessive time consumed in producing the final document.

6.4.6 Evaluation Committees

Reference has been made to the constitution of the Central Evaluation Committee in discussing the Pilot Project. As has been alluded to, the compensation administration specialists were assigned the task of spearheading job evaluation. This role involved both the organisational and control aspects, as well as focusing on the technical nature of the task. At the same time, as has already been pointed out, management and employee participation became important to eventual acceptance and success of such an undertaking. Lawler and Hackman (1969) found in a study of the effects of employee participation in the development of pay incentive plans that participation may have more impact in the effectiveness of a plan than the mechanics of the plan itself. As will also be later discussed, the aspect of employee perceptions is one of the
single most important ingredients of the whole process. This was further expressed in employee representation on the evaluation committee. In the survey of local authorities, it was found that in 92% of municipalities, employees are represented in the grading process. What became the subject of intense debate in the City Council was the form in which this was to be expressed, in particular in the context of the appeal process.

In the evaluation phase, representation was ensured by the constitution of the Central Evaluation Committee as outlined earlier, but in addition a representative of the job being evaluated (usually in the form of the immediate superior or branch head) performed the role of advisor to the committee on technical aspects of the job, complementary to the already finely detailed 'Job Description Schedule' - this, in addition to the sitting departmental representatives who rotated, depending on the nature of the job being evaluated.

In addition to the factors of representativeness and size also mentioned earlier, the number of jobs to be evaluated constitutes a significant factor in committee structure. In very large organisations, or where extensive job evaluation is being contemplated, Livy (1975:45) suggests that it might be more feasible to have a central co-ordinating committee with a number of sub-committees. Although the co-ordinative role was played by the central personnel office, the Central Evaluation Committee was retained as the core evaluation team which set the norm and from which the sub-committees derived. The evaluation committee structure was founded as reflected in Figure 6.5.

This particular form of representation conforms to those revealed by the Job Evaluation Usage Survey of local authorities referred to earlier. In the survey it was found that the grading panels comprise a combination of personnel specialists, management, and employee representatives. In a small minority of
municipalities, Councillors are also represented. This also accords with the approach adopted in the HAY-MSL evaluation.

**FIGURE NUMBER 6.5**

**JOB EVALUATION COMMITTEE STRUCTURE - CITY OF CAPE TOWN**

The Central Evaluation Committee set the norms and standards, and amendments and changes to the Job Evaluation Manual, known as the 'Blue Book' were effected via this forum. The Panel Membership derived from members of the Central Evaluation Committee. The Central Evaluation Committee went into recess while the Panels operated under the Chairmanship of the Personnel officials who were sitting members on the Central Evaluation Committee. Staff officials rotated amongst the three panels in an effort to ensure consistency of norms and standards across the three panels. These panels performed the bulk (86% of all evaluations) of the job rating phase of the project.

### 6.4.6.1 Rating of the Jobs

Referring to earlier discussion concerning the distinction between jobs and...
positions, the Council had to make a decision as to which jobs/positions would be evaluated. A series of decisions were in fact needed. The first principle involved ensuring the evaluation of every designation in the organisation. This comprised over 800 occupational titles. Since each title represented in many cases more than one job and/or position, a sample was decided upon in terms of the "progressive approach", designed to ensure representativeness on a stratified basis. This resulted in 1152 evaluations taking place incorporating 6411 positions which represented over 40% of all posts in Council being evaluated (Report March 1982:23). This represented an extremely satisfactory sample size.

The jobs were rated by the respective Committees as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Panel No 1 (Chairman C)</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Panel No 2 (Chairman B)</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Panel No 3 (Chairman E)</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Panel Nos 1 and 2 (alternative chair)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (for Personnel positions)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EVALUATIONS COMPLETED</td>
<td>1 152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the developments of utmost significance for the whole project was the withdrawal of the SAMWU from the Central Evaluation Committee. In terms of this decision, the Association did not participate at all in the evaluation phase, despite intermittent overtures by the organisation to persuade them to resume membership (Memorandum 1984-04-12). In a later communication, the Association, in advising of many complaints received by their members "with regard to the manner in which Council is proceeding with its investigations relative to job evaluation" also gave notice that in terms of instructions from members it was in the process of conducting its own evaluation of jobs which it intended to submit to Council (Memorandum 1984-03-21).
The second noteworthy aspect of the evaluation phase, was the pre-eminence of conflict in the grading forum. The conflict was multidimensional in nature involving intra and inter-departmental differences, conflict between departmental representative and the personnel officials and complicated by Union alliances of expediency. These conflicts, which will be further discussed in Chapter 7, reflected the stress under which an organisation can operate given the threatening nature and uncertainty about the outcome of the evaluation phase. In the event, the evaluation phase was completed by the committees over a period of ten months, running in large part concurrently with the job describing phase. Completed job descriptions thus ‘fed’ the evaluation panels.

6.4.6.2 Appeals against the Rating of Jobs

An elaborate three phase appeal procedure was formulated, in large part due to the initiative of SAAME to "allay the fears of the staff" (Memorandum 1984-03-28). This appeal procedure was designed for actioning after the final gradings had been formulated and staff informed, and was directed at the employees right to exercise such discretion. This will be discussed in Chapters 8 and 9 where Union and employee responses are more fully explored.

Prior to any decisions being taken concerning grade cut off points, grading of jobs or pricing, an opportunity was also afforded to departmental representatives to appeal against the rating of any job within 48 hours after its evaluation by one of the committees. Specific evaluation factors were addressed in this procedure in which 104 evaluations were reviewed by the Central Evaluation Committee. These additional reviews are not reflected in Table 6.6.

6.4.7 Consolidating the Rankings

Having concluded the ratings, the next step sought consolidation of the sample scores. This was undertaken by the compensation specialists and involved an
analysis of the spread for each group of like designated posts after eliminating extreme scores, and averaging the cluster/s to derive a representative score/s for each designation. The extremes were either ignored and carried by the average or were examined on their own merits as anomalies and recommended for inclusion in a new category within the promotional hierarchy.

6.4.8 Designing of the Pay Structure

The technical decisions required for final steps in the pay structure design were considered and taken independently by the central personnel office. This aspect was a source of frustration for the SAAME in particular as this was perceived both as inordinate delay in terms of the original time scale projections, but more importantly, as exclusion from those elements of the process in which they held a most vital interest. In addition, the final ratings had not been made available to them. Further, a salary survey conducted by the personnel office to enable the pricing of the structure was also undertaken without participation of those parties who previously had been actively involved in the rating of the various jobs.

One of the most important aspects which require highlighting at this point is that while these steps in the process have a technical/mechanical component, they are the areas which are more likely to be influenced by organisational policy than job evaluation principles. The exclusion of SAAME at this juncture of the project effectively removed flexible issues out of their sphere of influence and created far reaching ramifications as regards acceptance. It also reinforced and heightened suspicion and the feelings of frustration of staff already expressed on various occasions by the Staff Associations in differing contexts. The exclusion of management in this phase also proved to play a major part in the undoing of the proposed structure. Some detail is devoted to the proposals of the Director of Personnel as these represented the locus around which a breakdown in the project revolved and illustrates the manner in which technical aspects of the job
evaluation process were addressed and formulated.

Pay structure design requires the following:
- determining a pay trend line
- deciding on the need for one or more pay structures
- displaying the job data
- establishing the characteristics of the pay structure:
  * the number of grades
  * the width of salary bands
  * the height of the pay grades - i.e., the level of salaries
  * the degree of overlap between grades

These will be considered briefly in turn and an appreciation of the decisions taken at this point will enhance an understanding of subsequent decisions which were taken which represented a deviation from earlier developed principles.

6.4.8.1 Determining a Pay Trend Line and Level of Salaries

Following the carrying out of a salary and wage survey using a number of selected benchmark jobs, a pay trend line was drawn by plotting market pay against job evaluation points. The purpose of the survey is to collect up-to-date labour market information and the jobs included in the survey provided the anchors in the determination of pay for other like graded jobs and the trend line provided the base around which the recommended pay scales were grafted and guided in the determination of the level of proposed salaries.

6.4.8.2 One versus Multiple Pay Structure

Although at least one head of department in his own independent submissions favoured the creation of distinctly separate pay structures for the different occupational groups, this approach was not contemplated by the personnel
professionals who advocated an integrated uniform pay line. Deviations from this concept were seen as irreconcilable with the concept of paying jobs on the basis of comparable worth, having established such worth by means of what was purported to be a universal evaluation system.

6.4.8.3 Creating Job Classes or Bands

Job classes or bands are created in order to group jobs of similar complexity level together. There are two important reasons. Grouping recognises that job evaluation is incapable of making such exact and fine a distinction between jobs that could enable individualised pay based on points scored. Secondly, it facilitates more orderly salary administration. All jobs within the band are then treated in the same manner since they represent comparable responsibility on comparable levels within the organisation.

In certain proprietary brands such as the Paterson and Peromes Systems outlined earlier, band cut offs have been empirically derived and are universally applied. In other systems, such as the Five Factor System, no such predetermined job class structure exists, and therefore the number of grades and the respective cut off points depends very much upon the organisation's structure, and the need to fit a grade progression which reflects the promotional steps in the career paths of the various occupational groups. The size of the organisation thus plays a vital role.

In using a point method, in conjunction with the policy considerations, are practical aspects such as natural breaks which occur in the points rankings sequence which provide useful grade demarcation indicators. Each grade is ultimately expressed by a defined points range, and all jobs within that range are like graded. It should be borne in mind that too many grades implies fine distinction, of which a job evaluation system would be reliably incapable. Conversely, very few grades will
render the concept of differentiation meaningless by requiring very wide point ranges. Taking cognisance of these considerations, it was initially recommended by the personnel specialists that 27 grades would recognise that at the lower end of the structure certain fine distinctions were indicated to accommodate the existing promotional pyramids, which provide for important historical status differences, while at the upper level wider spans were more appropriate. This contrasts with prevalent practice in the major local authorities, where the tendency is to a lesser number of grades as reflected in Table 6.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF GRADES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - 25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.8.4 **Width of Salary Bands (Scales)**

A distinction should be drawn between the width of bands as determined by the spread of points which marshall jobs into the bands, and the range of the salary scale attached to the respective bands. In certain point systems, where there is a direct correlation between points and money, such will coincide. However, in other cases, once the jobs have been banded, the length of salary range, is determined by other considerations unconnected to the points spread. The choice revolves around having a broad banded structure with overlapping scales or narrow banded non-overlapping scales. In the former, greater emphasis is placed on room to reward performance while the latter places greater emphasis on job level and promotion. A third alternative is to provide a mix of the two approaches.

The proposal of the personnel office gave recognition to differing circumstances at differing points in the organisational structure. Recognising that career progression is relatively slow, provision was made in the greater part of the
structure for wider scale ranges to accommodate greater recognition for performance. Bands were narrowed at the bottom of the structure based on the short learning curve and limited scope for improving performance in lower level jobs. This also served to retain sensitive promotional chains. In addition, the traditional policy of fixed salaries in local authority upper structures was adhered to, taking cognisance of the ceiling salary of the Town Clerk as determined in terms of the Remuneration of Town Clerks Act 115 of 1984.

6.4.8.5 Overlap between Grades

The idea of some degree of overlapping of adjacent scales embraces the idea that an experienced high level performer in a lower job is of more value to the organisation than an inexperienced newcomer to a job on a higher grade, until such time as the latter has traversed the learning curve. There is a relationship between the width of a salary scale and the degree of overlap. Wider scale ranges are more likely to overlap. As a general principle it can be stated that the structure requires such balance as to provide for adequate differences between grades and scope for progression within grades (Armstrong and Murlis, 1982:92).

Practice has resulted in the evolution of certain guidelines. Taylor (1983:178) states that although each organisation needs to evolve its own pay structure in response to its own specific circumstances, a typical salary structure will have the following properties:

- width of salary band is 50% of the minimum salary of each band
- differential between grades is 20%
- the bands overlap by 50%

The job evaluation usage survey found that 64% of responding local authorities regarded overlapping scales as being necessary. The following Table reflects the degree of overlap that was considered appropriate by those who regarded it as necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% OVERLAP</th>
<th>% RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adds up to 101 because of rounding

As can be seen from the Table, the majority of respondents felt that grade overlaps of up to 10% were appropriate.

The personnel office proposals reflected substantially larger overlaps. These were justified on the grounds of slow career progression in the City Council, the need for performance room and provision for appropriate learning curves. The relatively wide scale ranges, some as wide as 60%, and the resultant overlapping became a major focus of objection by Heads of Department, particularly since scale ranges were introduced into sections of the structure which were traditionally characterised by fixed salary notches.

6.4.8.6 Declaration of the "No Lose" Principle

In the report of the Director of Personnel, the principle that no employee will lose financially as a result of the implementation of job evaluation was endorsed. The principle specifically addresses the case of employees whose current salaries exceed the new salary ranges justified by job evaluation. This too was an issue that was of vital concern to both Trade Unions.

6.4.8.7 Cost of Implementation

The implementation of the structure as devised by the central personnel office and contained in the report of the Director of Personnel to the Executive Committee (1985:76) was estimated to result in an increase of 4% of the annual basic salary...
and wage bill. Whilst 65% of the cost was attributed to increasing the salaries of the employees (7181) whose current salaries fell below the minimum of the new scales, the balance of cost was attributable to adjusting salaries that fell within the new scales, to the new key scale notches that were devised. The salaries of 1025 employees exceeded the proposed scale maxima and these were to be "red circled" and highlighted for future attention.

6.4.8.8 Maintenance of Job Evaluation

It is useful to draw a distinction between the introduction of job evaluation and its ongoing application. Once the initial anomalies highlighted by the system have been eliminated or justified, ongoing application of the system is needed in allocating new jobs to the appropriate category in the job worth hierarchy, or for reviewing existing jobs where job content has changed significantly. Accordingly, specific procedures were devised for system maintenance and updating.

6.4.8.9 Appeals and Appeal Procedure

This will be the subject of detailed discussion in Chapters 8 and 9, suffice to mention that the right of an employee to appeal against the re-grading of the post was reaffirmed and the earlier mentioned procedure was to be invoked to accommodate any special circumstances.

6.4.9 Deferred Implementation

The desire of the Unions for swift implementation was further frustrated when the Executive Committee, confronted by the proposals of the Director of Personnel, which in themselves had taken some months to formulate following completion of the evaluation phase, required some period of orientation to consider the proposals. This led to pressures from the Unions which were augmented by representations from certain branch managers who had been supportive of the need for job evaluation from the outset (Memorandum 1985-04-24). At least one
departmental head, as has been mentioned, submitted independent proposals as would affect his department (EXCO Minutes 1985-04-19). Taking cognisance of the expressed feeling of uncertainty as articulated by SAAME on behalf of its members, the intent was declared that subject to approval of full Council, implementation should take place with effect from 1st July 1985 (EXCO Minutes 1985-04-19). This was communicated to both Associations, with a view to placating SAAME membership in view of the impending annual general meeting at that time. The delays were explained as having been caused by the need for producing all relevant information required for a project of such size to be fully considered (Memorandum 1985-04-23). This time-scale can also be assessed against a self-imposed target of the Heads of Department that the project should be completed by June 1984 for implementation from 1st October of that year. This also provides an interesting dimension against which to analyse observable behaviour in regard to attainment of this objective. Chapter 7 will highlight this aspect. The avoidance of specific target attainment as mentioned in the opening paragraphs of this chapter is further illustrated by the initial resolution of the EXCO which set 'no time limit' for completion.

6.4.9.1 Consultants Report

The Executive Committee in June of 1985 appointed P.E. Corporate Services (Pty) Ltd to carry out an audit of the system and its proposed implementation (Report of Central Grading Committee 1986:3). The brief was to:

- examine the system proposed along with the documentation associated with it and the course of the project
- examine alternative proposals put forward by one of the Heads of Department
- to interview selected members of top management and others who could provide assistance
report on their view of the problem and the steps which should be taken to rectify the situation (P.E. Corporate Services 1985:1).

From the consultants report, it is evident that the brief conveyed the perception that the project had reached a critical stage in that although well on its way to implementation, it had been halted because of "...incomplete preparation, poor internal communication, and internal politics" (P.E. Corporate Services 1985:1).

This was presented as the problem on which the consultants were expected to provide guidance. It should also be noted at this point that the brief was narrowly defined in that it specifically excluded the option of scrapping the Five Factor System or recommendations that another job evaluation system should be used in its place (P.E. Corporate Services 1985:1).

The two most critical areas that came into focus in the consultants investigation were the need for wider participation and improved communication channels. The most important recommendation to emerge was for the establishment of a "high powered" Grading Committee. This was to be the vehicle by which to involve the Departmental Heads and the two Trade Unions directly in the decision-making process. Accordingly, the Executive Committee resolved to constitute the Central Grading Committee which was to comprise the then five Heads of Department and the representatives from each of the Trade Unions (SAMWU still electing not to participate) with the Director of Personnel acting as consultant, co-ordinator and advisor. The steps in the project were thus looped back in that the task of the Committee was to co-ordinate the gradings of the evaluation committees and hear all pending appeals. This implied recreating job classes/bands, and re-establishing the cut off points for determining such bands ab initio. The Committee was also charged with overseeing system maintenance where grading of jobs was envisaged as its ongoing function.
6.4.9.2 Rejection by Heads of Department

The strategy of gaining commitment of Department Heads through bringing them into the process and making them party to the decisions in the formulation of the final result was particularly significant given their rejection following the Pilot Phase and outright rejection of the proposals of the Director of Personnel. One Departmental Head stated that

"I have, along with at least three other Departmental Heads, repeatedly drawn attention to the problems and dangers associated with this job evaluation exercise. Our warnings and pleas however, appear to have gone unheeded. The Departmental Heads have also been virtually excluded, as have the two Staff Associations, from any meaningful joint discussion on this subject as the exercise progressed" (Departmental Communication 1985-04-11).

And again the same Departmental Head stated that

"It is only a pity that (such) joint consultation never took place right from the outset, as is I believe the practice in most other large municipalities" (Departmental Communication 1985-04-11).

Yet another Departmental Head said it was

".....indeed regrettable.....that Department Heads have not been able to participate directly in all aspects of an exercise which so vitally affects their Departments".

He added further that

"much of the deliberations did not have the benefit of the direct advice and opinion of the Departmental Heads" (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24).

The Central Grading Committee was given three months in which to complete its work (EXCO Minutes 1985-06-19).
The Central Grading Committee

The Heads of Department, in responding to the report of the Director of Personnel, articulated their views to the Executive Committee on the final evaluation results. In short, they rejected the job evaluation proposals on four principal grounds which will be analysed in detail in Chapter 7. Suffice to mention here that these criticisms related to the Five Factor System and its application including procedural aspects, the results attained, and features of the newly devised pay structure. Since the results were put in question, the Central Grading Committee carried as part of its brief, the authority to deal by "management decision" with exceptional cases (anomalies) which would have to be motivated to the Executive Committee.

The Committee first met on 29.6.85 and spent some considerable time considering various banding models that had been prepared. In the event a 28 grade structure was developed following which the process of what came to be known as "massaging" took place, which constituted management discretion in adjusting posts either upward or downward from the grade justified purely on points scored in terms of the agreed upon banding model. Some 276 designations out of a total of 820 were adjusted in this manner. The third fundamental decision of the Central Grading Committee was to opt for non-overlapping grades, thus resulting in a narrow banded structure with short scales. An exception to this feature was the case of entry posts, the first level positions in any career path - clearly requiring a more appropriate learning curve and for which market-related starting rates were set. A second exception was in cases where open bands between successive jobs in a given career path were 'closed' by overlapping the salary scales to ensure touching notches from one level to another (this structure is illustrated in Figure 6.10).
More than fifteen months after its constitution the report of the Committee was considered by the EXCO. The Heads of Department cautioned this time against the implementation plan arrived at, on the grounds that "the system on which it is based is so flawed and so open to criticism that the benefits that will flow from its introduction could well be more than outweighed by the damage that it is likely to cause staff morale throughout the organisation" (Central Grading Committee 1986-08-22:11). In evaluating this conclusion the question must be raised as to whether it may be interpreted as independent reaffirmation of the prior assessment of Heads of Department based on the pilot phase and subsequent proposals of the Director of Personnel or whether the already firmly embedded attitudes influenced such conclusion a fortiori. The commitment engendered by the experience of the Central Grading Committee thus hardened the resolve of scrapping job evaluation, an alternative specifically excluded from the brief of the consultants.

The report also contained however a strong minority view (held by one Head of Department and the 2 SAAME representatives) expressing the belief that flawed as the system might be, the prolonged period of uncertainty should be terminated by rapid implementation. It was argued that this would be far preferable than to dash the expectations raised in many categories of staff (CGC Report 1986-08-22). During this period, this view gained prominence through the fact that considerable organisational frustration emerged, formally channelled by the Union and the Municipal Service Commission, and in spontaneous employee reaction in the form of petitions, representations, etc particularly in the light of further target dates for implementation having been surpassed. In terms of procedure as determined by the By-Law 1994 the EXCO thus referred the matter to the MSC having simultaneously directed the Chief Executive to proceed with a draft Grading Document on the basis of the Central Grading Committee's report.
Finalisation of the Grading Document

Resolving the Final Grade Structure

Since the "massaging process" had resulted in substantial deviation and thereby reduced the importance of the points scored, the term job grading was conceived as having as its basis job evaluation, but taking account of "other factors" in arriving at a final structure. 'Massaging' thus became institutionalised as an element in the grading process. The Grading Document which was formulated contained proposals which in themselves reflected some considerable deviations from the Central Grading Committee's structure and in certain instances reversed adjustments made by "management decision" but effected yet others. Since the EXCO had resolved to proceed with implementation, the axis of conflict shifted to a choice between the structure proposed by the Central Grading Committee and that contained in the Grading Document. It presented a unique role conflict for the personnel functionaries who were the instruments in the creation of both these alternative proposals. Departmental Heads and their representatives, including both Trade Unions, rejected the Grading Document in favour of the Central Grading Committee's proposed structure, as the best alternative that could be devised under the circumstances of inevitable implementation as implied by the directive of the EXCO. This included SAMWU, who although initially having assumed observer status in the finalisation process, declared themselves full participants.

SAMWU expressed disquiet over the ambiguous role that points scored now appeared to play in the derivation of the job hierarchy, in particular with regard to the fact that the Executive Committee had ordered the removal of points from the final documents and this had added to the uncertainty as to the weighting afforded these as one of the factors in the determination of final pay structure proposals. The organisation responded to the Union by stating unequivocally that the proposals should be understood as the end result of job evaluation.
On the basis of Union and organisational consensus, the Central Grading Committee's proposals were accepted as the frame of reference, with all deviations as contained in the later proposals regarded as anomalies for individual investigation. In the final result, the Municipal Service Commission endorsed the proposals of the Central Grading Committee, deviating in 56 instances representing about 7% of designations, which represented in many cases a compromise between the Central Grading Committee's proposals and the Grading Document proposals for these particular occupations.

The most fundamental deviation was however the integration of the bottom two grades, thus resulting in a 27 grade structure as originally had been mooted by the central personnel unit. As a consequence to the integration, the minimum salary level was also increased by one key scale notch flowing from representations by SAMWU.

6.4.11.2 Issues in the Implementation Formula

Although the most recent undertaking of the Executive Committee had been for implementation to take place with effect from 1st July 1986 both Trade Unions indicated to the Municipal Service Commission their preparedness to put forward the implementation date to 1st January 1987 on condition that the initial idea of a phased implementation, by way of placing limits on the initial increase to be enjoyed by any employee, be replaced by implementing the result to the full. The Municipal Service Commission was sympathetic to this proposal particularly in view of the benefit to the administrative aspects of the implementation which would have been further complicated by having to implement with retrospective effect.

The second area of contention in regard to the implementation proposals surrounded what was articulated by the Unions as the "loss of seniority" of employees in being transferred over to the new scales of pay. Contrary to the
general principles of job evaluation implementation, SAAME demanded a 'notch for notch' implementation formula whereby employees whose present salaries were within the new range of pay would be assigned a notch in the new scale which reflected the same relative position of the old scale, eg an employee on the top of the old scale should be assigned to the top of the new scale. SAAME thereby advocated an exact replica of the differentials which existed between employees within the old scale of pay.

Although the organisation was not in favour of this idea, the Municipal Service Commission formulated a compromise "advance on incremental date" formula which was found acceptable to the Unions. (The term incremental date was described in Chapter 4, section 4.6.2.) This seniority provision was however rejected by the Executive Committee in approving the proposals and SAAME thus elected to pursue the matter as provided for in industrial legislation. This will be analysed further in Chapter 8. As far as the former aspect of implementation was concerned, the Executive Committee elected to limit the benefit of immediate implementation to four notches (or 20%) from 1st January 1987, the balance to be awarded from July of that year. The lengthy period of negotiations leading to implementation proceedings in any event necessitated retrospectivity as the scheme was only approved in June of 1987 with the new Special Conditions as contained in the revised Grading Schedule still to be reviewed prior to the new structure being "on line".

6.4.11.3 Final Negotiations between Unions and Executive Committee

Authorisation for implementation by the Executive Committee and Council became complicated by a dispute declared earlier in the year by SAAME in respect of an 11.1% across-the-board salary demand to be effective from January of that year. Ironically, the final authorisation became hampered by circumstances which spirited the need for job evaluation in the first instance.
The Executive Committee's attempt to dispense with the salary dispute by offering a "package deal" coupling job evaluation to a general salary increase was met with aggressive reaction by both Unions. Both were firmly of the view that the two issues were totally separate. SAMWU (1987-04-02) wrote that

"the Union is not prepared to consider a "packaged deal" which would involve combining salary/wage increases with implementation of the results of Job Evaluation....." and urged that "Council implement their own Job Evaluation structure forthwith".

SAAME in a far more aggressive approach reneged on its compromise to postponement of implementation from 1st July 1986 to 1st January 1987 in demanding that Council implement job evaluation within 30 days retrospective to 1st July 1986 failing which they would declare a dispute and apply for a Conciliation Board (1987-03-25). Following these representations, the Executive Committee decided to separate the two issues and after being considered by Council on a number of occasions were given a mandate by the latter to settle with the Unions on the basis of the job evaluation results.

The noteworthy feature at this point was that, although independently initiated by the Council, the implementation of job evaluation became an issue of negotiation with the Unions in which the latter made the demands. Council was accused of reneging on its "declaration of intent" formulated two years previously. SAMWU described this as "blatant refusal to implement the results of its (Council's) own job evaluation exercise" and warned of "positive action" should Council not implement job evaluation and accede to pay demands of R50 per week which had been submitted (1987-05-22). It was suggested by some sources that Council's reluctance to accede to demands was based purely on the financial implications (Argus 1987-06-10). Although the Executive Committee in separating the two issues had attempted to deal first with salary increases and thereafter superimpose job evaluation, thus allowing the latter to "absorb" some
of the effects of the former, both Unions were adamant that job evaluation be implemented first, the salary scales attached thereto having been devised as a result of surveys conducted during July 1986; and salary increases be applied over and above for the period July 1986 - July 1987. Agreement was finally reached in terms of which job evaluation was implemented with retrospective effect to 1st January 1987, in accordance with the provision outlined in paragraph 6.4.11.2 and that salary adjustments be effected from 1st July of that year. Both Unions, in accepting the compromise, reserved their rights in respect of the "loss of seniority" provisions for which they gave notice of intent to negotiate further.

6.4.11.4 Features of the Approved Structure

Three important features of the approved structure are relevant at this point. In the first instance it comprised a 26 grade structure, the Executive Committee having decided to eliminate an open band in the upper structure. This model is depicted in Table 6.9.

Secondly, the salary structure was characterised by a core structure reflecting short non-overlapping scales with differential minima in exceptional cases as outlined in paragraph 6.4.10. This concept is depicted in Figure 6.10.

Finally, as a result of the implementation of this structure, staff were afforded salary adjustments as illustrated in Table 6.11.

As can be seen from the table, approximately 40% of employees gained immediate financial benefit. All employees with few exceptions were placed in a more favourable position in view of the higher maximum salary notches to which they could aspire in terms of the system of annual increments outlined in Chapter 4, section 4.6.2.
### TABLE NUMBER 6.9
CITY COUNCIL'S GRADING STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAND NO.</th>
<th>POINTS RANGE</th>
<th>SKILL LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>191 - 201</td>
<td>Chief Executive and Upper Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>180 - 190</td>
<td>Top Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>170 - 179</td>
<td>Senior Management and Heads of Major Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>160 - 169</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>Professionally Qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>150 - 159</td>
<td>and Experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>140 - 149</td>
<td>Specialists, Middle Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>130 - 139</td>
<td>Skilled, Technical and Academically Qualified Employees, Junior/Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>120 - 129</td>
<td>Low level skilled and semi-skilled employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>110 - 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>100 - 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>90 - 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>80 - 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>40 - 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30 - 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20 - 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10 - 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 - 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE NUMBER 6.10
CHARACTERISTICS OF CITY COUNCIL'S SALARY STRUCTURE

![Graph showing salary structure with shaded areas representing different skill levels and pay ranges.](image-url)
6.4.11.5 The Appeal Procedure

A multi-staged appeal procedure was devised in order to provide the employee with sufficient safeguards on the one hand and ensure an adequate screening process and division of labour for the organisation on the other. Figure 6.12 illustrates the agreed upon procedure which was adopted in October of that year. Employees were given till the end of the year to submit motivated appeals against the grading of their posts. Each employee was informed in writing of the effect which job evaluation had on the grading of his/her post and the consequent changes to his/her salary, if any.

Aside from the complex procedural aspects, the major complicating factor to consideration of appeals was the substantial massaging which had taken place resulting in the relegation of points as a factor and thus increasing the subjectivity of decisions.

The appeal process however, suffered a major setback when differences between the Unions and the officials, in particular, the personnel functionaries, came to the fore over representation at the Central Evaluation Committee. This focused more specifically on the presence of incumbents during Committee evaluations of their own jobs. While the Unions perceived this stage of the process as one analogous to a court hearing, the organisation saw this as performing a purely technical role of reviewing the evaluation of the appellant's post. Although on the recommendation of the MSC, EXCO agreed to this right a 'gentleman's'
agreement was reached in terms of which the Unions agreed to refrain from bringing in incumbent representation at that stage, this to be done at the Municipal Service Commission hearings as the Appeal Body proper. Representatives of the Central Evaluation Committee agreed to restrict representation to the appointed members of that Committee.

Resolution of these differences caused delays in the hearing of appeals which resulted in turn in employee reaction by means of petitions in which accusations about deliberate delaying tactics were once again made. At the time of writing, the appeal process was still in motion. Further analysis on the appeal process as an employee response will be discussed in Chapters 8 and 9.

6.4.12 System Maintenance

Although it could be argued that the job evaluation is incomplete until such time as all appeals have been resolved (since changes in grading are likely to follow in some instances,) a procedure for system maintenance was devised and implemented. Jobs are dynamic, they change in content and nature. In addition, as functions and structures grow, new jobs are created to meet the new demands. To cater for these occurrences therefore, evaluations take place twice a year in April and October and changes to the grading of individual jobs are effected, guided by the outcome of evaluations undertaken.
FIGURE NUMBER 6.12
CITY COUNCIL MULTI STAGED JOB EVALUATION APPEAL PROCEDURE AGAINST GRADING OF POSTS

EMLOYEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submits appeal to Head of Department</th>
<th>Head of Department does not support employee's appeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEAD OF DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>DEPARTMENTAL APPEAL COMMITTEE considers appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Department supports appeal and forwards to Town Clerk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN CLERK assesses appeal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places appeal before Central Evaluation Committee OR direct to Municipal Service Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Reviews Evaluation of the post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports findings to Municipal Service Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL SERVICE COMMISSION</td>
<td>hears further submissions on appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submits recommendations to Executive Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE</td>
<td>considers recommendations of Municipal Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL-IN-COMMITTEE</td>
<td>approves recommendations of Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee informed of outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If still has grievance may refer back to Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Union pursues Grievance

STAFF ASSOCIATION/TRADE UNION

| Union supports appeal |

STEPS IN THE COUNCIL'S JOB EVALUATION PROGRAMME
The success of any endeavour must be assessed against the attainment or otherwise of the objectives set. This will be considered in the concluding chapter. Equally important in testing the success of job evaluation is to appraise employee, union and organisation satisfaction with it (Belcher, 1974:102). It has already been pointed out in Chapter 6 that employee acceptance is a primary criterion. To attain this, participation of all parties is fundamental at various levels from managerial commitment to the concept of job evaluation, through to participation in the mechanics of the job evaluation committees. The forthcoming chapters provide an analysis of the role and response of principal actors in this process. The present chapter addresses the perspective of senior management.

7.1 INFLUENCE OF HAY-MSL

Senior management's orientation to the job evaluation must be understood in the light of its previous experience with the HAY-MSL evaluation and against the back-drop of corporate cultural traditionalism. The latter part of Chapter 5 described the dissatisfaction which emanated therefrom and the inviolable correctness which was ascribed to the existing status hierarchy. Many senior managers considered the existing Grading Schedule as a valuable product of evaluation, refined over many years as a result of regular review based on practical experience. On more than one occasion, it was described as having "stood the test of time".

7.1.1 The Influence of HAY-MSL on the Pilot Phase

Resistance arising out of the previous exposure to job evaluation was evident
early in the Pilot Phase. At that stage it was reported that "previous experience with job evaluation left a distinctly negative scar on the minds of members of the team" and "a very real and deep-seated negative feeling toward job evaluation per se was detected" (Pilot Report 1984:10-11). As was further reported, "the chairman of the committee had a difficult, indeed an almost impossible task to change (sic) the existing attitude and to develop a sufficiently positive orientation towards job evaluation so as to, at least, get the evaluators to participate meaningfully in the evaluation process" (Pilot Report 1984:11). The perceptions were fully recognised when it was also stated that "some of the members of the Committee represented Heads of Department who are wholly or partly opposed to the entire concept of job evaluation....." (Pilot Report 1984:11).

In practical terms this resulted in representatives participating positively in the evaluation process when their own departmental posts were rated and reacting negatively to others. Departmentalism was reflected in a situation where "tension rose gradually and the effectiveness of the rating procedure was adversely affected by the growing strain on the relationship between members of the evaluation team. This led to in-fighting and distrust" (Pilot Report 1984:12).

7.1.2 HAY-MSL as a Basis for Judgement

Not only did the previous experience crystallise attitudes, but also generate a fear of recurrent hurt (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24). The presence of early conflict experienced in the Pilot Phase was however transferred as an argument against job evaluation per se by ascribing to job evaluation the generalised properties for creation of discontent (EXCO Minutes 1983-05-19). The re-emergence of the job evaluation process, it was argued by one senior manager, also had the effect of putting dissatisfaction arising from HAY-MSL "in cold storage as it were" in anticipation of the present system being adjudged on the basis that it would address any maladjustment resulting from HAY-MSL (Departmental Report...
1985-04-12). The HAY-MSL results were thus regarded as a priori incorrect and the future acceptance of the results arising out of the application of the Five Factor System was in the minds of some managers, made conditional on its ability to "rectify" these past maladjustments. This had the effect of setting a rigid criterion and reflects the scepticism with which the system was viewed. On the basis of the research findings outlined in chapter 3 on the high correlation of results attained after using different job evaluation systems, this expectation was unlikely to be realised. In point of fact, four of the five Heads of Department, in commenting on the outcome of the Five Factor System, following publication of the results, urged the Executive Committee with specific reference to the top structure, "to restore equality between Departmental Heads as was the case pre-MSL" (Departmental Report 1985-04-11). In contrast, for those whose status was enhanced as a result of job evaluation, correlation with the HAY results by the Five Factor System served to reaffirm the correctness of the differentiation derived. This is highlighted by the action of senior managers who had petitioned for implementation of the HAY-MSL results, in submitting protest at the protraction of the Five Factor System and demanding speedy implementation.

### 7.1.3 Comparison of the Point Score Results of the HAY and Five Factor Systems

An analysis of the comparability of the results of the HAY and FIVE FACTOR system was thus undertaken for senior management posts. Overall there was an expectedly good correlation between the hierarchy derived in applying the Hay System and the Five Factor System. The majority of the management posts remained largely unchanged in content from the time of the Hay evaluation in 1979 till their formal description under the Five Factor System in 1983/4. Correlation co-efficients between the point ratings for the Hay and Five Factor Systems were compared for original scores and for adjusted scores (appealed scores in Hay System or massaged scores in Five Factor System) for the 64
posts common to both. It was expected that a higher correlation would be found in the case of the latter since in each case it was hypothesised that this represented an attempt to 'correct' out of line scores as compared to the status quo. Accordingly, it was found that whereas $R^2 = 0.88$ for original scores, this stood higher at $R^2 = 0.92$ for adjusted scores.

A number of marked differences were however noted in the case of the Five Factor System evaluation. This is graphically depicted in Figure 7.1.

![Figure 7.1: Comparison of Two Job Evaluation Systems](image)

The Figure reflects in each case the extent to which the Hay and the Five Factor System rankings of the senior management posts, deviated from the rankings that
pertained prior to the Hay evaluation in 1979. From the figure it can be seen that some significant changes arose in both instances, but in each case there were variations in the extent of deviation from the pre-evaluation order. These variations between the two systems are more systematically reflected in Figure 7.2 which depicts the Hay Rankings of the senior management posts against the Five Factor Rankings without reference to the prior hierarchy.

It can be seen that some significant clusters declined in status following the Five Factor Evaluation. In so far as the amended Hay hierarchy was intact at the time of the evaluation, this aspect above dispelled any chance of acceptance by Senior Managers. The effect of the Five Factor evaluation on grading of the senior
management posts can be seen in Figure 7.3 which provides a comparison of grading before and after the implementation of the Five Factor Evaluation.

We find for example that posts banded in 12 prior to Five Factor job evaluation fell into three new levels as justified by the scores prior to massaging, the majority falling into the new grade 06 with a lesser number in 07 and three posts in 08. (Note: A 'straight' comparison between grades is not possible as old gradings covered 14 levels, whereas new grades were 'condensed' into 8 levels.)
7.2 ACCEPTABILITY OF THE "CONSULTANT"

It is considered that an important element in senior management response related to the form of the change agent. Negativism toward external consultants was evident, when as described in Chapter 5, after considering various proposals by consultants who were approached for this purpose by Council, Heads of Department and Unions alike, saw only marginal value from employing consultants and advised on an evaluation being undertaken internally. As far as Heads of Department were concerned, this preference emanated from the view of the uniqueness of a municipal bureaucracy, and the need for substantial input to the consultants in any event. As far as the Unions were concerned, it afforded a more accessible sphere of influence, since acceptance of results was subject to subsequent negotiation with themselves. As will be recalled, one of the subsequent criticisms from SAAME was that they were not consulted in the process of re-evaluating scales of pay as described in Chapter 5. The greater opportunity to exert influence provided a fundamental interest for all parties in ensuring an internal evaluation.

In the case of the HAY evaluation of Senior Management posts, Council acted in accordance with accepted practice of employing consultants to evaluate managerial jobs (Belcher 1974:97). The point was again highlighted in Chapter 5 that senior managers did not accept the ability of an outside consultant to appreciate and assess posts in the context of a large municipal administration. It is argued therefore that this prevailing view contributed to negative response to the Five Factor System in so far as the consulting role was played by the Chairman of the Municipal Service Commission/Director of Personnel, who, as one senior manager put it, had not "paid his dues" in the organisation. This was not a personal directed response but a principle one. The "consultant" was perceived as an
outsider whose lack of knowledge and experience of the organisation did not “qualify” him to understand the context of posts. The external nature of the consultants role was reinforced by the authority deriving from an external body, namely the Provincial Administration, who as was pointed out in Chapter 4, appoint the members of the Municipal Service Commission. The many criticisms levelled at the Five Factor System, irrespective of their being objectively justifiable or otherwise, should be understood in symbolic terms, namely as rejection of the “consultant” who developed it. Since the system was not “organisation bred”, it was not regarded as capable of application. This aspect will be pursued later in this chapter in the context of response to “systemic” factors. In similar vein, personnel who were newly recruited in accordance with the motivation for additional staff outlined in Chapter 5, were described by one manager as “outsiders”. This perception could also be attributed as a reason for the view expressed by another Departmental Head that the complexity and responsibility level of a number of the posts evaluated was not fully appreciated by panel members (Departmental Report 1985-06-24).

7.3 THE DIVIDE BETWEEN ELECTED MEMBERS AND OFFICIALS

It has been pointed out repeatedly that a fundamental precondition to the success of any job evaluation scheme is a commitment from the top management in the organisation. This aspect becomes particularly complicated in local government since the top decision-makers are political office bearers who are also temporary office holders due to political factors. Control by locally elected representatives is central to the concept of local government. Officials of the administration are accountable to elected representatives for administrative actions and to ensure that policies which represent the outcome of the democratic decision-making process are implemented as efficiently as possible (Håynes, 1980:13). Leaving
aside the debate on what constitutes policy and what can be regarded as administrative detail, the official on the other hand has a profound potential for influence. Highly qualified senior managers are in a potentially powerful position with regard to policy formulation. In the final analysis however, the councillors, and in this particular context, the Executive Committee, has overall and ultimate responsibility and in whatever form advice is given by officials, the directives of the former are required to be followed.

Yet another aspect of this distinction was demonstrated in the objectives to which the Executive Committee subscribed on the one hand, and the traditionalist approach which officials favoured on the other. As advisors to the Executive Committee, the Heads of Department recommended against proceeding with job evaluation after the Pilot Phase had been completed. The 'readiness for change' can be analysed by the following useful mathematical formula:

\[ c = (abd) > x \]

where

- \( c \) = change
- \( a \) = level of dissatisfaction with the status quo
- \( b \) = clear or understood desired state
- \( d \) = practical first steps toward a desired state
- \( x \) = 'cost' of changing.

For change to be possible, and for commitment to occur there has to be enough dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs to mobilize energy toward change (Beckhard, 1979:462).

The orientation of the senior managers in terms of readiness for change as expressed immediately after the Pilot Phase did not satisfy such equation. Specifically there was no commitment as to the need for job evaluation coupled with the anticipation of discontent based on the HAY experience. Indeed, the only
interest in job evaluation was expressed by the criterion of whether it would reinforce a pre-conceived status quo. It was also argued that the Pilot Project indicated that few changes were in fact necessary when compared to the existing Grading Schedule. Anticipation of a few anomalies would therefore not justify the costs of changing. Lack of a clear conception of the end result was evidenced by a call on Council to spell out precisely the reasons why a job evaluation was at all necessary.

On the practical level, resources for the job description process, complexity of the scheme, and particularly a lack of enthusiasm to commit departmental resources were major practical points raised. Against this, the time scale and cost implications were anticipated to be considerable. The commitment on the other hand of the Executive Committee, to a policy of more competitive rewards to higher performers and achievers reflected the lack of clarity between attaining an internally and externally consistent job structure on the one hand, and the appraisal of individual employees on the other. In the belief that job evaluation would provide answers to its salary and wage administration difficulties of the past, the decision was taken to proceed (albeit in stages). As an expression of its commitment, the Executive Committee directed reports back at certain intervals, as a monitoring device. In consequence, senior managers, notwithstanding, were held accountable for the execution of acts to which they remained uncommitted.

7.4 EARLY MANIFESTATION OF THE AMBIVALENCE

Although departmental managers had counselled against the implementation of job evaluation, some recognition was accorded to producing job descriptions in a planned process. Furthermore in addition to the information contained in the notice sent to all employees described in Chapter 6, management's responsibility to the Council for allocating and regulating functions and recommending equitable
rates of pay was identified. Management was also designated to 'take the lead' in the job description phase on the basis of the 'top down' approach also outlined in Chapter 6. Manifestations of ambivalence could therefore have been expected given the obligation to take the lead in a project with which they did not identify, and this was demonstrated early on in the tardy approach in the job description phase.

Repeated directives by the EXCO for submission of job descriptions in terms of the job describing phase earlier outlined, were paralleled by successive postponements of the deadlines to the point where failure to submit was to be deemed misconduct and to be dealt with in terms of the Council's Conditions of Service (EXCO Minutes 1984-08-09). Indicative of the aforementioned ambivalence was the fact that a number of senior managers fell into this category (although misconduct proceedings were never instituted) some of whom yet later petitioned against the delay in implementation on the grounds that such delays were prejudicing likely salary improvements which were assumed on the basis of their higher post evaluation results relative to other then similarly remunerated managers.

Aside from the lack of commitment a number of other reasons can be ascribed. In the first instance it was evident that a substantial burden was placed upon many managers over and above their normal workload. This is exemplified by one manager who in writing to his departmental head stated that

"the workload.....imposed when job descriptions were required..... gave rise to widespread resentment, particularly where senior officials were required to report in person their reasons for non-submission of the documents by due date".

This arose with particular regard to the method applied for gathering job information.
This manager went on to say that

"no cognisance was taken of the lack of literacy skills in the lower order and blue collar occupations, these persons being trained specifically in manual and manipulative skills. The additional workload imposed in rearranging these documents into readable form was formidable, but this fact was not taken into account at any stage. In my personal capacity .... my involvement and input in this connection was considerable" (Departmental Communication 1985-09-03).

The consultants employed to "audit" progress for the EXCO were also of opinion that the system whereby employees write their own job descriptions was inefficient (1985:3).

A second phenomenon observed was that which related to prescribing roles and defining actual lines of job demarcation. Conflict was evident between the terms of reference of the job analysis directive which embodied a de facto approach of how the job is being performed "here and now" as opposed to prescribing a normative role. On the other hand, once formalised the de facto would emerge as the expected pattern of behaviour for the said job for present and future incumbents. In other words, the formalising of job descriptions brought into focus the relationship between what incumbents said they did and what they were expected to do.

Although evidence from several studies indicate that job incumbents are quite consistent in describing their work, there was evidence of conflict between subordinate and supervisor/manager as to where lines of demarcation should be drawn. It was alleged by some that they were performing work that should have been done by superior officers and that although the latter had allowed this to prevail, resisted the formalisation in the job description. The procedure whereby the immediate superior was to check the correctness of the job description and become a signatory for the express purpose of compensating for any bias from
an incumbent, was in certain instances self-defeating insofar as the *de facto* was blocked from becoming *de jure*. Much of management time was devoted to resolution of these differences, which although in itself a positive process, consumed time and contributed to resentment.

Closely related to the above was the insecurity associated with committing functions to paper, which could be scrutinised not only by the superiors, but by a remote evaluation committee. This was exacerbated by a recurring feeling on the part of employees that their job was so unique and complex as to render it indescribable. This in turn contributed to what senior managers identified as a weakness in the system, namely that of excessively lengthy job descriptions and of variable quality. Counterbalanced to this however, is the employees' need to ensure that all aspects of the job are included. (This issue was discussed in Section 6.4.5.3.) These points, however, will be further discussed later in this chapter as well as in later chapters.

### 7.5 THE GRADING FORUM

#### 7.5.1 Departmentalism

The evaluation panels (committees) were the centre of conflict on a number of levels and proved to be fertile ground for inter-departmental competition. Stoker and Wilson (1986) point out that inter-departmental competition to increase or protect staff, budgets and responsibilities is a key feature of the intra-organisational politics of local authorities. Similar examples to those cited by Stoker and Wilson have been evidenced in the City Council where departmental political considerations have prejudiced the creation of more rational structures, or more optimal service delivery.
In the case of job evaluation, conflicts relating to the relative status of jobs were grounded in the relative status of departments. It is useful at this point therefore to reflect on how departmental staffing compared. This is illustrated by the indicators reflected in Table 7.4 which show the variations in staff complement and salary/wage budgets. A somewhat unbalanced relationship in management structure is also reflected. The City Engineer’s Department for example carries the smallest management structure relative to size of department. This indicator of relatively larger groupings of responsibilities can be expected to find expression in the relative evaluation ratings.

The observations made, confirmed the assertions of Stoker and Wilson (1986) that the momentum for conflict is provided by the perception of officials in different departments that they are involved in competition. These perceptions are suggested to have three sources. The first is what can be termed “bureaucratic rivalry” associated in this instance with the desire of departmental officials, to protect their administrative empires. The second important dimension is related to “professional jealousies”. Examples of rivalry between technical disciplines involved in land development such as planners, architects, housing managers, valuation officers, estates officers and engineers who each claim overriding input over all others, cut not only across departmental lines, but manifested itself in rivalry within singular departments where these disciplines were placed.

It is also suggested by Stoker and Wilson (1986) that the continued professionalisation of local authority service areas enhances the perception of departmental differences and fuels disputes of over what has been termed ‘debated territory’ between the professions. In this respect it is pertinent to mention subsequent splitting of the City Engineers department into two separate departments, one covering the traditional engineering functions and the newly created Planners Department incorporating the planning disciplines. Resisted by
the City Engineers department despite intra-professional differences, the split was of primary interest to the smaller departments who have long endured an inferiority under the shadow of such an organisational giant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE NUMBER 7.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPARISON OF DEPARTMENTS 1985: SOME ‘SIZE’ INDICATORS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CEE</th>
<th>MOH</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posts</td>
<td>4,538</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>9,333</td>
<td>18,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
<td>14,8%</td>
<td>4,6%</td>
<td>3,8%</td>
<td>51,7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985/86 Sal/Wage incl. Allow R1000</td>
<td>54,865</td>
<td>33,151</td>
<td>10,003</td>
<td>11,514</td>
<td>92,370</td>
<td>R201,9 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>27,2%</td>
<td>16,4%</td>
<td>5,0%</td>
<td>5,7%</td>
<td>45,7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snr Mngmnt Staff * No. As % of Dept posts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Annual Salary R1 000</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>R2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
<td>3,6%</td>
<td>4,3%</td>
<td>0,9%</td>
<td>1,44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Head of Department down to and including Branch Heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>CA - Administration Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEE - Electricity Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOH - Health Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT - City Treasurer’s Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE - City Engineer’s Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the evaluation point of view, this was particularly pertinent in so far as the Department Head was placed on the HAY-MSL evaluation at a higher grading than other departmental heads. This was reaffirmed under the Five Factor System. Once the department was split, the new departmental heads were equated. It is worth repeating the quote of one of the departmental managers purporting to speak on behalf of others in response to such differentiation confirmed by the Five Factor System when it was stated that “we are of the unanimous opinion that the only practical, reasonable and equitable system would be to restore equality between Departmental Heads as was the case pre MSL” (Departmental Communication 1985-04-11). One departmental manager reacted by attributing departmental ills directly to HAY MSL when he stated that...
"my department has been steadily going downhill, which is a situation which I forecast would happen when the status and standing of my department was unfortunately adversely affected as a result of the HAY MSL evaluation."

It is worth digressing at this point to pursue this issue of departmental differentiation, for in the application of the Five Factor System an attempt was made to differentiate between large and small branches and departments as a valid purpose of job evaluation. The concept of large and small was operationalised in terms of a number of indicators. These included the following:

- budget size (operating and capital)
- number of staff (absolute)
- ratio of professional and technically qualified staff to total staff establishment
- diversity of disciplinary activities
- centralised as opposed to multiple decentralised operational units

It was clear that this approach was likely to undermine existing organisational structures as no set of criteria existed in the organisation for delineating organisational units such as what constitutes a branch, division, etc. One departmental manager specifically rejected the deliberateness of the weighting in favour of "big (number)" departments (sic) thereby illustrating denial of the need for differentiating qualities in the first instance (Departmental Communication 1985-04-12). The lack of consistency in balancing organisational structures was thus given expression in the evaluation results of the upper structure. Again as in the case of HAY MSL these differences were perceived as being anomalous with no evidence of a preparedness for organisational review as suggested by the discrepancies highlighted. Neither was recognition afforded to the discriminatory powers of an objective evaluation. This is illustrated by the view of one manager who said that
"the classification of Branch Heads is anomalous and does not reflect the true relative evaluation of the various posts of Branch Head" (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24).

What or how that 'true relativity' was to be determined was however not addressed. The above also illustrates a common misconception which has been found to prevail in applying job evaluation, referred to as mechanical organisational parallelism (Suskin, 1977:41). This misconception concerns the belief that all positions at the same or parallel organisational levels (and reporting to the same superior) should be in the same grade or pay level. In the case of the Council, this extended to departmental, branch and even divisional levels. It is not suggested that the possibility of the same grading for parallel organisations should be denied, but rather that the arbitrary assumption that parallel organisations always warrant the same grading is unjustified. There is every reason to expect that parallel organisational units could be evaluated at different levels.

The third source affecting the perception of departments being in competition while less pertinent to the process of job evaluation, relates to 'value clashes'. This refers to fundamentally different orientations between interdepartment disciplines. Some reference has been made to this in the context of predominantly administrative departments suggesting the system was geared to technical jobs, while technically orientated departments saw the reverse.

7.5.2 Grading Mechanics

One of the main areas where departmentalism manifested itself overtly was in the grading forum. The structure of the grading committees (panels) was outlined in the preceding chapter. In addition to the formal representation, the branch head or supervisor of the post being evaluated was present in order to provide additional information and clarify any queries regarding the job description, since theoretically this document was the main source of information for evaluation purposes. In practice this at times evolved into an exploitative situation in which
the departmental representative and the line superior provided in certain instances
an orchestrated exaggeration and over elaboration of the scope of the job, this
having been the result of prior rehearsal. Some departmental managements met
at regular intervals in order to plan strategy for job evaluation committee
appearances. One departmental head was highly critical of the fact that “one
department was found using a City Council computer during working hours, to
best apply the responses to evaluating teams in the interests of their own
employees” (Departmental Communication 1985-04-12). Skilful departmental
representatives led line superiors in evidence in order to influence the rating
members. The objective was to get the job valued as highly as possible - what
Lawler (1987:41) has described as “point grabbing”. Some job descriptions were
found to be inflated and in view of the fact that the evaluation process and the
job description stage ran concurrently, knowledge of the system increased to the
extent that factor definition semantics were woven into some job descriptions in
many instances to 'prompt' the rating. Although inadequately written job
descriptions were used as an excuse for poor ratings, this ironically facilitated a
greater degree of verbal padding which provided for greater scope for exerting
influence on the rating in the committee forum than may have been the case with
a more comprehensively documented job description.

Departmental representatives were motivated to do the best for their departments.
Because the results were so important to the employee, representatives also had
to be sensitive to how the employees believed the department represented their
jobs. This process was encouraged by the Union representatives (in this case
SAAME) sense of responsibility for getting the best point results for the employee.
Once a single job was successfully 'pegged', this could be used as a benchmark
by departmental representatives in articulating arguments for other jobs, despite
the fact that the "rules of the game" specifically outlawed comparison, preferring
to measure each job on its merits against the evaluation yardstick. The purpose
of objectively rating each job so as to determine relativity of one to another thus
became obscured. It was evident however that the need by some members to
use a comparative approach was a function of the difficulty in interpreting the
factor scale definitions, thus favouring the use of benchmark jobs as a means to
rating others. The perceived vagueness of definitions will be addressed later in
Section 7.6.1.2.

Apart from the above factors which influence the committee, Paterson (1972:76)
has pointed to the effect of the material (job description) upon which the
committee bases its grading. This is illustrated from a study by Rupe (1956) who
found that twelve analysts using different approaches to their analysis of the same
twelve jobs, produced job descriptions which varied considerably. Truthner and
Kubis (1955) in studying eight analysts and a grading committee found that
members of the committee were more consistent than the analysts in their
grading. Paterson uses these findings to illustrate that the analysts by virtue of
their prior closeness to the jobs were more liable to be individually biased by this
than the other members of the grading committee who see only the written
descriptions.

This phenomenon could be observed in the three evaluation panels where the
departmental representatives were chosen specifically on the basis of their affinity
to the jobs under evaluation. Indeed, in many instances departments set
themselves target scores for jobs which led to hours of unproductive haggling
over awarding of points for each of the ten factors. In addition, since semantics
defined the differences in job worth, much debate ensued about interpretations.
This was complicated by cases where jobs were deliberately described in terms
of the semantics of the job evaluation factors. One of the factors found to be
most abused was the educational requirements specified (Factor 1A). An analysis
of the requirements specified in employment advertisements in comparison to the
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educational specifications of the job descriptions revealed that this factor was not accurately applied in all cases. For example, out of 227 advertisements scrutinised in 1986, it was found that 25 were advertised at a lower level qualification than that called for in the job description. This represented 11% of advertisements. Further analysis of this category revealed a predominance from the administrative occupations where a high degree of insecurity as a distinct field exists, in particular relative to technical occupations where tertiary training to carry out defined functions is stipulated and institutionalised.

Lawler (1987) in his critique of point-factor job evaluation has pointed out that since pay levels are tied so directly to the job description itself, it creates a real danger that point-factor systems can encourage and reward dishonesty. Over time, the writing of inflated job descriptions can become standard operating procedure in organisations. This, it is argued, has three important negative consequences. First, point inflation can occur and as a result the organisation ends up paying everyone too much. Second, an organisational culture can arise in which it is acceptable to misinform the personnel department. Finally a conflict between the compensation (personnel) specialists and the rest of the organisation is likely if the former try to correct the point inflation problem (Lawler, 1987:42).

Indeed, a major axis of conflict existed between departmental representatives and the personnel specialists whose interests lay in as great a degree of objectivity as was possible. The role of the chairman and the staff officials often centred around 'correcting' for departmental bias and maintaining perspective. While instances of conflict between departments were evident, equally evident were departmental 'coalitions' in cases where jobs cut across departmental boundaries.

7.5.3 Factors Tempering the Evaluation Results

A number of factors were found to temper the above process. In the first
instance, to the extent that inflation prevailed in most representations, it could be argued that relativity was left largely undisturbed. Exceptions related to the variable degree of pressure exerted. A considerable amount of 'telescoping' was observed, however, whereby 'middle order' jobs were pushed to the limits thus creating a closeness to professional posts for which clear cut normative standards had evolved defining their limits (see Section 7.5.5). Secondly, the fact of grading posts based on point ranges had a tempering effect since any additional points awarded through exaggerated job information would have to be significant to result in a different grading in many instances. On the other hand two closely evaluated jobs could be 'split' on either side of a grade cutoff. This also meant dealing with many of the exceptions. Bearing in mind that no empirical basis existed for grade demarcation lines, subsequent decisions about where jobs should be placed influenced the determination of final cut offs and therefore effectively pulled in outliers.

Yet another of the fundamental balancing factors was the averaging process, described in Section 6.4.7, which had the effect of disregarding extreme scores and arrived at a grading based on the central tendency of multiple evaluations. Exceptions to the process were however those jobs where only one post existed.

In the fourth instance, specific cases that were not perceived as having been correctly graded were adjusted by management decision. Significant 'massages' were thus undertaken by management in terms of which jobs were placed in grades other than those justified by their points rating. An analysis of the massaging process will be discussed later in this chapter. Collectively, the above factors thus had a moderating influence on the grading of posts as was finally implemented.
7.5.4 Toward a Greater Corporate Approach

The most significant aspect of the tempering process was however evidenced much later, in the post-implementation phase, in the appeal procedure also to be discussed in greater detail in a subsequent chapter dealing with employee reaction. This aspect relates to the gradual transition which the Central Evaluation Committee experienced from a focus of conflict through a process of 'constructive confrontation' to a new co-operative equilibrium. It reflected a clear signal of a greater corporate approach in recognising some of the negative consequences of earlier departmentalism practices in the evaluation process. This is evidenced by the fact that notwithstanding the upward thrust in the nature of an appeal, 17% of re-evaluated posts were reduced in points, and in a number of instances quite dramatically as a consequence of recognising inflation in the original assessment. Although these reductions did not necessarily affect the grading of the posts, of 84 posts that were re-evaluated and were included in the original sample, 20% were affected by a grade change. The relative flatness of the curve in Figure 7.5 illustrates the degree of caution exercised in the re-measurement on appeal. The exceptional radical deviations that did indeed take place were evident both upward and downward.

In many respects, this transition process exhibited elements of Lewin's change model namely an unfreezing through a realisation that past attitudes and behaviours did not engender the best results, followed by the development of greater corporate value orientation, to a point where a new equilibrium was reached (Beer, 1976:939). It would be premature at this point to consider the process complete by the 'refreezing' but signs are encouraging that this state of affairs could prevail. The process witnessed may be aptly described as a spontaneous self-directed team-building exercise - the kind of result aspired to in formal organisational development interventions (French and Bell, 1984). This phenomenon represented a greater degree of maturity in organisational culture,
and can be viewed as an important organisational by-product of the job evaluation process, in some respects of greater significance than the realisation of what remained unclear primary objectives. This view is supported by Plachy (1987:31) who in defence of point-factor job evaluation has argued that the goals of job evaluation provide the opportunity to educate managers in appropriate management methods: treating employees fairly, working as a team member with other managers and being accountable for jobs, pay, performance, and efficiency in their areas of responsibility. In this way, managers become the focal point of the system. He states "we have foolishly... asked the compensation department to shoulder the burden...; frequently, managers are not serious about jobs and job values because they are not held accountable for them". Significantly, Plachy
(1987:31-32) asserts that "most managers who cheat the system do so because they do not know any better way to manage; they are stuck with an inequitable system or they can protect their employees only by juggling the system to their best advantage. When managers agree to play on the same team and to work for the same goals, there is no need to play with the system".

### 7.5.5 Professional vs Non-Professional Jobs and the Effect on Departmentalism

The approach with regard to professional posts is of particular relevance since they serve as symbols of departmental status.

One of the problem areas in any evaluation system is the distinction between professional and non-professional jobs. Many systems do not have clear-cut distinctions or definitions to differentiate technical jobs from professional jobs in the same disciplinary field (Suskin, 1977:46). This has important implications in a number of respects since preconceptions concerning the degree to which professionalisation has been attained by a particular discipline influences the extent to which it is permitted to enter the 'professional domain'. More important, it brings sharply into focus the relative status of different professional groupings which adds an additional dimension to that aspect of departmentalism discussed earlier in section 7.5.1. Furthermore, following the argument that the term 'profession' may be considered an ideal type and that it is more pertinent to conceive of 'professionalisation' as a dynamic process whereby occupations can be observed to change certain crucial characteristics in the direction of a 'profession', some guideline is required to determine at which point such occupation may be justifiably classified as professional.

These issues are complicated by inter and intra professional variation, and collectively generated conflict within the evaluation panels. Although as has been pointed out in the opening chapter, jobs are evaluated without reference to existing
rank or pay levels, previous classification of occupations as professional played a large part in the final grading of these posts.

The evaluation committees attempted to apply a professional model as outlined by Hall (1974:72-81) which identified certain attributes: A major criterion was the necessity of formal training (university) necessary to acquire a body of specialised knowledge. A second important criterion was the need for licensing or registration either in terms of mandatory legal requirements or as laid down by the established professional institutions. Furthermore, a code of ethics in the form of codified statements of the appropriate behaviour was considered to be a further important guideline. Although all these attributes can be criticised, particularly since professions professionalise themselves by their own momentum in creating a body of theory in order to justify their own existence and in lobbying for legal and ethical codes, they do provide useful criteria. Yet another attribute is the presence of a professional culture which involves norms governing membership of professional associations, approved training institutions and the like.

Significantly, although previous classification played a large part in the evaluation process, the point scores reflected a new differentiation of professional occupations spanning what eventually covered three separate grade categories of the formal structure. The small degree of variation for professional posts on Factor 2 suggests that other factors played a role in this differentiation. Two aspects were of particular relevance in this regard.

In the first instance, the decision-making factor was particularly problematic in the sense that the hierarchy had ultimate power in decision-making over professional expertise. Multiple layers of professional officers thus had a multiplying effect on the professional decision-making scope. At the same time however, the assertion was made that professionals rely on expertise as the major control mechanism.
This is in direct conflict with the concept of reduced decision-making scope and shared responsibility for effects and raises yet another question in regard to the supervision factor. Professionals, it was argued, are not supervised, yet were like all occupations in the structure subject to the hierarchical controls of the particular work setting. Differentiation thus could be attributed to the specific organisational circumstances which prevailed in each case. These circumstances, it is suggested related to departmental differences in both structure and management style. Thus, electrical engineers, legal officers, and medical personnel were found to be at higher levels than for example, civil engineers, quantity surveyors and planners. Municipal Accountants were found to be at the lowest end. These categories in each case were representative and symbolic of autonomous departmental activities. Significantly, therefore the massaging process resulted in a re-equalisation of professional categories into one. Thus in the final analysis, organisational perceptions of classifications which had existed prior to job evaluation were reinstated in cases where deviation resulted. In this respect organisational perceptions of what constitutes professional can be paralleled to what Haug and Sussman (1969) have noted, namely that public acceptance is crucial in determining whether or not an occupation can be called a profession (Hall 1975:80).

7.1.4 Inconsistencies of the Multiple Committee System

One of the major areas of dispute in the application of the system was the perception of inconsistencies between the three evaluation panels (Departmental Communication 1985-04-12; 1984-10-04; 1985-08-24). Insofar as inconsistencies may have existed it is suggested that the tempering process outlined above, in particular the averaging, went a long way toward negating such inconsistencies as may have existed. However, this issue received particular focus in view of the fact that Heads of Department agreed to the split of the Central Evaluation Committee into the three panels on an understanding
that the Central Evaluation Committee would review the work of the panels by means of a monitoring procedure as an essential safeguard to ensure uniformity of approach. One of the departmental heads stated that since this (monitoring procedure)

"was never put into effect.... there is no assurance that the three panels were consistent in their application of the system and there is in fact evidence to the contrary" (Departmental Communication 1985-08-12).

Though the 'evidence' was not specifically revealed, the lack of consistency was argued to have been evident in cases where

"certain posts in one department were evaluated by one evaluation team and a similar or nearly similar job being done by another....." (Departmental Communication 1984-10-04).

This belief in inconsistencies between panels was also shared by the consultants (bearing in mind however that a major source of information for the consultants was by means of interview with officials, particularly certain heads of departments.) (P.E. Report June 1985).

This perception needs to be adjudged against the constant cross-flow of raters amongst the three panels. It will be recalled from Section 6.4.6 that personnel representatives were rotated among the panels as a control measure specifically for consistency purposes. Given the varied agenda of the panels, departmental representatives also circulated among the panels on a daily basis. Insofar as these perceptions of inconsistencies may be justified, they may be argued to be directed specifically at differences between the three chairmen. There is evidence to suggest that based on perceived differing abilities of the respective chairmen to resist pressures exerted by departmental representatives, departmental teams planned evaluation strategies accordingly. One departmental manager reported that on occasion
"panels were influenced by an aggressive and vociferous approach and higher scores resulted" (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24:3)

This also introduces the bias of a strong chairman who is able to impose his own views or the more subtle influence exerted by a member of the committee who is regarded as an expert in job evaluation (Elliot, 1960:35-39).

A number of departmental representatives stated that jobs were more leniently evaluated in one panel to the extent that some posts received higher evaluations than they had hoped for. Another was 'criticised' for its ultra-conservatism and both Union and departmental representatives on more than one occasion voiced displeasure at what they termed the 'under-evaluation' of posts in this particular panel. This was seen by other representatives as an intimidatory strategy. In the case of one particular panel, it was found that the evaluation record contained information on existing salaries of numerous posts. Although it was not possible to substantiate, it suggests that current salary played an influencing role in the rating process. Unknowingly, one official reported the impression that this particular panel appeared intent on justifying the existing Grading Schedule. These observations are significant in view of the research findings reviewed in Chapter 3, namely that knowledge of pay level associated with the job was found to influence evaluators in their judgement of job content.

In Chapter 6, the process of averaging individual scores in order to arrive at a representative score for each designation was described (section 6.4.7). It could be argued therefore that the averaging process 'smoothed over' differences between panels, in particular in cases where a sample of similar jobs was distributed amongst the three panels. This argument would however not apply in unique cases where only one position exists for a particular designation. It should also however be reiterated that even when two positions do have the same title which is directly descriptive of work performed (and are not
represented by an integrated job description) for example typists, minor variations between these jobs do exist and these could be reflected in the evaluation scores. This therefore negates the identification of variations on an impressionistic basis as was intimated by those senior managers quoted above, as necessary justification for assuming inconsistencies.

In an attempt to establish empirically therefore, the validity of such aforementioned assertions concerning discrepancy of the evaluation panels, further analysis was undertaken.

An overall picture of how the panels differed is reflected in Figure 7.7 which represents a cumulative frequency distribution of percentage change from pre to post evaluation salary maxima as justified by the points scored for jobs evaluated by the three panels. It is difficult to discern any marked differences save to note that the curve of Panel 3 is characterised by a marginally steeper slope than Panel 2 which is relatively flatter in character. Again, examining the average change by panel, from pre to post evaluation salary maxima, the following was found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PANEL</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
<th>AVERAGE PERCENTAGE RISE IN MAXIMUM PAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although of no conclusive value, the above is interesting to note in so far as the order of extent of change corresponds to the order of leniency into which the panels were ranked by managers. While Panel 3 was perceived as the most lenient, Panel 2 was criticised for being the most conservative.
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Implicit in the inconsistency argument was that differences in evaluation results could be attributed to the different panels.

Further analysis was undertaken in an attempt to determine to what extent the change in salary maxima attached to the jobs as justified by job evaluation (before massaging) related to the different Panels that evaluated such jobs. The following model was applied.

\[ Y = a + b_1 P_1 + b_2 P_2 \]

where \( Y \) represents the dependent variable of percentage change of salary maxima after job evaluation and the Panels as independent variables were coded using two dummy variables \( P_1 \) and \( P_2 \) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>( P_1 )</th>
<th>( P_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was applied to the entire group of data for the three panels. No significant variations were found. It was decided therefore to partition the data according to three salary groupings, viz. lower paid hourly and weekly occupations (group 1); lower to middle order salaried occupations (group 2); and middle to higher salaried occupations (group 3) (senior managerial posts were excluded from this exercise as these were evaluated by a separate committee and represent a relatively small number of posts). Only in the case of group 3 was there any suggestion of variations being explained by panel behaviour.

Table 7.8 reflects the results attained.
The above reveals that there is no significant variation that can be explained by panel differences overall. However, in partitioning the data, there is some evidence of panel variation in the higher salary groups at the P<0.05. While it is statistically significant, it represents however a very small percentage of the variation leaving most unexplained.

It has been suggested that the averaging process would to some extent have balanced out differences. However at the higher salary levels there are a greater proportion of jobs that are unique unto themselves whose evaluation scores could thereby have "stood alone" and not have been averaged to representative scores. The "massaging process" addressed such perceived anomalies that were seen as over or under valued and in this sense also tempered panel differences in the final grading of posts.

It may be concluded therefore that to the extent that panel differences could be statistically significant, this is confined to a very small percentage in the higher salary groupings of jobs evaluated by the three panels. Other superficial
differences as are apparent, correspond to perceptions, but no significance can be attached to the differences reflected. Such as there are differences, it must also be seen in the context of the averaging of job clusters and the grading process by which jobs were grouped, this to a large degree smoothing over such differences as may have been detected from the raw scores, and subsequently further tempered by the massaging process, which in terms of its own objective, was applied specifically for the purpose of eliminating "unacceptable" differences.

7.6 FURTHER MANAGEMENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE SYSTEM AND ITS APPLICATION

Certain management perceptions relating to the system and its application have been dealt with in prior sections, for example the aspect of the perceived discrepancies arising out of the multiple-tier committee system as above. Underlying management reaction was the extent to which senior management experienced themselves being isolated and excluded from participating in decisions which affected their Departments as was quoted in section 6.4.9. This exclusion created a tenuous attachment which enabled scope for criticism without any danger of self reproach. These perceptions I have categorised into four distinguishable yet inseparable features. They cover systemic factors, practical application and procedural aspects, the face validity of results and pay structure features. Highly related to and interwoven with these is the question of acceptance of the concept of job evaluation and the system by both management and employees. This perception of the value of job evaluation is a theme carried throughout the report. Many issues related to the above have already been addressed. Further issues are discussed below.

7.6.1 Systemic Factors

The following all-encompassing statement of one of the organisations' then most
senior managers is illustrative of the attitude directed at the Five Factor System and its application:

"my considered opinion is that the evaluation system is defective; that it cannot and does not provide a proper basis to evaluate posts ranging from, for example, a head of department to a cooking hand as it purports to do; that the factors are not relevant to many posts; that the weighting is arbitrary and often inappropriate; that the wording of the factors is often meaningless; that arbitrary rules and guidelines have been laid down in an effort to make the system work; that such rules and guidelines have not been applied consistently and uniformly; that interpretations of the wording of factors and grades have been arbitrary and inconsistent and, finally, that the evaluations have been made by people who do not possess the experience, the knowledge or the qualifications which would enable them to arrive at correct and fair assessments of the value of all the posts they have been required to deal with....."

(Departmental Communication 1985-04-12)

While some of these issues have already been touched upon, others can now be more specifically addressed.

7.6.1.1 Universalism

In respect of the universality of the system, doubt was raised

"that a system having a single set of evaluation criteria with identical weighting throughout can effectively measure such a widely divergent range of job families and levels as are found in an organisation as complex as this Council" (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24).

It was further stated that the system appeared to have been designed for professional and certain other white collar jobs and that it was not appropriate for technical, emergency services, semi-skilled and non-skilled jobs. This was linked specifically to the belief that each industry requires its own tailor made evaluation system and that to apply a universal system in the Council was "as incongruous as it would be in the private sector to attempt to apply the set of criteria and values to all of them" (i.e. to all industries) (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24).
It is pertinent to restate here that the benefit of the two most prominent systems used in South Africa today, the Paterson and Peromnes systems, as outlined in Chapter 2, lies in particular in their claimed universal applicability. Note Paterson's statement that "the common denominator (emphasis added) from tea boy to chairman is quality of decision". As Pearson and Cogill (1978:5) have stated it, "potentially, the decision-band method provides a unitary basis for comparing jobs throughout the employment range across race and sex groups and according to Paterson, across firms and industries".

Although the universalism may be difficult to achieve, it is precisely this quality which vests job evaluation with its power to facilitate the elimination of pay discrimination in an organisation. This view is supported by Snelgar (1987:5) who states that "job evaluation is the vital tool in this process, especially when establishing comparable worth on an internal pay structure basis.....". In providing practical guidelines for avoiding pay discrimination, Auld (1987:9) has cautioned that "it is inadvisable to have separate evaluation systems for blue collar and white collar workers as this can lead to secondary discrimination through different and inequitable pay scales being applied to blue collar workers (mainly Non-White) and white collar workers (mainly White)".

One departmental head, although accepting of the point score allocations, advocated totally separate and distinct pay lines for jobs with equivalent score ranges based on career path associations. Having completed an evaluation using a universal system this approach carries the risk of undermining fundamental internal consistency principles and could only reinforce discriminatory pay for those career groups that are dominated by either one or other of the sex or race categories. Again Auld (1987) advises that an integrated pay curve should be attached to the grading system and further, that the pay curve, benefits, conditions of service and the like should be set according to a racially/sexually integrated
market sample. Empirical support for the above assertions is contained in the September Survey report of P.E. Remuneration (1984) where it was reported that

"participating organisations are moving toward a greater degree of sophistication in salary administration. Job evaluation is being used more extensively, particularly amongst the larger organisations. In the light of the current industrial relations climate, these companies see the need to look further than the simple notion of equal pay for equal jobs. Through implementation of job evaluation, they are developing integrated pay structures and moving toward paying equal rates for jobs of comparable worth."

The issues raised with regard to universalism highlight the fact that the opportunity for attainment of long standing policy objectives "equal pay for equal work" - was not fully grasped. Indeed, job evaluation provided a basis to audit that work of equal value was attracting concomitant reward.

Allied to the implied suggestion that separate systems are indicated for different 'industry sectors' or the idea of separate pay lines, was the assertion that the system was not suited to lower level jobs on the grounds that little point scoring differentiation was observed covering the dozens of differing designations in this category (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24). The implication that the system is not sufficiently finely tuned to discriminate subtle differences in lower level jobs is supported by general consensus of operators of the system. The limited number of degrees in the scale had the effect of cramping the dispersion and thus inhibiting the desired powers of discrimination. It could however be argued that too fine a distinction was expected since job evaluation at best is a crude measure and a false impression of accuracy is created by the points. This crudeness would then be compounded by trying to differentiate too closely between jobs. Indeed, this is what occurred in practice. In order to accommodate the historical promotional pyramids, (see section 6.4.8.3) fine distinctions were forced by determining narrow banded cut-off ranges of as few as four points
spread (see Table 6.9). Not only did it place too great a reliance on accuracy and clash with the concept of a crude measuring device, but ignored the magnitude of the margin for error, bearing in mind that 10 individual factor ratings are undertaken. The possibility of a one point variance in the same direction on say half the factors represents a full band margin at this level.

7.6.1.2 Factor Scale Definitions

This leads on to yet another recurring response to the system - which was described in the opening quote as the "meaningless wording of the factors". There was general consensus among senior managers and operators of the system alike that the factor scale definitions were lacking in clarity. Paterson (1972:76) quotes from the work of Kershner (1955) who in studying the "discriminability of factors" came to the conclusion that the degrees in the factor scales of some systems were too numerous, creating considerable difficulty in making distinctions. Notably, he regarded some of the distinctions as "word figments". In the case of the Five Factor System, too, one of the reasons for the unproductive haggling over points arose precisely because of the room for wide interpretation. The vagueness also effectively facilitated abuse of the system notwithstanding the explanatory guide that was provided in the "blue book". This vagueness was exacerbated by the non-defined midpoints between factor-scale definitions. Inevitably these were exploited through typical arguments that elements of the next grade could be detected or a little more than the suggested definition fit could be justified. Such wide scope for use of non-defined points led inevitably to a certain amount of inflation as described earlier. This placed constant pressure on the personnel specialists to re-educate the Committee as to the appropriate interpretation and application of the factor scale definitions and as pointed out earlier, created an axis of conflict between line departments and the compensation specialists. It could be argued in fact that this lack of clarity provided a further locus around which the conflict was centred.
The most telling piece of evidence of openness to interpretation is provided by a comparison of evaluation scores for posts that were included in both the pilot phase and the full project. Table 7.9 reflects some marked variations in point scores for the twenty-three posts in question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST</th>
<th>PILOT SCORE</th>
<th>PROJECT SCORE</th>
<th>RATIO CHANGE</th>
<th>POINTS DIFF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post A</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post B</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post C</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post D</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post F</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post G</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post H</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post I</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post J</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post K</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post L</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post M</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post O</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post P</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Q</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post R</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post S</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post T</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post U</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post V</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly the scores for all but one post increased substantially. A number of observations can be made in this regard. In the first instance, there is the argument that in the pilot phase the jobs that were included were described in isolation and thus the absence of active horizontal and vertical interlocking of functions may have rendered some of the data unreliable. Against this however, one must note the point raised in the Pilot Report (1983:8-9) which suggests that this could have led to an over representation of the functions described. If this were indeed the case, one would expect the deviation to be in the opposite direction. Secondly, it should also be noted that in many instances the identical job description was in fact submitted for the full phase and where this was not the case, variations were minor. Thus for all intents and purposes, the same job
descriptions were evaluated. It would indicate therefore that the scope for interpretation was sufficiently wide to allow for a degree of influence as suggested by the aggressive representations.

However, in contrast to this conclusion it should also be pointed out that such as the discrepancy was, the important question to ask is whether the norms and standards in the full project, different as they were to those applied in the pilot phase, were consistently applied in the second situation. To the extent that this can be answered in the affirmative the relativity can be assumed not to have been disturbed. The assumption however is questionable in view of the change in rank order that is reflected in Table 7.10. Such variable changes in rank clearly amounted to a new relativity between non-comparable jobs.

**TABLE NUMBER 7.10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST</th>
<th>PILOT SCORE</th>
<th>GRADING JUSTIFIED</th>
<th>PROJECT SCORE</th>
<th>GRADING JUSTIFIED</th>
<th>GRADING DIFF.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post A</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post B</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post C</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post W</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post M</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post D</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post F</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post I</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post J</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post K</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post L</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post H</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post E</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post P</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post S</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Q</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post R</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post U</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post G</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post O</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post V</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post T</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Grading cut off points adopted in the full project were applied to the pilot scores.*
7.6.1.3 Choice of Factors and their Weighting

In Chapter 1 (section 1.7.1) it was pointed out how the choice of compensable factors in job evaluation can be related to dimensions of social stratification. It was stated that job evaluation is found to employ those factors found to be valued by society as determinants of occupational status and prestige as criteria to differentiate jobs within the firm. This idea also carries the notion of consensus on which these factors should be i.e. the need for value congruence amongst organisational interest groups. According to Belcher, (1974:136) within the context of an organisation, it is employer, employee and union viewpoints which should be reflected in the factors chosen. This immediately raises certain questions bearing in mind distinctly different union membership profiles and further complicated by the 'dual loyalty' of senior management first as an interest group in itself, and secondly as members of an exclusive union. What is significant however is that none of these parties played any part in the selection of the compensable factors whether in the sense of choosing a set of factors as contained in one of the proprietary brands that are available (Paterson, Peromes, Castellion, NIPR etc.) or in the development of an in-house tailor-made system. As was pointed out in Chapter 6, the Five Factor System was essentially imposed upon those who had to make it work.

Although Belcher (1974:136-142) has attempted to identify criteria, characteristics and methods for determining compensable factors, the arbitrary and subjective nature of the process underlines the need for consensus amongst all interested parties. In his critique of the lack of objectivity of factor choice in the point method, Paterson has illustrated that the criterion of acceptance by all parties underlines the point that factors, weights, point values and the like are negotiated (1972:75). Although the specific point being pursued here is that the choice of factors is arbitrary, it is also important to note that since the factors constitute the criteria which will be rewarded in monetary terms, the choice of factors becomes
a major policy option that establishes the framework for grading and pay rates that follow therefrom (Pornschlegel, 1982:18). It also raises other issues - for example the parties need to know how they will work and what the results will be. The complexity of a multi-factor points system can make this knowledge the preserve of specialists. Secondly, it is not inconceivable that negotiation around the issues could be undertaken in stages as each phase of the process is completed and outcomes become clearer to the parties affected.

Senior managers in the City Council to varying degrees thus came out strongly against the selection of factors and the weighting accorded to them. The following statement is representative of the reaction toward the constituent factors in the Five Factor System:

"We are being asked to accept that these are the only factors to consider to the exclusion of all others, be they quantifiable or not. The weighting given the various factors-largely equal-is purely arbitrary with no real scientific basis".  
(Departmental Communication 1985-04-11)

The particular manager went on to state that the system, in common with all other similar systems (point methods)

"cannot take into account all the complex and unquantifiable factors involved in assessing the relative importance and ranking of any given post".

Yet another questioned

"whether the factors selected... are appropriate to many of the occupations in the municipal service" (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24).

The above statements relate not only to the questions of which factors are
appropriate but again raise doubts about the attainment of universalism. Belcher (1974:136) has stated that factors selected must be found in all jobs or at least the jobs under study. In this connection Livy (1972:73) has suggested that universal points rating schemes which are designed to be applicable across an entire organisation tend to be cumbersome since an unwieldy number of factors must be included in order to encompass the whole range of jobs. Some support is thus lent to the arguments of senior managers outlined earlier implying separate factors for the different occupational groups. This in itself could become impractical through the necessity to reproduce a series of different systems and suffers from the disadvantage of not being able to develop an integrated pay structure.

As has been stated, no firm guidelines exist for the selection of factors and these decisions are discretionary to the organisation and will depend upon practical and value considerations. Whether the application is directed at jobs across the organisation or to a particular cluster, a basic principle however is that the range of factors must be applicable to all jobs under consideration - too few factors may reduce the discriminatory powers, whilst too many will introduce the likelihood of co-variance. The danger of factor contamination was highlighted by one of the senior managers who stated that the qualifications factor (Factor 1A) influenced other factors that followed.

"In practice it seemed that once an occupation had been given credit for requiring professional qualifications, the most important factor, that of nature and variety of work, was almost automatically given a grade 7 evaluation irrespective of the actual nature and variety of the job. However, an occupation not deemed to require a professional qualifications was not readily granted a grade 7 evaluation for nature and variety of work. In other words, it appeared to those involved that the system tended to give recognition for qualifications in the professional occupations throughout the factors, thus recognising the same feature more than once and prejudicing technical and certain administrative occupations and at the same time creating a bias in the same direction regarding credit for the actual complexity of the work done". (emphasis added)

(Departmental Communication 1985-06-24:2-3)
As has been stated, this phenomenon of the overlapping of factors is more likely when a greater number of factors are employed. Finding an ideal balance in the number of factors to be employed is an issue that has received attention from researchers in the past. Reference was made in Chapter 3 to a series of studies conducted by Lawsche et al who showed that the same results can be obtained by the use of a simplified system involving fewer characteristics to be rated, and that the shorter the scale used, the better (Livy, 1975:124). Paterson (1972:79) quotes Stieber (1959) who found that three factors, "pre-employment training", "employment training and experience", and "mental skill" were so highly intercorrelated, that they could be taken to measure the same things. Livy (1975:125) has pointed out in quoting from Otis and Leukart (1984) the value of first using a wide range of factors with all jobs in the study and then to identify those specific factors which would work best for that specific situation.

In their comment on the number of factors employed in the Five Factor System, one head of department and the consultants specifically recommended that consideration should be given to reducing the number of factors used in the evaluation exercise. An analysis of the inter-correlation of the sub-factors employed in the Five Factor System is reflected in Table 7.11.
It can be seen from the correlation matrix that all factors correlate highly with one another and with the total scores. The lowest correlates with the final scores are factor 1A (academic/technical qualifications required), 1C (training period/experience), 4A (supervisory control over others) and 5B (external contacts).

A stepwise regression analysis proved a useful indicator of the relative contributions of the different factors in declaring the variance. These results are reflected in tables 7.12 and 7.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER OF VARIABLES ENTERED</th>
<th>R-SQUARE</th>
<th>FACTOR DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1 Variable Factor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nature and Variety of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Contact with People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Report of the Director of Personnel March 1985 is acknowledged for the two Tables above.)

By far the biggest contribution was made by factor 2. It will be recalled that this factor carries 34% of the weighting. Alone this factor declares over 98% of the variance and is thus able to give a good indication of final rank order on its own.
An analysis was undertaken of the effect of cumulatively adding factors successively in the order of contribution as determined by the stepwise regression analysis, in each case 'as if' the subset were the only factors used, in other words abbreviated sets of factors. Scores for each subset were standardised as follows:

\[
\text{Mean Score on (F) T} = \text{CAT} \\
\text{Mean Score on (F) A} = \text{CAT}
\]

then \((F)A \times \text{CAT}\) standardises 'as if' only \((F)A\) had been used.

Where

\[
(F) T = \text{Total scores for all 10 Factors and} \\
(F) A = \text{Total score for Subset/s of factors.}
\]

The deviation of standardised scores for each successive subset of factors from the total score for each job was calculated, and the results expressed as a series of frequency distributions. This analysis thus enabled a description of the numbers of jobs that would be substantially affected by any reduction in factors. Figures 7.14 to 7.22 reflect the change brought about through the addition of each successive factor. Each frequency distribution is compared to the previous one.

Taking into account the point spread of the grading model decided upon, Figure 7.17 reflects a relatively insignificant number of jobs which continue to be affected in ranking. The addition of any further factors would thus add little to an overall hierarchy.

One unanswered question however, is that should an abbreviated number of factors have been employed, it is difficult to assess how many jobs would essentially have remained in the same grade, how many might have been displaced by one grade and how many might have been displaced by two or more since, in the event, a differing grading model would have resulted. An even
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more fundamental question arises regarding the determination of the greater contributing factors in the first place. If an analysis of several factors is required in order to determine the greatest contributors to variance, it is hardly worth thereafter employing the abbreviated number. Finding the abbreviated factors in the first instance would therefore be problematic and should such be chosen from the outset, then questions regarding the degree of grade displacement resulting from the use of abbreviated versus a non-abbreviated set of factors would not arise.

One final point worthy of mention at this stage on the choice of factors relates to the recurring reference to abnormal physical conditions (APC) such as stress levels and working environment. Examples abound of concerns expressed by senior managers of the absence of any weighting given to such factors. One typical assertion was that
"the evaluation failed to take cognisance of the high stress level of the job where the incumbent has to be available 24 hours per day" (Memorandum 1985-08-29).

Another stated that

"no allowance was made in the criteria laid down to compensate for the hazardous nature of the occupation and also the fact that the incumbents are required to operate sophisticated equipment ... in often unpleasant weather conditions" (Memorandum 1985-09-04).

Yet another stated that the grading of the post

"in no way recognises the difficult environmental conditions under which his duties are carried out, the degree of danger and the mental and physical stresses ..." (Memorandum 1985-08-06).

While these concerns are mentioned here, the justification for such assertions shall be more extensively covered in the chapter on union approaches in which the absence of working environment as a factor had a significant effect in shaping SAMWU's response.

The concern of the absence of weighting afforded to environmental factors also brings to the fore the discontent with the distribution of weights afforded the five factors. Participants' views quoted above included comment on this aspect. Again the issue of weighting of factors labours under similar difficulties to those that characterise the choice of factors. As Livy (1974:76) has stated "in determining the weighting of factors there is no prescribed formula or scientific method which can help us". Elizur (1980:26) illustrates the fundamental criterion of organisational consensus when he states that "discussions on the relative weights of the items consume a lot of energy and committee time and finally the weights are arbitrarily determined". As has been pointed out this criterion was not fulfilled in the case of the system applied to the City Council.
Stieber (1959) has shown that small differences in weights can alter the position of jobs in the hierarchy. Elizur (1980:31-33) has clarified this assertion by demonstrating that where jobs are comparable, (e.g., of the same occupational category) the rank order of jobs remains the same no matter what the weight of the items are. On the other hand, where there are different kinds of jobs which are not comparable, the rank order will depend entirely on the weights assigned. The arbitrariness of weighting the factors for comparable posts therefore poses no serious consequences and face value acceptance by participating parties represents a purely nominal requirement. However, where a multi-factorial system is to be applied universally to such disparate and diverse occupational groups as the Five Factor System purported to accommodate, the suggestion is that an arbitrary rank order of non-comparable jobs will result. This is particularly significant in view of the dominance of Factor 2 carrying about one-third of the system weighting. Such consequence must in its nature affect the validity of the instrument. In other words, does the system in fact measure differentials between the jobs? While this question needs to be addressed, this will be considered in the concluding chapter in reviewing theoretical considerations of validity and reliability.

7.6.2 Aspects of Practical Application

The second broad categorisation of response as described in section 7.6 relates to certain practical and procedural aspects in the application of the Five Factor System - the process aspect of job evaluation. Most notable of these was the feeling of exclusion as expressed by the Heads of Department and discussed previously in an earlier context in section 6.4.9.2. The sentiments quoted there provide an adequate picture and the continuity of this aspect will be taken up later in this chapter in the section covering activities of the Central Grading Committee under which participation of the Heads of Department was harnessed. A second important aspect following under this heading was the multi-tier committee system.
The issue concerning the consistency of the evaluation panels has also been discussed in section 7.5.6 of this chapter. Remaining pertinent issues are discussed in the following sections.

7.6.2.1 The Job Analysis Procedure: The Variable Quality of Job Descriptions

Arising out of the job analysis procedure as described in Chapter 6, a large degree of discontent of departmental managers was focused on what was described as the variable quality of job descriptions. The information contained in the job description is fundamental for the validity of all that follows. The reliability of the basic data contained in the document is the cornerstone not only of the job evaluation process, but of the entire personnel system. However, job descriptions were seen to be inconsistent in quality and Departmental Heads thus questioned the evaluation results on the basis of the variable quality of job descriptions which, it was argued, was attributable to the job analysis procedure that was adopted (P.E. Corporate Services 1985:3; EXCO Minutes 1985-06-25).

As one Departmental Head put it:

"... so much depends on the incumbent's ability to perceive their job and to describe it" (Departmental Communication 1984-10-04).

The importance of the job description was appreciated to varying degrees. It was stated that

"...employees in at least one department had the advantage of expert advice on how to write up their job description" (Departmental Communication 1984-10-04).

This referred to assistance additional to that which was made available in terms of the job describing phase as outlined in Chapter 6.
These assertions are indeed empirically verifiable and although it could be argued that this was tempered by representation at the evaluation of the job in question, this representation was in itself of varying quality and intensity as has been discussed previously. Further, if the impression that "the panel had pre-scored the post under evaluation and were sticking to their prior views" was justifiable, it could be expected that such pre-scoring as was based on the job description prior to representations being made at the evaluation panel, would indeed be reflected in the results.

Paterson (1972:76) in support of his assertion that the results of the committee can be affected by the material on which they base their grading, has drawn on the research of Rupe (1956) who, as was discussed earlier, in studying twelve analysts using different approaches to their analysis of the same twelve jobs, found that their job descriptions, on which the grading was to be carried out by a committee, varied considerably. (Elizur, 1980:47) has also quoted from studies by Christel, Madden and Harding (1960) who show inter alia that evaluations may be affected by acquaintance with the job as well as length of the job description. It could also however be argued in the case of the City Council procedure, that in instances of designations with multiple posts, the averaging process took account of such variability. This also has to be balanced against a further assertion that "the sample of designations selected ... has proved in certain cases not to be representative" thus posing the possibility of inaccurate averages. (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24:3). While posts included in the evaluation were sampled on a random stratified basis, there were also numerous cases of one of a kind jobs where the once-off evaluation represented the final evaluation score in comparison with integrated or multiple post jobs which were averaged to attain a representative score.
7.6.3 Acceptability of Results

The acceptability of the results does not depend so much on the actual scores attained, as on how these are used in designing the final structure. In a point method, no matter how acceptable the compensable factors and their weighting may be, the evaluation procedure must also be seen to be reliable. The points values are always subject to error. The size of such error will depend on how reliable the evaluation process is. It has already been illustrated how this was perceived by senior managers. Because of the margin of error and the crudeness of the measure, as discussed earlier, it is necessary to use grades.

7.6.3.1 Grade Cut-Off Points

In chapter 6 (section 6.4.8.3) the issues to be considered in delineating grade demarcation lines were discussed. As was stated, this involves various policy considerations but natural breaks in the distribution of scores also provide indicators for deciding upon cut-off points. The important point, however, is that these decisions are discretionary, particularly in such systems as the Five Factor System where demarcation lines have not been empirically determined through patterns that have evolved with continued usage in differing contexts as is indeed the case with the Paterson or Peromnes systems. Difficulties also arise with jobs whose points lie close to the cut-off lines. The difference between two jobs which lie at the top and bottom of the same grade may be greater than between two jobs one of which is at the top of the grade and the other at the bottom of the next higher grade. Ultimately, therefore the acceptability is likely to focus more closely on the grouping of posts rather than based on the actual scores themselves, since like-graded posts are treated equally for pay purposes.

The Heads of Department perceived the grouping recommended initially by the Director of Personnel as "totally arbitrary" (Departmental Communication 1985-04-15). One Departmental Head, who expressed particularly strong views,
stated that

"to proceed with the grouping of posts as suggested would be to court disaster, and lead inevitably to a serious breakdown in staff relations and a further drastic decline in morale and productivity" (Departmental Communication 1985-04-11).

Commenting on the size of the grade points-range it was further stated that

"even if ten-point grouping were accepted, which it is not, the cut-off points could just as well have been placed elsewhere ..." (Departmental Communication 1985-04-11).

In other words, given the arbitrary nature in the determination of cut-off points, it was suggested that any selected grouping of posts would be just as valid as another.

Noteworthy at this point is the view expressed by the P.E.Consultant (1985:2) that the pilot project failed inter alia to establish cut-off points for grades. Underlying management attitude toward the derived grouping was

"the inherent and unavoidable inaccuracy of the system ... compounded by the assessment process which has clearly been demonstrated to be highly subjective, being open to personal views and opinions ..." (Departmental Communication 1985-04-11).

This clearly illustrates the issues mentioned above. The same manager thus concluded that

"overall the basic system plus assessment process cannot be expected to have any greater accuracy than possibly 15 points on the total points score; being generous, perhaps 10 points" (Departmental Communication 1985-04-11).

This was reinforced by the view of the Consultants who recommended fewer bands (between 18-23) (P.E. Report 1985:5).
This led heads of department with the exception of one, to propose an alternative grouping of the upper structure which followed the practice as understood in the public service - namely that heads of department and senior staff should be on the same salary grades for what was termed equivalent levels of responsibility. This in essence implied grading by equating posts nominally (mechanical organisational parallelism, referred to earlier).

7.6.3.2 Job Evaluation as one Guideline Determinant of Pay Structure

The grouping and ranking of posts was thus perceived as neither fair nor equitable and not accepted as a "true reflection of the value and relationships of the posts" (Departmental Communication 1985-04-12). This view was held by the majority of departmental heads, who did not accept the implied differential status that was afforded their own departments vis-à-vis the City Engineers Department. It will be recalled that in both the HAY MSL evaluation and the Five Factor evaluation the City Engineer's post was grouped higher than other departmental heads. In this context, too, it should be stated that senior managers viewed job evaluation as just one of a number of guides in determining the grading of posts and salary policies. The view is in line with arguments put forward in the opening chapter of the role of other factors in determining the final pay structure - the differences arise however in the weighting afforded each consideration.

One proposal put forward by a departmental head suggested that the

"job evaluation results should be put in true perspective and used merely as another guide for adjusting the existing grading schedule where the results indicate that significant adjustment is necessary and this is confirmed by managerial assessment" (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24).

It was however further stated that a reshuffling of the Grading Schedule was not warranted on the basis of what was considered evidence of only small or insignificant variances in ranking score. This perception of the inconsequence
of small variances from the existing Grading Schedule should also be assessed against the assertions made that if job evaluation deviates too radically from the existing order it has less chance of acceptance (Paterson, 1972). Figure 7.23 however reflects some significant variations of the newly derived grade structure in comparison to the old Grading Schedule, using the old and new maximum salary as justified by the evaluation score as a means for comparison (prior to massaging).
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7.6.3.3 Prognosis of Staff Morale

While the issue of employee responses will be dealt with in more detail in chapter 9, it is relevant at this point to touch on management's prognosis of employee reaction, particularly since projected negative employee reaction was suggested.
as an argument militating against the implementation of the job evaluation results. This aspect of staff morale can be broken down into two aspects - the first relating to the effect on staff expectations arising out of the protracted implementation process and the second relating to the effects of implementing the proposed structure as initially recommended by the then Director of Personnel to the Executive Committee. Interestingly, these two aspects pose certain contradictions, for on the one hand, the period of uncertainty on the fate of job evaluation was argued to create employee frustration - this in large part facilitated by SAAME creating unrealistic expectations for their members as will be discussed in Chapters 8 and 9. Thus one manager stated that

"morale is presently at a very low level and prompt action is needed to restore confidence and improve productivity"

while another urged

"that this frustrating exercise be brought to a conclusion immediately"

and

"that some statement of intent be made ... to allay uncertainty, insecurity and doubt in the minds of ... staff".

(Departmental Communications 1985-04-11:4; 1985-04-02:11)

On the other hand it was anticipated that implementation would lead to negative employee response. The following represents some independent views on such effects and against which post-implementation employee response can be tested:

* "implementation could lead to the development of a chaotic situation in staff management in the Council with consequential loss of morale, lower productivity ..." (Departmental Communication 1985-04-12).

* "anomalies and imperfections will ... lead to counter-productive antagonism and dissatisfaction ..." (Departmental Communication 1985-06-24:4).
"implementation would lead to considerable discontent and thus create major problems" (Departmental Communication 1985-04-12:1).

"the grouping of posts ... would ... lead inevitably to a serious breakdown in staff relations and a further drastic decline in morale and productivity" (Departmental Communication 1985-04-11:1).

"implementation will lead to so much consternation in the Council's service and the individual appeals that will emanate from departments will no doubt indicate the extent to which pay plays an important part in employee job satisfaction or dissatisfaction" (Departmental Communication 1985-01-16).

Such views illustrate the extent to which senior managers were wary of upheaval that was anticipated as a result of a disturbance in the rank order of the status quo and did not share any optimism of a more equitable structure.

7.6.4 Pay Structure Features

In chapter 6 attention was drawn to the exclusion of management in the initial pay structuring process. It was also argued that this exclusion proved to be the major undoing of the proposed structure. Various aspects relating to the pay structure design were also discussed (See section 6.4.8). Of these features the following were brought into focus by the reaction of the Heads of Department:

- deciding on the need for one or more pay structures
- number of grades
- width of salary bands
- level of salaries
- degree of overlaps between grades.

It was pointed out in section 6.4.8.2 that at least one head campaigned for separate pay structures for the different occupational groups. These issues have already been discussed in Section 7.6.1.1 and will not be repeated here.

The two interrelated features at which major opposition was levelled were the width of the proposed salary scales and the degree of overlap. Traditionally
management posts are characterised by fixed notches in local authority upper structures, and the proposed introduction of relatively wide scales at this level was perceived therefore as too radical a deviation from existing convention. The wide salary ranges proposed and the concomitant high degree of overlap were thus perceived as grounds for potential anomalies and disputes about notching. Specifically too, the idea that an incumbent in a higher grade could at a particular point in time be earning less than the incumbent of another job in a lower grade was seen as entirely unacceptable practice.

Most authorities recommend that some overlap is better than none at all. Excessive overlap is however generally considered undesirable and will tend to defeat the purpose of job evaluation (Husband, 1976:109). The advantage of overlap is that it provides for merit and allows flexibility and recognises that an experienced competent performer may justify a higher salary than a new inexperienced employee in the next higher grade. This also allows more equitable treatment of borderline jobs by permitting overlaps into the next higher grade.

**SUMMARY**

At this juncture, it is worthwhile to consolidate on a number of salient points that have emerged from the foregoing. As a primary requisite, the absence of consensus amongst senior managers on the need for job evaluation has been highlighted. This was shown to be rooted in the EXCO's resolve for a formal structure to guide the remuneration process as affected the procedural elements. In the second instance, having had to abide by the decision to proceed with job evaluation, notwithstanding non-acceptance of the need, senior management played no role in the choice of the system to be applied. Subsequently they were excluded from meaningful participation in the decision-making process as affected the procedural elements. The managements of the different departments displayed
varying degrees of commitment in exploiting the *modus* of the system and its operation. The inability to accept disturbance of the status quo as reflected in the results inevitably led to the negation of the system upon which the results were based. This impinged on the perceived validity of the system. Job Evaluation in general and the system in particular were thus rejected because they did not achieve acceptable results. Changes in the status quo were assessed in terms of the perceived relative status of departments. To make the results acceptable and workable, it was therefore realised that participation and commitment of the Heads of Department was fundamental. The Central Grading Committee was thus created.

### 7.8 PARTICIPATION EXPRESSED: THE CENTRAL GRADING COMMITTEE

In chapter 6, the creation of the Central Grading Committee was described. This committee was designed as a vehicle by which to involve the Heads of Department and the two trade unions directly in the decision-making process and gain their commitment. From the vantage point of the Executive Committee this was an important strategy of neutralisation, whereas from the point of view of Heads of Department, it afforded the latitude to put right all the anomalies arising out of the flaws identified in the system and the results it had derived.

#### 7.8.1 Establishing a Banding Model

Arising out of the recommendation of the investigation of the P.E. Corporate Services, was the establishment of a 'working group' as a subsidiary of the Central Grading Committee whose main task was to agree on the number of grades and appropriate cut-off points. As was mentioned in chapter 6, the Central Grading Committee considered various banding models that were prepared. Because of the new differentiation which arose out of the point ratings, it was
difficult to achieve a model compatible on both an intra and inter departmental level in a way that satisfied all Departments simultaneously. Because of the difficulty in reaching consensus on what was a fundamental structural edifice, certain Heads of Department again felt the entire exercise should be aborted at that stage, personally experiencing the arbitrariness of deriving cut-off points.

The 28 grade structure finally adopted represented in large part the influence of the strongest department whose structure it best suited. This influence was facilitated by its head being chairman of the Committee. It had the effect of placing upon the remaining departments a greater onus of motivating and justifying management discretion in effecting adjustments.

7.8.2 Management Discretion: The Massaging Process

7.8.2.1 A Micro Analysis

It was also pointed out in chapter 6 that the Central Grading Committee was authorised to make adjustments by management discretion - these to be justified to the Executive Committee. Massaging constituted the application of management discretion in assigning a post to a band other than that justified by the evaluation score, and thereby artificially adjusting the total points either upward or downward, to that which corresponded to the closest point score to its own - which fitted into the grade to which the post was finally assigned. The guideline parameters were to limit changes by two to three points or two to three percent, whichever the greater. The Committee decided to interpret the guideline as being that it was free to massage posts to the extent of three points or three percent (CGC Report: 1986-08-22:4). Table 7.24 reflects the number of job designations massaged by level of structure and as a percentage of all jobs in that portion of the structure.
It can be seen that a third of all job designations were in fact adjusted by management discretion. This fact created the shift from the concept of job evaluation toward a conception that a grading structure had been devised which was "based on job evaluation". An ex-staff specialist who had been approached to provide advice on certain aspects of the implementation of the new structure, in referring to the massaging process stated that

"this exercise alone completely destroys any credibility one might lend the system used" (Memorandum 1986-10-07).

Livy (1974:44) has however pointed to the fact that if people do not accept the outcome it will not work anyway. He states that "few would deny that it is sometimes politically advantageous to 'juggle' the results of a job evaluation scheme in order to reach consensus rather than aim at scientific accuracy".

Taking into account both the 48 hour appeal facility described earlier and the massaging process, over 80% (54/64) of senior management posts were in fact subjected to change.

An analysis of the above table reveals however, what was at the time impressionistically described by the SAAME representatives as inconsistent standards. While almost all jobs in the upper levels were massaged upward, the majority of jobs were massaged downward within the lowest echelons. These apparent discrepant norms could be argued to stem from the creation by the Central Grading Committee of two separate constituents - the Heads of Department who reviewed the upper structure and a Sub-Committee of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION OF ADJUSTMENT</th>
<th>UPPER BANDS</th>
<th>MIDDLE BANDS</th>
<th>LOWER BANDS</th>
<th>ALL BANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded</td>
<td>67 (36.5%)</td>
<td>65 (18.0%)</td>
<td>42 (16.6%)</td>
<td>174 (21.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downgraded</td>
<td>9 (3.7%)</td>
<td>40 (8.7%)</td>
<td>53 (18.6%)</td>
<td>102 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>76 (40.2%)</td>
<td>105 (26.79%)</td>
<td>95 (35.2%)</td>
<td>276 (32.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER 7

CHAPTER 7

SENIOR MANAGEMENT REACTION
Administrative managers who reviewed the structure from band 12 downwards. This recreated a parallel to the multiple committee system which had been so vehemently criticised.

It has been recognised earlier that the inexactness of job evaluation requires some form of clinical approach in order to derive a workable structure. While the number of posts requiring such adjustment was substantial, it is also noteworthy that in about 40% of cases the guideline for adjustment of 3 points or 3 percent was exceeded. Table 7.25 reflects a similar picture to that of Table 7.24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTION OF ADJUSTMENT</th>
<th>UPPER BANDS</th>
<th>LEVEL OF STRUCTURE</th>
<th>LOWER BANDS</th>
<th>ALL BANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>19-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downgraded</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest degree of deviation arose in upgrading upper structure jobs whereas the greater proportion of downgraded jobs fell in the lower echelons. In the case of the lower structure there was some evidence of an undermining of the comparable worth concept, since it was found that of the 30 female dominated occupations that were massaged, 28 or 93% were massaged down. These were seen to be too highly graded relative to the prevailing market salaries which such occupations commanded. This serves to reinforce the argument put forward in section 3.2.3 that manifestations of gender bias can arise out of foreknowledge of discriminatory market pay. This creates a cycle that is difficult to break.

Table 7.26 shows a distribution of the number of jobs massaged by extent of massage.
In each case however, it should be borne in mind that the number of points massaged depended upon the intended grading of the post. In the lower structure the small point ranges required smaller additions or subtractions while at the higher level with a wider band point spread, a greater number of points manipulation was needed. It should also be borne in mind that the "contribution" of a point at the lower echelons was thus heavier than in the case of the upper structure. The impact in the margin of error in grading for posts in the lower structure was thus more severe than those in the upper level.

7.8.2.2 A Macro View

While some attention has been drawn to the magnitude and direction of the massaging by focusing on actual job designations massaged, it is illuminating to
examine the overall effect of the massaging process on the degree of change from the original to the post-massaged structure. Table 7.27 reflects the tempering effect which massaging had on extreme variations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE CHANGES IN SALARY MAXIMA</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE JOBS ORIGINAL RATING</th>
<th>AFTER MASSAGING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D &gt; = 25</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O &gt; = 15 &lt; 25</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W &gt; = 05 &lt; 15</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N &gt; 0 &lt; 05</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>15,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33,2</td>
<td>40,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U &gt; 05 &lt; 15 &lt; 25</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>22,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &gt; 25 &lt; 35</td>
<td>8,1</td>
<td>11,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>4,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While both extremes were tempered, it clearly reveals an upward tendency, evidenced by the virtual elimination by comparison of the number of downgraded jobs. This effect can be seen from Figure 7.28 which compares a cumulative frequency curve before and after massaging. The notable feature is the flatter and less extreme shape of the post massaging curve, suggesting that massaging played a major role in lessening and in some cases in neutralising resultant changes.

It may be argued therefore that, as a process, massaging had the effect of according the structure a greater degree of semblance to the existing order in relative terms. This is in a sense understandable since massaging by its very root was spirited through the need to "restore hierarchical imbalances" in situations where unacceptable 'deviations' had been revealed. The massaging process ultimately suggests the depression of the lower end of the structure and the elation of the top structure, thus in effect widening the gap in relative terms between the jobs affected.
Impact of Massaging on Status of Points System

The impact of the massaging process was far reaching in so far as it threatened the status of the point scores which till that stage had been understood by participants of the evaluation process (which included the departmental representatives, line officials and union representatives) as the major determinant of relative status. In considering the Central Grading Committee's report, the Executive Committee specifically resolved "that all reference to points of evaluation or adjustment be removed from the Grading Document ..." (EXCO Minutes 1986-09-11).
It was at this point that the shift in emphasis was formalised when the Executive Committee directed that a Salary and Wage Grading Document be formulated which would "be based on the job evaluation programme in so far as the Central Grading Committee had established 28 bands within which all jobs were to be ranked" (EXCO Minutes 1986-09-11). This statement reflects a diminution of the impact of job evaluation - reduced as it were to contributing to a hollow shell grade structure. The criteria for marshalling jobs into such structure thus became hazy in a third of the cases and were embedded in the subjective motivations put forward by the departments as grounds for management discretion. "Hard earned" points were relegated in importance as jobs were moved upward and downward on the basis of varying criteria. While points did indeed emerge as a dominant feature overall, the weighting afforded them in the final assignation of grading thus varied amongst the jobs. SAMWU posed the question very directly in asking of the Grading Document

"Is it the final result of Job Evaluation or has Council totally abandoned its Job Evaluation exercise?" (Memorandum 1986-11-01).

As noted, there is evidence to suggest that the massaging process was influenced by current salaries although it was intended as a review of the job structure prior to pricing. Once the pricing process began it became apparent that some form of salary structure design was needed in order to 'validate' job structure decisions. This led to the development of a formula by which incumbents of posts falling into the same band could aspire to the same salary maximum, while differential starting rates were required to give expression to career path and market differences.
7.8.2.4 Sanctioning of Massaging Process

The massaging process received formal sanction in the forum of the Municipal Service Commission. It will be recalled that the Central Grading Committee proposals were accepted as the frame of reference. Differences as contained in the Grading Document were regarded as anomalies. These anomalies were thus the focus of attention in the MSC forum - culminating in acceptance of the Central Grading Committee proposals with the exception of 56 designations where the MSC differed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE NUMBER 7.29</th>
<th>SUMMARY OF GRADING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MSC RECOMMENDATION TO EXCO AND CGC PROPOSAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTION OF DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>NUMBER OF JOBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as Grading Document</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise between GD and CGC</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CASES</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.9 "ENFORCED JUSTIFICATION" OF HEADS OF DEPARTMENT

It will be recalled that the Central Grading Committee was created as a vehicle by which to involve the Heads of Department and the trade unions fully in the decision-making process and thereby ensure commitment to the results attained by this process. As was pointed out in Chapter 6 this strategy did not attain its full objective. The majority of members of the Committee cautioned the Executive Committee against the implementation of the job evaluation project. Although the Committee stated that it had reached the end point in its attempt to carry out its mandate to the stage where it could confidently recommend the adoption of a completely revised Grading Schedule, most of the members were completely lacking in confidence in the results that had been achieved. The Heads of Department however found themselves in a position of "enforced justification" of
the results they had achieved through the Executive Committee's decision to proceed with implementation. Since the Grading Document reflected deviations from the results achieved by the Central Grading Committee, Heads of Department found themselves in a position of justifying the Central Grading Committee proposals as the best alternative achieved after extensive investigation and research in the context of the original brief.
Chapter Number 8

UNION PERSPECTIVES: THE ROLE OF THE TRADE UNIONS

8.1 BACKGROUND

In Chapter 5 the background to formal job evaluation in the Council was described by tracing a thread through features of the salary and wage negotiation process. The description demonstrated the inevitability of job evaluation as a basis for conducting salary reviews. Implicit in the description was the assertion that the Unions support of an evaluation was motivated by reasons different to those identified by management, and this support was conditional upon their access to structures which enabled influence to be exerted over the process and the end results. Significantly too, Pornschlegel (1982) has reported that in some instances job evaluation is looked upon, not just as a vehicle for improving the wage structure, but also as a means to achieve wage increases over and above those that would normally be negotiated. This factor highlights an important point of departure in Union perspectives.

8.2 WAGE ISSUES IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

A central role of trade unions lies in the negotiation of wages. One only needs to look at the major causes of strike action in South Africa to gain an appreciation of the dominance of the pay factor (Andrew Lewy and Associates, 1988). The wage issue can however embrace a number of dimensions. In the City Council of Cape Town of primary importance as far as SAAME is concerned is the general level of wages in relation to changes to the cost of living and relative to earnings.
of employees in other municipalities. For SAMWU the primary area of focus concentrates on the minimum level of wages, coupled to equality of distribution across the broad spectrum of workers. Other important issues relating to wages cover the relative position of different workers or groups of workers within the organisation.

Collective bargaining is also used to regulate systems of reward, that is the elements that go to make up total earnings. This has in the past covered such items as share of pension contributions of the organisation, allowances, and the like. Whether one speaks of the general level of wages, wage structure or wage systems, these are ultimately determined within a process of collective bargaining.

8.3 DIFFERENCES IN MANAGEMENT AND UNION PERSPECTIVES ON SALARY/WAGE ISSUES

The collective bargaining process provides the medium through which pay in the organisation is periodically adjusted. In the City Council, this periodic reassessment primarily focuses on the general level of wages. Other aspects mentioned above relating to specific cases or groups are dealt with on an ad hoc basis, arising at times through the grievance procedure, or more often through independent submissions by the Unions. In the latter instances each of these cases receives in-depth attention and is adjudged on individual merit.

Unlike the latter instances however, salary and wage bargaining covers the entire spectrum of the organisation. At this level the employer traditionally looks at salary/wages as a cost factor - the objective being to minimise such cost while still achieving organisational goals. Trade unions on the other hand look to maximise the pay of its members and thus pursue different objectives to that of
management. The foremost objective of SAMWU at this time, for example, is to secure a “living wage” at the lowest end of the wage structure. Table 8.1 lists areas of conflict of interest between management and trade unions on wage issues.

Conflict is endemic to the relationship and the successful outcome of wage negotiations will thus depend upon the resolution of conflict through the bargaining channels. In this respect, one of the benefits accredited to job evaluation, namely that its introduction will result in elimination of conflict in wage negotiations, should be treated with reservation. By definition, the conflict of interest remains whether job evaluation is applied or not. Thus it should be seen in the context of an agreed upon basis upon which wages can be negotiated. From the Unions point of view therefore, any proposal by management for the introduction of job evaluation, can be expected to be assessed in terms of whether such systems or procedures are likely to weaken or strengthen the Union's influence with respect to the determination of the general level of wages.

8.4 UNION VIEWS ON JOB EVALUATION

It is pertinent at this point therefore to assess trade union views on job evaluation. Janes (1979:80-85) conducted a comparative study (1971 vs 1978) of union views on job evaluation in the U.S.A and revealed some noteworthy findings. In 1978 he found that 64% of bargaining agreements contained the actual job evaluation plan. Coupled to this was an increase in the acceptance of plans designed by unions or jointly by the management and the union. The majority of unions did not express any preference however for any one type of system. The most frequently cited problems with job evaluation from the Union's point of view were found however to be the following:
### Table 8.1

**Examples of possible management and trade union or workers’ objectives and interests in wage determination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Issues</th>
<th>Possible Employer or Management Objectives and Interests</th>
<th>Common Objectives and Interests</th>
<th>Trade Union and Workers’ Objectives and Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of wages and salaries</td>
<td>As low as possible (cost factor) while maintaining the necessary labour market attractiveness</td>
<td>Acceptable level, at the same time maintaining a sufficiently attractive position on the labour market</td>
<td>As high as possible (income factor) with a strong attractiveness on the labour market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status and qualification</td>
<td>Strong emphasis on status referring to hierarchical position and organisationally important qualifications</td>
<td>Balancing of conflicting approaches by compromising</td>
<td>Leveling of status and qualification-oriented differentials as far as compatible with members’ group and individual interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation of employees</td>
<td>Towards loyalty to and identification with organisation; interest in own work, output, productivity and profitability</td>
<td>Balanced systems of safeguards and possibilities for necessary adjustments</td>
<td>Group solidarity and loyalty (including to the union); interest in own work; no pressures by strong output orientation; no alienation from work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of wage or salary payments</td>
<td>Possibilities of immediate adaptation according to management’s needs and concept of costs</td>
<td>Safeguards against down-grading and loss of wage prospects; quick adjustment to upward moves</td>
<td>Fixed, liberal rules; joint control under a system of checks and controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline of employees</td>
<td>Wage and salary systems as rewards and sanctions; if possible, unilateral management control and action</td>
<td>Settled procedures for disciplinary action if necessary, recourse to committees or arbitration</td>
<td>Fixed, liberal rules; joint control under a system of checks and controls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differentiation of wages or salaries:**

- **By jobs -**
  - Relatively fine differentials; "divide and rule"
  - Compromise between conflicting parties’ objectives
- **By seniority -**
  - Tying employees to the organisation; increasing their loyalty
  - Recognition of experience and contribution to organisation while maintaining plausible differentials against grading
- **Through payment by results -**
  - Achievement of high output or targets; merit rating
  - Complex systems of setting rates or using merit rating, mostly under joint control
  - Principal objections or admission with strong safeguards for earnings and health of members

*Source: Pornschlegel (1980:7-8)*
the plan is not understood by the employees;

* the plan tends to restrict collective bargaining on wage adjustments;

* rather than using job evaluation as a guide, it is used as the sole criterion in establishing wage scales;

* job content is established on the basis of "ideal" and not "normal" performance;

* the plan is not kept up to date;

* poorly written job descriptions specifications are a problem.

A slight decrease in the satisfaction with job evaluation plans was also reported. Janes (1979) also reported a real decrease in the resistance to job evaluation practices. This was however coupled to an increase in the use of grievance-arbitration procedure to challenge the system on any point at any time. Overall in slightly over 50% of all comments, unions voiced approval of evaluation, reserving the right to challenge the system at any point at any time. Janes (1979) asserts that unions have very seldom really opposed job evaluation provided it is not used as the sole criterion for establishing wages or as a substitute for the process of collective bargaining. Although unions display a distrust for "human engineering" Janes has interpreted a modest trend toward acceptance of job evaluation by unions in the U.S.A.

On the issue of restrictive collective bargaining Pornschlegel (1982) maintains that from the unions point of view, the introduction of job evaluation schemes can reduce the scope for negotiations since the pattern of future collective bargaining will be largely set. Under job evaluation there is less flexibility than is the case with simple forms of wage or salary grades. According to Gomberg (1951), a trade unionists view of job evaluation is largely governed by his estimate of its effectiveness as a collective bargaining tool (Cogill, 1984:58). Shichter,
Healey and Livernash (1960) maintain that unions influence the timing, the method and the character of introduction of plans selected or developed by management (Cogill, 1984:58). An important criterion for acceptance by unions is that the system must be understood and it must be perceived as equitable and fair (Cogill, 1984:58).

Pornschlegel (1982:14-15) has identified some of the principal reasons for Unions support of job evaluation. These have been:

- securing relatively better wages for lower-paid workers and minorities (eg female workers) and at times also for highly qualified workers;
- setting realistic, collectively agreed rates against market rates;
- participating in control of the process of grading jobs with management;
- supporting the principal of equal pay for equal (and equally difficult) work by providing applicable yardsticks.

In the latter regard, a study conducted by Glucklich, Povall, Snell and Zell (1978,in Cogill, 1984:59) found that in the sample studies conducted in Britain, greatest progress to equal pay had been made where job evaluation had been implemented. Cogill (1984:59), in gauging union views in Britain from official union publications, concludes that the tone is reluctantly acceptant. For example:

* The most attractive feature of job evaluation is that it concentrates on the rate for the job and thus is consistent with many trade unionists' ideas on wage payment.

* In the case of differentials between skilled and unskilled workers, or between one region and another, job evaluation is part of the industrial scene. 
Job evaluation is not seen by these unions as something separate to the normal negotiating or consultative process.

In South Africa, the unions have had little impact on the development of job evaluation (See Chapter 2). If the figures supplied by Cogill (1984) are accepted, namely that 65% of the blue collar labour force was covered by job evaluation, it suggests that management has on a fairly wide scale succeeded without union impact. As Cogill has pointed out, job evaluation has been introduced 'with little regard for obtaining consensus, commitment and participation. As will be recalled, it was the initial approach adopted by the City Council, quickly abandoned in favour of a more participative approach following representation of by SAAME (See Chapter 6). The first recorded case of complete involvement of a union in the grading of jobs according to Cogill (1984:60) took place at the Chloride plant in East London in June 1981 as reported by Heffer (1982). Having had limited involvement in job evaluation and lacking in the expertise, unions and workers have had little opportunity to challenge it. Typically, as Cogill (1984) points out, unions have found themselves buying into job evaluation in return for higher pay in circumstances where firms want to rationalise pay structures.

It is worth noting further the point raised by Cogill (1984) that wage surveys using the Paterson System analyse wage differentials upon the basis of like banded jobs (comparable work content and not identical work content). Since the system uses one universal factor and does not include such factors as education, it is also perceived as not prejudicing non-white incumbents. To the extent that job evaluation thus plays a role in narrowing the wage gap, it is likely to be of benefit to the Union movement. Once this process loses momentum, there could conceivably develop a new cause based on management job universes vs employee job universes. The higher degree of acceptance on the part of unions in South Africa of the Paterson System is reinforced by the findings of the Survey.
Report of FSA-Contact Pty Ltd (1989) as contained in Table 8.2.

### TABLE NUMBER 8.2
**ACCEPTANCE OF JOB EVALUATION SYSTEMS BY UNIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCEPTANCE OF SYSTEM</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>% No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peronnnes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castillion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In house</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from FSA-Contact (1989:4)

Of the 350 respondents who had a formal job evaluation system, over 40% were reported as using the Peronnnes, and slightly more than 20% use the TASK or Paterson based method. Noteworthy is the fact that 15% of companies use other systems, some of which have been developed with Union involvement. In reflecting on these figures it should however be borne in mind that as respondents, it is management's assessment of the views of unions. A similar finding was revealed in the survey of South African local authorities, referred to in earlier chapters, where management perceived unions as being satisfied with the job evaluation systems. There was no reported case of dissatisfaction.

### 8.5 INITIAL UNION FORMULATION

It has been illustrated thus far that the salary and wage bargaining process is one of conflict, in which each of the participating parties is driven by opposing goals. Job evaluation, which has been predominantly applied as a management goal, is thus approached by unions on the basis of facilitating the attainment of its objectives.

A further divergence of approach was evident in the City Council, since the two
unions by virtue of their differing constituents and political affiliations, displayed significant differences in approach to job evaluation. Whereas the benefits to SAAME were, in short, in the potential for higher salaries for their members, as far as SAMWU was concerned "a proper and fair evaluation and grouping of posts" had always formed the subject matter of demands submitted by them in the context of salary and wage bargaining. In the case of SAMWU, the significance of a fair grouping of posts may be directly related to an application of the concept of equal pay for jobs of comparable worth. It was thus regarded as a technique for deriving a greater degree of equatability in wage structure. For SAAME, on the other hand, the issue of major concern was any disturbance in relative status. The terms of their support for the job evaluation proposals, were namely that it be "subject to the proviso that the existing rights of employees will not be prejudiced" which clearly indicate the realisation that benefits would not be uniform. The concern for employee safeguards emerged repeatedly in SAAME's representations to the organisation. SAMWU's initial acceptance of the proposals was subject to the development of events in the process.

8.6 NON-PARTICIPATION OF SAMWU

The demand by SAAME for participation was outlined in section 6.2. While SAAME calculated that their participation in the job evaluation process would strengthen their hand in the determination of pay, SAMWU adopted precisely the opposite point of view demonstrated by their preference for negotiation on the basis of the results which management derived. This was regarded as providing a greater degree of flexibility and reinforced the view point that job evaluation was not seen as the sole criterion in establishing wage scales.

At this stage it is opportune to reflect on the essential criteria for a trade union. These are likely to be:
* their own goals related to present and future wage structures;
* the reaction to the adequacy or shortcomings of the proposed system;
* the ease or difficulty with which the system is operated;
* the likelihood of detrimental effects on the system and therefore on grading and status arising out of technological changes, eg computerisation making jobs simpler;
* the context of local, social and cultural values. (Pornschlegel, 1982:25)

The withdrawal and non-participation of SAMWU can now be assessed on the basis of the above criteria. It has been demonstrated in Chapter 5 that SAMWU supported a proper evaluation of jobs. This issue formed the subject of successive wage demands. The union fully recognised the need "to rationalise a Grading Schedule that was growing into a monster" and recognised that a job evaluation could assist in resolving the situation in which "workers suffer loss because they are designated as one kind of worker but they perform work of a higher quality" (SAMWU Report on Job Evaluation, 1986). However the fundamental difficulty that SAMWU had with the Five Factor System was in the factors included. As the union stated, "it is important that criteria be applied, or factors taken into account which are acceptable to workers" (Report on Job Evaluation, Nov 1986). Quite plainly, the factors constitute the criteria which will be rewarded in monetary terms. Those factors not taken into account cannot acquire points, and therefore have no impact on wage differentials. This highlights the fact that the choice of factors is a major policy decision that establishes the framework for grading jobs and the wage or salary rates that are derived. More fundamental therefore to the objection to the factors included, was that the union was never involved in the formulation of criteria used to evaluate jobs. The union went further by asserting that the factors chosen "can only result in the widening of the gap between the higher paid and the lower paid" (Report from the EXCO of SAMWU and General Council to Members, May 1987). This places an
alternative perspective to that argued thus far, namely that job evaluation provides a means to the narrowing of the wage gap on the basis of race or sex. In so far as the lower paid jobs are dominated by membership from SAMWU, any evaluation that increases such differentials will be dismissed as discriminatory. This should also be understood against a fundamental approach of SAMWU to equal cash increases with regard to wage demands, such approach effectively flattening the shape of the pay curve over time.

The desire to approach the evaluation by way of negotiation with management on the basis of its results also emanated from an agreement between the Union and the Council during the course of the Industrial Court proceedings which took place in 1984 and 1985 arising out of a dispute between the union and the Council. In terms of this agreement, one issue of dispute, namely the question of grouping of posts was left unresolved on the understanding that Council was undertaking a job evaluation and that the parties would resolve such dispute within the context of the job evaluation.

The union in dealing with an unacceptable set of criteria thus informed the Council that it was in the process of conducting its own evaluation of jobs with the intention of submitting its proposals for Councils consideration and further action (Memorandum, 1984-03-21).

8.6.1 Environmental Factors

It has been pointed out that those factors that are not included in a points system cannot be taken into account, and cannot therefore acquire points, and this will not be reflected in the wage differentials that are derived. This, as has been mentioned above, was a major stumbling block in SAMWU acceptance. Specifically, it was the absence of environmental/hardship factors which attributed to this position. Biesheuvel (1977:21) has pointed out that physical effort is not a general factor and also ranks very low in our society's value system and is
replaced by machine power as soon as it is economic to do so. Paterson (1972:119) follows a similar argument by pointing out that working conditions can change. If this factor is given a heavy weighting of points, the employer may improve the conditions and thus reduce pay. Should the conditions be improved it will be equally difficult to reduce the job in points.

The physical/environmental factors are however ones which are of considerable importance to lower level and shop floor workers. Interestingly, however, a number of City Council managers came out strongly against the system for not taking cognisance of such factors. One stated that

"the evaluation failed to take cognisance of the high stress level of the job where the incumbent has to be available 24 hours per day" (1985:8:29).

This was brought out very strongly in the case of jobs in the power station which are exposed to heat, noise, dust, hazardous substances, and have to accommodate physical stress in the form of rapid temperature changes in their daily routine. It was thus argued that the adverse effect of the factors were not considered in the evaluation process. Other such similar examples of request for review of grading on the basis of factors not considered were prevalent. The approach taken by the compensation specialists in the City Council was that these factors are not universal and are also subject to change. For this reason it was more appropriate to provide compensation by way of allowances for specific circumstances which prevail, but which may change over time.

The conditions of employment contain numerous types allowances which are payable for abnormal conditions. Another approach could be to apply separate evaluation systems for the different levels, but this would then detract from attaining comparability across an entire organisation. Biesheuvel (1985) concurs in the former approach by proposing that where two jobs in the same grade can
be shown to differ significantly with regard to physical effort, a criterion of normality could be set up against which such circumstances can be tested, and the differences addressed by way of a graded hardship allowance. The system is thereby retained pure. It has the further advantage that where such abnormal conditions are not continuous, but arise only from time to time, then the allowance can be paid as and when it applies without the basic rate of the job being affected.

Ultimately, whichever course of action is adopted will depend upon worker acceptability. In this context, SAMWU simultaneously excluded itself from participation on the basis of factors chosen, was unable to accept the provision of allowances as a solution to the compensation for hardship factors, yet was prepared to negotiate with Council on the basis of the results derived from such systems.

8.6.2 Use of Negotiation around the Results

SAMWU's desire to negotiate on the basis of the findings of the plan in preference to commitment to the plan itself or to the process of evaluation is one of a number of variations that have been found in union participation in job evaluation plans. The union had early on informed the Council of the fact that it was in the process of undertaking its own evaluation with a view to submitting its proposal to Council for consideration (Memorandum 1984:03:21). Although this was not taken to its full extent, it was evident that such assessments that were made, formed the basis for negotiations on the job hierarchy finally adopted for implementation. Thus a compromise was bargained subject however to the Union reserving its right to submit an appeal on any individual post arising out of representations to it by any of its members.

Noteworthy, however, is that SAMWU's guarded approach was evident at the
outset, prior to exposure to either the composition of the factors or the application of the system, when it declared itself an observer on the initially constituted Central Evaluation Committee. The nomination of a representative was described as an interim measure (Memorandum 1982-12-29).

Furthermore, in responding to the proviso of the Executive Committee that nominees should carry full delegated powers to act on behalf of their Unions, (see section 6.2) the union reserved the right to its own independent viewpoint on any issue irrespective of the viewpoint expressed by its nominee (Memorandum 1983-02-24). Subsequent to its exposure during the pilot phase, SAMWU withdrew its participation from the Central Evaluation Committee (Memorandum 1983-11-13). The Union also declined participation on the Central Grading Committee and resisted what it regarded as merely being a party to implementation. It once again made it very clear that it did not accept the scheme and therefore was

"not prepared to bind itself in advance to a job evaluation scheme the effect of which will be to retain and buttress a discriminatory and inequitable grading structure - heavily loaded against the majority of the Council's lower paid workers" (Memorandum 1985-07-02).

The Union later pointed out that it was however vitally interested in the job evaluation exercise and any proposals which may flow therefrom, but it was only prepared to negotiate on the basis of proposals which it could consider (Memorandum 1985-07-16). The union was clear about the bargaining steps it envisaged. It expected the Council to submit its proposals for a revised Grading Schedule. The parties would then have an opportunity to accept, reject or submit alternative proposals. The parties could conceivably meet in an attempt to arrive at an agreement. Should no agreement be possible, the matter should be allowed to take its course. Notably, when Council's proposals were referred to the forum of the Municipal Service Commission, SAMWU maintained presence as observers
until such time as clarity was attained on the status and nature of the proposals before the Commission.

SAMWU's concern was also directly linked to the agreement reached in the context of the Arbitration proceedings in the Industrial Court referred to earlier, at which time demands for a regrouping of posts were removed from the terms of the dispute on the understanding that the Council was to implement a job evaluation which would address the issue of re-ordering the job hierarchy. SAMWU maintained that this factor also had an influence on the court award. Because of the removal of the points from the Grading Document, and in the light of the substantial massaging, SAMWU raised doubt as to whether these were the results which could give effect to that agreement. As was pointed out in section 6.4.11, Council made it clear that the proposals should be understood as the end result of job evaluation. It was on attaining this clarity that SAMWU was able in terms of its pre-determined approach, to declare itself full participant in the discussions, albeit without prejudice to the rights of the Union and with reservation of all its rights (Memorandum 1986-11-01; Meeting MSC 1986-11-03).

Once part of these discussions, the Union then began its arguments on the basis of other factors, outside of the criteria of the evaluation system. In successfully arguing for the amalgamation of the bottom two grades of what was at the time a 28 grade structure, factors such as physical exertion and climatic conditions were used as motivation alongside such arguments related to the alleged performance of semi-skilled work by large numbers of Council labourers. It was from this stage onward that the interplay of the two Unions in the process created a new dynamic. Before attention is given to this aspect, it is necessary to draw the threads of SAAME's status as participant.
8.7 SAAME’S PARTICIPATION

SAAME’s demand for participation and the Council’s conditions for the inclusion of the unions has been described in section 6.2. The reasons for and desirability of participation have also been discussed.

SAAME was motivated by the potential for enhanced salaries which became the main objective of its focus. Mindful however of differences in benefit that could arise, the second area it was particularly concerned about was safeguards of employee rights. Indeed this was the proviso under which SAAME supported the proposals for a formal job evaluation. In this context it should also be recalled that when the idea of formal job evaluation was first mooted, SAAME had expressed concern about any disturbance in the status quo.

8.7.1 SAAME’s Role in the Evaluation Committees

The constitution of the Evaluation Committees was illustrated in Figure 6.5. SAAME was thus represented by nominated representatives in each of the committees/panels. As a voting member, the Union was expected to play an active role in the evaluation process itself. The second important reason for the Unions presence was to ensure adherence to "the rules of the game", bearing in mind that the committee approach is adopted to safeguard against biased evaluations. It was evident however that the Union representatives found it difficult to distinguish between deriving fair and equitable evaluation results on the one hand, and attaining the best evaluation result for each of its members, on the other. In the latter role the Union formed an important element in the conflict that prevailed in the evaluation committees as discussed earlier in chapter 7 (see sections 7.5.1 and 7.5.2). The union's affiliation thus cut across departmental lines forming expedient 'coalitions' perceived to be in the interests of members. While departmental representatives often played a moderating role in respect of
each other, the union representatives were undiscriminating in pushing for the highest evaluation possible in each instance, this often to the irritation of departmental representatives. The union appeared to have little regard for an overall perspective of relativity, and the willingness (or ability, in some instances) to apply the evaluation process rules (eg factor scale definitions) in as objective a manner as was intended, was questionable. The union was thus an active catalyst in reinforcing the perceptions by management that one of the panels was "undervaluing" jobs -in particular since this chairman was seen as being competent to deflect union aggression.

The attitude that prevailed was simply that money equalled points and therefore the greater the points score, the greater the likelihood of enhancing monetary benefit. This question of job evaluation being a means to achieve pay increases over and above those that would normally be negotiated is to be considered in a forthcoming section of this chapter.

8.7.2 SAAME's Role on the Central Grading Committee

As participant on the Central Grading Committee, SAAME became party to the massaging process. While the massaging process started out as a means to 'rectify' anomalies and deal with borderline cases, with an overall objective of ensuring consistency, SAAME encouraged upward adjustments whilst opposing any attempts by the committee to massage down what were perceived as being in a clinical way obvious over-evaluated posts. The presence of the union in this process was an inhibiting factor for departmental representatives, since under the watchful eye of the union representative they had to propose downward adjustment to posts that had justified a higher grading based purely on the points evaluation. This created further role conflict by virtue of the representatives own membership of the union. It is interesting to speculate at this point as to the effect on downward massaging the presence of SAMWU might have had, had the
union participated in the Central Grading Committee.

Significantly, the Heads of Department who, as part of the Central Grading Committee, dealt with the review of the upper structure, completed this exercise informally at the exclusion of the Union and tabled proposed adjustments as a fait accompli at the formal sessions of the Committee. This led to Union claims of inconsistencies between the Central Grading Committee's approach to the upper structure as compared to the Sub-Committee's review of the balance of posts in the organisation. The substantiation for such accusation has been discussed in Chapter 7 (section 7.8.2 and illustrated in Table 7.24) and is reflected in the discrepancy in direction of massaging between the upper structure as opposed to the middle and lower order posts. In the above sense therefore, the Union also played a moderating role since the Central Grading Committee was influenced to modify norms for massaging, closer to those norms that had applied in the Sub-Committee. The Union, moreover, in contrast to the majority of the Heads of Department, was instrumental in voicing a minority view in pressing for the implementation, notwithstanding expressed fears concerning the flaws of the system.

8.8 BOTH UNIONS PRESS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Indeed, both unions played a vital role in the actual decision to implement. SAAME's desire for implementation was evidenced by the consistent pressure that was applied immediately after completion of the evaluation phase (Memorandum 1984-08-28). More specifically, this union attempted on a number of occasions to participate in the pay structuring process (Memorandum 1984-11-19). In the report of the Central Grading Committee, it formed the backbone of the minority report urging the Council to implement the plan. SAMWU's declaration of support for the Central Grading Committee's report on
the basis that it came very close to the Union's own independent evaluation, provided further momentum to its eventual acceptance.

There is little doubt that in the final stages the unions were the major force in ensuring the implementation of job evaluation. These events have been described in detail in section 6.4.11.3 of Chapter 6. The Council found itself in a position of having to negotiate around the implementation of its own job evaluation scheme which it had initiated. Delay in implementation, which became intertwined with salary and wage demands, was met by threat of action from both Unions. SAAME threatened the declaration of a dispute and application for the establishment of a Conciliation Board by the Department of Manpower. SAMWU demanded implementation. A general meeting of members endorsed this position and accused the Council of using the issue of job evaluation to avoid paying workers "a decent wage" and a proper "rate for the job". The membership instructed the Union "to take positive action" should the Council not meet its demands (Memorandum 1987-05-22). Other threats of action came in the form of attempts at incitement at a special meeting of the membership of SAAME, when the Council was accused of exploiting municipal workers by taking advantage of the fact that municipal employees could not strike in terms of the labour laws (1987-06-11). Although Heads of Department had urged the EXCO from time to time to bring the project to finality, it was this thrust of union pressure which better articulated staff frustration with the uncertainty and had the effect of forcing the decision to implement. The leverage enjoyed by the Unions was also heightened by final consideration of job evaluation implementation coinciding with the salary and wage review period, bringing sharply into focus its original motivation for embarking upon the project in the first instance.
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SALARY INCREASES AND JOB EVALUATION

It has been mentioned in this chapter that job evaluation may be looked upon not only as a vehicle for improving the pay structure but also as a means to achieve pay increases over and above those that would normally be negotiated. The point was also raised that the introduction of a scheme could have the effect of reducing the scope for negotiations for trade unions in the sense that there is less flexibility for manipulating pay scales once a basis for a new structure has been agreed upon and installed. Both these situations were applicable to a lesser or greater extent to each of the trade unions.

For SAAME the object of the job evaluation was to place "the proper market value on every job proposed in Council" (SAAME News V12 N3, 1986). SAMWU similarly viewed the exercise as a process of attaching a proper value to each job on the basis of work performed. It was clear that SAAME saw job evaluation purely as a means to salary increases. This was coupled to the perception that Council salaries were uncompetitive, and therefore making any new structure externally consistent would of necessity require substantial upward adjustment. Were this not to be the end result the entire exercise would prove to be a waste of time (Memorandum 1983-07-20; 1983-11-03). This view was reinforced by a report from the SAAME Executive to the membership following conclusion of the salary and wage negotiations in 1984 in terms of which an across-the-board increase of 12% was settled, with some lower paid workers getting more than 12%. The Union assured its members that

"anyone who will not receive more than 12% should not be too disappointed, as the implementation of the Job Evaluation Scheme should result in this backlog being more than made up" (June 1984).
SAAME used the so-called compromises in salary and wage negotiations on an understanding that the implementation of job evaluation was imminent. As regards the membership this was used as a means to sell the settlements agreed upon. This was expressed in communications with both the Council and its membership as follows:

"For over four years salary and wage negotiations have been hampered by the 'impending' implementation of the Job Evaluation Scheme. Employees have had to be satisfied with cost of living adjustments drastically below the rate of inflation as further increases resulting from "Job Evaluation" were always waiting at rainbows end" (SAAME News V13 N2 March/April 1987).

Ironically, it could be argued that SAAME played a role lowering staff morale by creating unrealistic expectations amongst its membership. This same level of frustration was not as evident in the case of SAMWU members who were more distant from the job evaluation process.

While job evaluation was seen as bringing salary increases, it was also paradoxically distinguished from a general salary increase of an across-the-board type. A year prior to the implementation SAAME wrote to its members predicting that

"job evaluation will be implemented at the expense of the usual salary regrading... The sinister difference is that whilst everyone benefits from an across-the-board percentage increase, some members stand to gain nothing from job evaluation...." (SAAME News V12 N4 July/August 1986).

The resolve of both unions to separate the general adjustment to salary levels from the implementation of job evaluation has been documented in section 6.4.11.3. Both unions were very clear in their conception of the need to adjust the structure on the basis of job evaluation first, and thereafter on the basis of the demands applicable in the case of each union. SAAME conceived of market related adjustments and adjustments made to compensate for the rise in the cost
of living as two separate and independent issues. SAMWU was concerned that linking job evaluation to pay increases would prejudice workers—in particular since it was the Council's job evaluation scheme and thus should be divorced from the Union's independent submissions on pay demands.

SAAME was however badly affected in the salary and wage negotiations subsequent to the introduction of the new structure. It presented a clear example from the unions point of view of the constraints on their collective bargaining 'room', for the Council used the agreed upon market-related approach as a basis for its offer which entailed differential adjustments affording higher increases to the lower and upper structure and more conservative proposals to that middle part of the pay curve which required some flattening out. While the higher increases at the lower end were able to satisfy the needs of SAMWU for an enhanced minimum wage, the traditional across-the-board demand of SAAME on the basis of the rise in the cost of living was frustrated by the market related approach. The Council successfully argued that any adjustment based on market relatedness incorporated cost of living as one of the factors which the market takes into account in making such adjustments. This once again highlighted the conflicting interests of management and unions and reinforced the perception of management's wish to "divide and rule" by diminishing unity and solidarity amongst union membership through such a tool.

8.10 EMPLOYEE SAFEGUARDS

It will be recalled that SAAME's acceptance of proceeding with job evaluation was subject to a proviso safeguarding employee rights. SAMWU, during its brief period of participation on the Central Evaluation Committee, also reserved all rights in protection of its members. The fundamental difference between the roles of SAAME and SAMWU in this context was that SAAME through its participation was
able to exert influence and have an impact on the path of the project and the resultant grading of its members. Since SAMWU adopted the approach of negotiating on the basis of results, it was placed in a disadvantageous position in so far as opportunities were foregone to influence the grading of posts, in particular during the review process of the Central Grading Committee where the opportunity existed for applying "other factors" outside the system criteria. In finalising negotiations in the forum of the Municipal Service Commission, SAMWU nevertheless reserved all rights to make further submissions on behalf of members. This was expressed in the degree to which SAMWU paid attention to the procedural detail and submissions put forward in the appeals against the gradings. SAAME on the other hand, followed the issue of employee safeguards throughout the path of the project and in successive representations to the Council had ensured an elaborate "appeal procedure" with special rights over and above the grievance provision provided for by the Conditions of Service of Employees, or those of By-Law 1994 (Memorandum 1983-11-03; 1983-12-21; 1984-03-02; Reference Memorandum MSC 1984-02-16). This meant that should the special appeal procedure not engender a satisfactory result, the employee would still have open the established machinery for further representations in the matter.

The safeguards provided therefore, not only for an avenue of appeal against the grading of posts but also the assurance that the "no lose principle" would apply whereby an employee who, as a result of the evaluation, occupied a post graded at less than his existing scale would, for as long as he occupies such a post, retain his present ranking and pay level as well as any benefit from future across-the-board salary adjustments which would have been applicable to that particular job.
8.10.1 Appeal Procedure

The appeal procedure was referred to in section 6.4.11.5. Figure 6.12 reflects the steps designed in the appeal procedure. SAAME played an initiating role in the devising of the appeal procedure. Departmental representatives had not favoured a multistaged procedure and preferred use of the established machinery for handling grievances. SAMWU having entered the process without prejudice to its rights or the rights of its members, laid great emphasis on negotiations around the question of hearing appeals and the appeal procedures. It was abundantly clear that SAMWU laid great stress in providing the avenues in the appeal procedure for "making up" lost ground foregone through their absence during the ranking and grading phases. In particular the Union was not able to accept that the appeal procedure should be devoid of 'massaging' since this would eliminate room for bargaining on "other factors".

Notwithstanding this position, the role of the Central Evaluation Committee as a body designed for review of the evaluation was accepted by them, this in a sense condoning the place of the points rating and the accompanying criteria. Although the Union did participate in these reviews in the case of posts submitted by themselves for appeal, it was also clear that the representatives did not equip themselves to apply the technique but were concentrating their energies on the forum of the Municipal Service Commission as the appeal body proper.

For this reason, one of the major areas of conflict between the unions and the organisation was around the question of employee representation on the Central Evaluation Committee specifically the presence of the incumbent of the job being reviewed. It will be recalled that in the original composition of the committees this was not the case. The official's argument was therefore that since this represented a review of the original evaluation, the same procedures should apply, thus not disadvantaging others who accepted their evaluation results without their
own presence. The unions, on the other hand, saw the appeal as a special situation which warranted an approach which would satisfy members that the reasons for their dissatisfaction were heard.

Protraction of this disagreement had the effect of further frustrating appellants, since although having submitted appeals timeously, little feedback was forthcoming. This led to a number of spontaneous petitions from employees containing several hundred signatures (1988-04-27; 1988-06-03). The unions, by acting co-operatively, were able to convince the Municipal Service Commission of the need for employee presence and this was recommended to and adopted by the Executive Committee.

The emphasis in the role of the Central Evaluation Committee was thus altered. The 'victory' for the unions was to a large degree negated when, in a further agreement, the Committee itself decided to restrict representation to the original format and confine itself to an objective and clinical approach. In final review of its work the Committee examined other factors and submitted recommendations which ran contrary to the points evaluation on the basis of other factors put before it. SAMWU in particular, however, saw this as a small step in the process in view of their rejection of the evaluation criteria, thus regarding the points as one of other qualitative inputs into the final decision. In this respect it therefore used the forum of the Municipal Service Commission in order to provide large delegations of employees to present their appeals.

The Union's approach was thus to argue appeals on factors which fell outside the evaluation criteria. In total 42 appeals were submitted through the offices of the Union covering ± 17% of their members. SAMWU's approach in this respect contrasted sharply with that of SAAME's. As was previously pointed out, SAAME had enjoyed the opportunity of influence throughout the course of the project.
This was reflected in the small number of appeals that emanated from this union. Indeed they advised their members to use the avenues provided departmentally, restricting their own attentions to those appeals not supported by the respective departmental heads. SAMWU was the main vehicle for facilitating its members' appeals thus reinforcing the view expressed that the methodology for attaining its objective was by independent submissions in preference to using a system whose criteria they did not accept. Noteworthy is the fact that in preference to any further attempts to influence the formulation of criteria for evaluation, the Union opted to withdraw. SAMWU, as a union, thus placed itself under severe pressure, since it left itself with the appeal procedure as the only vehicle by which to attain its objectives.

Significantly therefore, the Union displayed frustration with what it described as the approach of the Municipal Service Commission in not giving the appeals "the serious consideration which it merits". The MSC was accused of purely going through the procedures and prejudging many of the issues (Memoranda 1988-07-25; 1989-04-04). It should be noted here that the parties had agreed upon what was termed the "fast lane concept" in terms of which appeals would be heard with a view to identifying those "clear cut" cases of obvious justification, the remainder to be considered more in depth. As a result of the comprehensive and time consuming submissions of appellants, this concept in the perception of the MSC and organisation representatives, fell away. The Union did not see it that way. On submission of the MSC recommendations to the EXCO on the appeals, the Union protested against appeals adjudged unsuccessful being submitted to Council for finalisation. The Union maintained in terms of the agreed upon "fast lane concept" that it had the right to make further submissions in all unsuccessful appeals. As they argued,
"if the Commission anticipated the initial submissions to be less detailed, they cannot assume that the Union’s submissions were therefore complete" (Memorandum 1989-07-17).

SAMWU thus urged the Council to take a decision on successful appeals only, reserving its right to pursue any appeal which had not been met in full and which it believed warranted further representations. The Union found the suggestion that members further grievances be taken through the grievance procedure unacceptable. The appeal to Council to withhold all unsuccessful appeals till agreement was reached was coupled to a threat that should the Council decide to approve the report of the MSC, the Union would consider itself in dispute with the Council as envisaged in the Labour Relations Act No 28 of 1956 (as amended) (Memorandum 1989-07-23). The Council in the interests of equity and sound labour relations, decided to hear the Union in the matter and provided the opportunity for submissions to be made on those specific cases on which it wanted to make further representations. At the time of writing this was the status of the issue.

As has been mentioned, the above serves to demonstrate the seriousness to which SAMWU placed success on the job evaluation appeals. This approach, it is suggested, arose precisely because they excluded themselves from exerting influence in the formative stages and thus found themselves under pressure from the membership to provide results. Interestingly, in the early stages the union objected to Council’s approach to the job analysis phase. This related to allegations that members were requested to exclude certain duties that were performed by them and merely sign job descriptions in other instances where these were already completed on their behalf. The Union however advised members to co-operate to the best of their ability. On being challenged by the Council about the allegations, the Union however responded through the argument that to provide specific instances would amount to a breach of confidence of its members. The Union however chose to deal with this matter by avoidance,
informing the Council at this stage of its own evaluation which it was conducting.

8.11 LOSS OF SENIORITY - AN ISSUE OF IMPLEMENTATION

Yet another example of the attempt to use job evaluation as a vehicle for increases over and above those that would normally be negotiated, is provided by the dispute arising out of an implementation formula demanded by the unions, styled a "notch for notch" implementation formula. By this was meant that an employee on the top of the old scale had to be "notched" at the top of the new scale, even if the minimum salary of the new scale exceeded his existing salary. The demand was thus for an exact replica of the differentials which existed between employees WITHIN the old scales of pay, to be transferred in the new scales. This request was contrary to standard practice, the objective of which is for 'out of line' jobs to be placed within the new parameters by bringing them up to new minimum salary for that scale. Jobs falling within the new range are not normally adjusted. Often, the former process is subject to phasing. The Council in turn accepted full implementation, with the only proviso that should an employee's salary be required to be enhanced by more than four notches on the key scale (i.e. about 20%), the balance be awarded six months later. SAAME claimed that by implementing job evaluation in the manner proposed, "many of its members would suffer the humiliation of loss of seniority". This concept of loss of seniority referred to the fact that on the new scales certain more junior employees would catch up to more senior ones in terms of salary earned. Seniority was thus conceived of purely in relative monetary terms, and was used as an argument for higher adjustments to be awarded. Although the Municipal Service Commission proposed a 'compromise' solution, the Executive Committee did not adopt such proposal and both Unions reserved the right to further negotiate the seniority provisions.
Further representations by SAAME met with a further negative response from the Council and therefore the Union declared itself to be in dispute with the Council. Significantly, the SAMWU did not pursue the matter. The Conciliation Board meetings did not settle the dispute which remains unresolved. In comparison to the approach of SAAME towards the numerous other disputes they have declared that have ended in conciliation, it has become apparent that the Union will allow this dispute to lapse on the basis of the tenuous arguments of their case. This reinforces the view that it was purely an attempt to intimidate the Council into some form of monetary concession. The Council had argued that notching in no way reflects an individual's seniority in an occupation or service in the organisation. Length of service would continue to influence promotional opportunities in the future as they had done in the past.

8.12 SUMMARY

The above analysis has attempted to show the differing approaches by the unions in the job evaluation process by focusing on union attitudes and illustrating by way of specific enactment of roles. Relevant research findings on union views were presented as a frame of reference.

Both unions acknowledged the value of job evaluation. While SAAME focused almost exclusively on the overall monetary benefit, on the assumption that Council salaries were uncompetitive in the market place, SAMWU saw benefit to be derived from a regrouping of occupations on the basis of work performed. This was anticipated to be of benefit to its members who were seen as being disadvantaged on the basis of discriminatory wage determinants. SAAME accepted the system as appropriate to its own value orientation, addressing its concerns primarily to employee safeguards and procedural issues related to its ability to influence through full participation. SAMWU in turn was unable to accept
a system based on criteria with which it did not agree and selected exclusion of their own involvement. The factors were seen as reinforcing the status quo and the existing pecking order. For SAMWU the system was also difficult to understand and cumbersome to operate. It approached the process by a preference for negotiation on the basis of the results without compromising itself on the use of a 'discriminatory' system.

Each union from its own perspective played a vital role in providing the momentum to ensure implementation. This fact alone bears witness to the benefit that each anticipated for its members. For SAMWU the elaborate appeal procedure provided further latitude to make up "lost ground" as a result of non-participation, with the added advantage of being able to introduce extraneous factors in the context of employees being aggrieved.

While the new structure proved to hamper SAAME's approach to salary and wage demands, by providing management with a structural base for differentiating salaries, this was facilitating to SAMWU's interest of a living wage, in that like-graded occupations at the bottom of the structure could be identified for equal treatment, while those in the middle to higher levels were treated with all like-graded posts of comparable worth.
Chapter Number 9

IMPACT ON EMPLOYEES OF THE NEW GRADING OF POSTS

9.1 INTRODUCTION

It is proposed in this chapter to examine the effects on employees by means of a number of differing indicators. In the first instance, the trade unions could be seen to be articulators of the members they represent. Bearing in mind that in terms of the closed shop agreement all employees are members of one of the two unions, this would be representative of the entire staff of the organisation. The consultative process through the Shop Steward structure down to shop floor level does in the case of SAMWU in particular ensure a very high degree of representativeness. Allied to this is the communication channel open to employees by way of union publications to enable expression of individual views. In the third instance, there is a wealth of information that can be collected by participant techniques. However, by far the most useful indication for analysis was the degree, extent and nature of employee grievances which arose out of the implementation of job evaluation results, particularly in the context of one of the important objectives identified in Chapter 1. namely to minimise grievances over pay by reducing the scope of grievances and providing an agreed upon procedure for appeals, grievances, and their treatment. In the final analysis therefore for employees the criterion will primarily be perception or otherwise of a "felt fair" result.
9.2 EQUITY THEORY

9.2.1 Jacques: Norms of Felt Fair Payment

Equity theory is the most directly applicable theory to job evaluation. It will be recalled that in Chapter 1 (section 1.6.3.1) Jacques' time-span of discretion method was discussed. It was stated that Jacques claimed that individuals have an intuitive awareness of what are fair levels of payment for various types of jobs. Jacques suggested "the existence of an unrecognized system of norms of fair payment for any given level of work, unconscious knowledge of these norms being shared amongst the population engaged in employment work" (Jacques, 1971:46 in Biesheuvel, 1985:39). This idea of intuitive norms of felt fair payment for any given level of work, provided for a concept of equity in describing his scale of felt fair differential payments. For the purposes of this discussion it is also pertinent to note that these norms according to Jacques are universal, that is the differential between any two levels of felt fair payment for two given time spans is the same whatever country (Paterson, 1972:100-101).

It could be said at this point that for the majority of employees the "felt fair" reaction will depend primarily on the differentials between grades rather than on actual rates of pay. It can be expected that the focus will be directed at jobs about which they have some direct knowledge in their own occupational grouping rather than with the equity of the gradings and job hierarchy as a whole. In terms of job evaluation objectives the concern is expected to be more with internal consistency than with the external market. Jacques also noted that all industrial disputes about payment were at source differential disputes relating to the distribution of income (Elizur, 1980:16).
Adams' (1963) concept of equity is derived from Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance and based on a process of social comparison. In Adams' exposition he refers principally to wage inequities. His concept of equity rests on an individual's perceived balance between his inputs and outcomes. On the input side of the exchange are education, experience, training skill, seniority, age, sex, ethnic background, work status etc. and very importantly the amount of effort expended on the job. The outcomes which represent the other side of the exchange are the rewards received by the individual for his services such as pay, rewards intrinsic to the job, seniority benefits, fringe benefits, job status, status symbols etc. These factors are as perceived by the individuals and may not correspond to the perception of the other party in the exchange.

Perceived equity or inequity arises from an individual when he compares his own input-outcome ratio, consciously or unconsciously with what is perceived to be the ratio of another person(s). Adams (1963 : 424) thus states that inequity exists whenever a person's perceived job inputs and/or outcomes stand psychologically in obverse relation to what he perceives are the inputs and/or output of other. Inequity can thus exist for a person not only when he is relatively underpaid, but when he is relatively overpaid. The presence of inequity, according to Adams creates tension in the individual proportional to the magnitude of inequity present. The presence of inequity will motivate a person to achieve equity or reduce inequity. This can be achieved by varying their inputs or outcomes in a number of ways for example increasing or decreasing inputs or outcomes, leave the field, psychologically distort his inputs and outcomes, or change their comparative reference group (Adams 1963 : 427 - 429). (If Adams' postulations can be accepted then Jacques' system of equitable payment based on intuitive feelings of felt fair pay could provide a means to elimination of inequity. The practical difficulties of measurement as previously discussed make this system untenable,
however).

Adams conception of how individuals respond to inequity suggests that an individual will first try to change inputs or outcomes. If unsuccessful he will attempt to change perceptions and failing this then withdraw from the situation.

9.2.3 Value of Equity theory

Equity theory highlights the importance for organisations to manage perceptions of inequity amongst its workers. While job evaluation provides a means for organisations to establish equitable pay, the concepts outlined above provide a useful framework for analysing employee reaction to the new relativities which were created as a result of job evaluation. The question which can therefore be posed is to what extent did the implementation of job evaluation in the City Council impact on the presence of perceptions of inequity amongst employees. This is a difficult question to answer particularly in view of the fact that it can only be suggested that areas of inequity were implied by the presence of protagonists of job evaluation. The degree and extent to which grievances arose out of the implementation of results, provides a more useful indicator of perceptions of inequity, and it is in this area that the concepts of equity theory prove valuable.

9.3 ACCEPTANCE OF JOB EVALUATION BY UNION MEMBERSHIP

Before considering the extent of employee grievance, it is necessary to highlight two important aspects. It should firstly be remembered that both trade unions
played a central role in ensuring the implementation of job evaluation. It can be accepted that in applying the democratic process of consultation through the shop steward system down to the shop floor, SAMWU's decision reflected the will of rank and file membership. There is evidence of numerous meetings having taken place on this issue with feelings fed back up to the Executive. As far as SAAME was concerned, a special meeting was convened to consider the job evaluation proposals in conjunction with a general adjustment as described in the previous chapters, and voted overwhelmingly in favour of acceptance, in spite of some strongly worded protests from a number of members.

9.4 IMMEDIATE MONETARY BENEFITS TO EMPLOYEES

The second aspect relates to the monetary benefit that was afforded to employees arising directly out of job evaluation implementation. The effect of changes in grading has already been demonstrated in Chapter 7 (section 7.6.3.2 and Figure 7.23). Table 9.1 below reflects the distribution of notch adjustments by grade to convert employees from the old to the new post-job evaluation grading structure.

From the table it can be seen that over 60 percent of employees did not gain any immediate monetary benefit from the implementation formula. Of those that did gain, the majority enjoyed a one notch increase in salary. It should however be pointed out that in most cases the new scale to which employees were assigned had a higher maximum salary thus enabling improved aspirations in the future. Many employees who had previously been on the maximum notch of their previous scale of pay, were afforded the opportunity of once again being able to enjoy advancements within the new scale parameters. The above facts should therefore be weighed against union cultivated employee expectations that job evaluation was to "more than make up" for inadequate general adjustments.
negotiated in the years during which job evaluation was ongoing.

### Table 9.1

**DISTRIBUTION OF NOTCH ADJUSTMENTS BY GRADE FROM OLD TO NEW POST JOB EVALUATION SCALES OF PAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAND</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9.5 THE EMPLOYEES' "RIGHT OF APPEAL"

Any perceptions of inequity arising out of the implementation of job evaluation on the part of the employee were provided for by the elaborate appeal procedure. The structure of such procedure has already been previously discussed in Chapter 6 (section 6.4.11.5 and Figure 6.12) and Chapter 8 (section 8.10.1). From the individual's point of view each employee was informed of the effect on their positions of the implementation of job evaluation. A further advice to staff members stated that
"should you consider that your post has been inappropriately graded, an appeal against the grading may be made within 90 days from the date hereof, i.e. by 1987-12-31 by notifying the Head of your Department in writing on the prescribed 'Request for Appeal' form or alternatively by approaching your Staff Association directly".

In terms of the appeal procedure, employees were required to motivate an appeal and list the reasons for the appeal against the grading of the post. An information outline was also provided to each 'prospective appellant' providing an overview of the critical steps in the process of the evaluation. The basis upon which appeals were to be assessed were those identical factors that guided finalisation of the adopted grading.

The two main factors were:

- points scored by the job (internal value);
- going market rate of the job (external value) at the time of determination;

Other factors included:

- the traditional/historical position of the post;
- the position of related/similar posts;
- the nature of other posts in the same grade;
- maintenance of the hierarchical structure;
- internal consistency.

The first two factors were the predominant ones, with the remainder being additional support factors. In applying these considerations cognisance was to be given to the balance of weight in favour or against. Any single factor, although applicable, was not to be regarded as necessarily sufficient to justify appeal.
Claims on the part of employees for reinstatement based purely on traditional relationships were to be rejected since this was seen as being in conflict with the objectives of job evaluation in the first instance, namely the realignment of relativity and ranking order.

9.6 THE QUANTUM OF APPEAL

Table 9.2 reflects the number of appeals registered by the Department Appeals Committees of the respective departments and Table 9.3 those registered by the Unions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF APPELLANTS REGISTERING APPEALS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DESIGNATIONS PER DEPARTMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Administration</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Engineer's</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planner's</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Electrical Engineer's</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Treasurer's</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Health</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Town Clerk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This column does not tally up to the total since there are designations common to more than one department. The total reflects each designation once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNION</th>
<th>NUMBER SUBMITTED</th>
<th>IN FIRST INSTANCE</th>
<th>FOLLOWING REJECTION BY DAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMWU</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAME</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the surface it appears that a substantial number of appeals were registered. It is difficult to determine exactly how many employees were affected in view of
the fact that these numbers represent entirely individual appeals as well as multiple group appeals. In some groupings each individual employee registered a separate appeal while in others a representative appeal was submitted for the group. In the case of those appeals submitted by SAMWU, it was estimated to cover about 1 900 employees. Of those submitted by SAAME all were individual appeals. It is estimated that on the basis of either employees affected or designations included, the appeal factor was upward of 15%. This represents a substantial grouping of employees. There is however virtually no published data available in order to assess this factor against organisational norms. Information gathered from other local authorities in South Africa reveals substantially lower appeal factors in these organisations (Industrial Council of Cape Province).

9.6.1 Factors Influencing Appeal Ratio

The question therefore arises as to what explanations might there be for the high incidence of appeals recorded. It is suggested that a number of factors are relevant.

The massaging process created a perception (amongst some senior officials) that the system was capable of being manipulated. In so far as this perception had foundation it is suggested that the chances of upgrading an appeal were assessed as being positive. The massaging process particularly contributed to this belief that the points could be changed. In this context a number of employees became aware that their posts were massaged down and thus felt in a strong position to appeal on the basis of the original points scored. Further since the grading was based on a sample of representative jobs, many employees felt that their particular
post was worthy of separate evaluation as a unique case (See Table 9.4). Secondly the fact that the majority of employees did not gain immediately from implementation was contrasted sharply with the high expectations which were created by SAAME in particular and exacerbated by the protraction in implementation allowing this to build up over time.

A third very significant aspect relates to the prevailing culture of pertaining to employee rights to appeal decisions. This is particularly prevalent in the case of appointments where the right of appeal against an appointment by an internal applicant is institutionalised and frequently availed by employees supported by the trade unions. The available system of recourse as provided for in the Conditions of Service and By-Law 1994 has institutionalised "appeal" as a non-threatening and easily accessible recourse. This has created a climate in the organisation whereby employees demonstrate a high sense of awareness of rights and a reliance on union resources. This is in turn channelled by a proactive union presence which provides a strong support system to aggrieved employees. The Unions are thus able to play a pivotal role and are able to demonstrate achievement through such opportunity.

In terms of the "Appeal Procedure", each department was required to establish a Departmental Appeal Committee. During this screening process a number of appeals were rejected resulting in a lesser number being considered by the Central Evaluation Committee. A number of these rejected appeals were referred to the unions who resubmitted them on behalf of the appellants (See Table 9.3).

9.7 AN ANALYSIS OF THE BASIS OF APPEAL - APPLYING EQUITY THEORY

An analysis of the basis of appeals has revealed that a substantial proportion
were grounded in the relative position of the newly graded positions.

Table 9.4 reflects the frequency of responses to perceptions of inequity that arose out of the new grading structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR OF APPEAL</th>
<th>% FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relativity to other Posts/Jobs</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness of Post relative to other similarly designated posts</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised Nature of Post/Job and Responsibilities</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary unrelated to Market</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate Evaluation/Description</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not evaluated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Historical Position</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Formula</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Factor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Position</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that for the majority of appellants the "felt fair" reaction focused primarily on differentials between gradings. The most theoretically and empirically important referents have indeed been found to be internal comparisons with persons holding the same or different positions within the same organisation, and external comparisons with persons similarly employed in other organisations (Martin and Peterson, 1987 : 298).

In these instances the focus was directed at jobs about which employees had some direct knowledge in their own occupational grouping. Three examples will illustrate this phenomenon more pointedly and provide evidence in direct support of the theory of inequity.
What is also relevant is that the assumption of Jacques that an individual is aware of his own capacity of worth and his level of work and of the discrepancy between what he actually receives and what would be equitable pay for his work is also aligned to the perception prevalent amongst employees that their job is unique to the point of defying written description. This is supported by a qualitative analysis of submissions made and in numerous discussions with individual employees.

9.7.1 Inequity in the relationship between Professional Assistants and Engineering Assistants

The above case deals with the relationship of two groupings of employees - Professional Assistants or Technicians and Engineering Assistants or Artisans. Both groups are engaged in technical activities in the engineering and allied fields. Professional Assistants and subsequent levels through to Chief Professional Assistant were one grade behind that of the corresponding levels of Engineering Assistant, whereas the traditional position of these posts had been that they were directly aligned.

Work content in many instances is very closely aligned and the choice of either one or other designation often reflects purely the different technical streams along which the incumbents acquired requisite training.

Indeed in many respects the Professional Assistant enjoyed a higher status by virtue of the tertiary training undertaken at the Technikons as a requirement of appointment as compared to the artisan apprenticeship training of the Engineering Assistants. The anomaly of the new relationship was underscored by the fact that an artisan who becomes higher qualified and thus eligible for appointment as a Professional Assistant found himself in a less advantageous position than if he had remained an Engineering Assistant with a lower qualification.
Applying the concepts of equity theory, the inputs of Professional Assistants were higher than those of Engineering Assistants since they held substantially higher tertiary technical qualifications, namely the National Diploma for Technicians (T3) and in some instances the National Higher Diploma (T4) and Diploma in Technology (T5) and certain aspects of their outcomes were higher such as status, less physical content to their jobs, they were more closely associated with professionals, yet their pay was lower than Engineering Assistant for corresponding levels.

It is suggested therefore that from the discrepancies between inputs and outcomes as described above inequity existed. The outcomes of Professional Assistants were too low compared to their own inputs and to the inputs and outcomes of Engineering Assistants. This situation was exacerbated by comparison of the inputs and outcomes of Technicians in other organisations. On the basis of this analysis Professional Assistants felt therefore justified in submitting an appeal, and were rewarded by having the entire structure upgraded and realigned with that of Engineering Assistant. It could be argued that this was still not equitable, but this having restored what was a traditional historical relationship, was thus perceived as recreating equilibrium once again. This affected 103 employees whose grading was adjusted upward as a result.

### 9.7.2 The Case of the Road Roller Drivers

The appeal of the Road Roller Drivers is yet another illustrative case of employee response to perceived inequity. Road Roller Drivers, are part of the larger grouping of Motor Vehicle Drivers. Traditionally Road Roller Driver was a promotional avenue for heavy duty motor vehicle drivers. This relationship was disturbed when SAMWU’s pre job evaluation representations to the Council for the upgrading of the Motor Vehicle Driver family, resulted in heavy duty drivers being regrouped into the same category as Road Roller Drivers. The Council was not
prepared to consider further regrouping demands and held the position that all anomalies would be regularised through job evaluation. Job evaluation however resulted in the two categories both being graded in the same band and thus did not address the perceived anomaly. Road Roller Drivers perceived their higher inputs through a greater degree of skill and precision required in carrying out their functions, for the identical pay. They felt that their promotion had been taken away from them. The Road Roller Drivers thus demanded one of two ways of reducing the inequity - either by upgrading their jobs relative to heavy duty Motor Vehicle Drivers to align with extra heavy duty Motor Vehicle Drivers, to which level they could in any event have aspired as an alternative to Road Roller Driver, or if this did not succeed, reverting to their former designation and thereby holding less responsibility for the same financial reward.

9.8 FURTHER EXAMPLES OF INEQUITY

A similar attempt to seek equity arose with regard to certain categories of Inspectorate Staff - employees with artisan based training in the mechanical electrical, and building trades, many of whom were appointed from the ranks of Foremen and Senior Foremen, who although graded the same historically, accepted a sideways promotion because of the shorter working hours and white collar status. Inspectors found themselves graded below Senior Foreman. From the point of view of the evaluation system this was found to be justified since Inspectors worked within a very narrow field and had no supervisory responsibilities although they required extensive experience as artisans to perform effectively. As a group they sought upgrading to align with what they regarded as appropriate internal comparisons, some sought reversion to their former occupation of Senior Foreman.
As has been noted in paragraph 9.7 much of the dissatisfaction arose precisely out of changes in relativity to similarly designated and other posts. While the above examples are illustrative of anomalies, one occupation relative to another, it was also always assumed that the higher graded of the related groupings was the "correct" one. In the numerous other cases however, the reaction to loss of relative status was linked to other but unrelated posts in the job hierarchy. These examples serve to reflect an inability to accept that a change in the job hierarchy was justified. One illustrative example is that of a group of officers who appealed their grading not on the basis of an under evaluation, but purely because, of the various posts that were previously paid the same, theirs was the lowest graded in the new hierarchy. It was indeed found that others had perceived this job as having been over-graded in the old structure.

9.9 BREADTH OF ACCEPTANCE

Although, as was stated in paragraph 9.3 the majority of SAAME membership voted in favour of job evaluation implementation, it must also be stated that few understood fully the implications. The value or otherwise could only be measured in terms of immediate monetary benefit to employees. In so far as 60% of employees derived no immediate benefit, it could thus be argued that job evaluation was perceived by employees as having no impact as indicated by personal benefit. Indeed, although SAAME leadership proposed a vote of acceptance, the editorial of the Union magazine, SAAME News continued to deride job evaluation as ineffective and a failure. (SAAME News September/October 1987; May/June 1987; September/October 1987). Moreover the columns to the Editor enjoyed high profile anti-job evaluation correspondence (SAAME News November/December 1987; September/October 1987; May/June 1987). Typically
It was stated that "job evaluation has done nothing for 60% of the workers ...."

It was apparent too that employees were lacking in understanding of the broader concept and objectives of job evaluation and focused exclusively on its failure to bring salary increases on an across-the-board basis.

As far as SAMWU members were concerned, a significant number of occupations traditionally occupied by membership were upgraded as a result of new internal relativities attained. This is particularly evident with regard to the unskilled career path leading from labourer through to labourer leading hand, to gan~er and the consequent levels of Foreman Class C, B and A. It was these supervisory categories drawn from unskilled occupation that although traditionally dominated by one race group in the Western Cape labour market benefitted from a 'colour' blind system, even making allowance for bias from fore knowledge of existing pay level. Table 9.5 reflects the change in proportion of average earnings of SAMWU compared to SAAME membership prior to and following the implementation of job evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Coloured Earnings</th>
<th>Black Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1986</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1987</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1988</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates a marginally increased proportion following the implementation of job evaluation.
A comparison of the structural distribution of membership affiliation before and after job evaluation also reflects a change in the relative position of employees.

### TABLE NUMBER 9.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME CATEGORY * (RPA)</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1988</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 40 000 001</td>
<td>0,84</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 001 - 40 000</td>
<td>1,85</td>
<td>4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 001 - 35 000</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>5,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 001 - 30 000</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>14,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 001 - 25 000</td>
<td>14,5</td>
<td>21,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 001 - 20 000</td>
<td>30,4</td>
<td>40,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 000</td>
<td>87,2</td>
<td>88,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Base Year Figures 1988

However, significant groupings of SAMWU membership continue to display dissatisfaction with job evaluation gradings. In this regard a number of grievances are still outstanding. Most notable are recent submissions by a large grouping of heavy duty motor vehicle drivers who have organised on a group wide basis to press for their grievances to further be addressed.

In the Union's view, job evaluation instead of improving satisfaction, has resulted in frustration and demotivation by workers whose grievances are not in their perception being addressed.

### 9.10 LOSS OF SENIORITY

The issue of loss of seniority has been addressed in previous sections of this report. It should however be stated here, that this is one of the important contributory factors to perceptions of inequity. One of the most highly valued inputs in the public sector, that of length of service was seen as effectively diminished by the implementation formula. Briefly, the implementation formula was such that any employee whose current salary fell within the new salary range was transferred to the new scale at the same pay whereas all those whose salaries
were below the minimum salary of the new scale were converted to that minimum. Whereas individuals with longer experience were notched at a higher level in the previous scales, conversion to the new scales of pay often resulted in more junior employees "catching up" in terms of earnings. This most valued input namely 'seniority' did not contribute to any higher outcome and therefore was seen as inequitable.

It is not intended here to debate the merits or demerits of the implementation formula, but to identify the subjective perceptions of employees themselves. This was found to be particularly high in frustration for employees since it was not considered to be a factor for appeal, which as has been previously discussed, was confined to the grading of the post.

The implementation formula thus pursued by SAAME involved placing each employee on the new scale in the same relative position as was the case on the old scale. Employee reaction to this disturbance of the relative positions within occupations highlighted the sensitivity and value placed on seniority as a heavily weighted input.

9.11 SUMMARY

In summary it can be stated that while a substantial number of employees benefitted with immediate effect, and most enjoyed long term enhancement, a significant degree of dissatisfaction existed with the new relativities. It has been helpful to examine these perceived inequities in terms of equity theory which reinforces and in turn has been reinforced by the findings reflected with regard to employee grievances. It is suggested that the organisation and employees alike, while having experienced a turbulent period, can only assess the real benefit
within the longer term. Although management prognosis of employee dissatisfaction did indeed prove correct, the degree to which this was anticipated was not realised.
In this chapter the major recurring themes will be drawn together. Theoretical and practical implications will be aired and recommendations with regard to the case in particular and job evaluation in general shall be put forward with particular reference to public institutions.

In dealing with the issues it is again useful to consider the analysis in terms of the three distinguishable yet inseparable facets of job evaluation - what Cogill (1984) refers to as CONTENT, PROCESS and VALUE. Content refers primarily to the conceptual, theoretical and technical bases of the job evaluation system being used. Process refers to the processes and procedures adopted for instilling the system. Highly related and interwoven with the above two is the acceptance of the system by both employees and management and their perception of its ability to reflect fair pay. Having analysed the system and its application from the point of view of the principal role players, it is now apposite to attempt to answer the question as to what, it any, benefits did the organisation and its members derive, with particular reference to the objectives set, and secondly how and in what way could the system and its application be changed should the former answer not be an affirmative. Further what specific guidelines can be distilled from the case study that will have wider applicability.
10.2 ISSUES RELATIVE TO RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The acceptability of job evaluation in practice as a determinant of pay, as well as its theoretical acceptability, will depend on its reliability and validity.

A reliable job evaluation system must produce the same result at different points in time (assuming the content of jobs had not changed) with the same (or different) group of raters applying the same measuring instruments (Livy, 1975). In reviewing the Five Factor System and its application, the question of reliability should it is suggested, be examined longitudinally. Evidence provided in section 7.6.1.2 on the discrepancy in results attained on the sample of jobs in the Pilot Phase and Full Project provides a powerful indictment on the reliability of the instrument. This however should be adjudged by the fact that the main cause for variance is error and bias in human judgement.

Job evaluation is not scientific - one author has described its measurement as "a way of dressing up opinions as numbers" (Cowan, 1985:102). Yet another has described it as science fiction (Elliot, 1960). I do not believe any serious claims to being scientific should be made. It is however an attempt to systematise procedures and provide a tool of analysis without which decisions about pay would be even more subjective. Aspiring to greater consistency of judgement may be viewed as attaining a state where the system is administered on the basis of consensus. In a study by Taft (1962) into the qualities necessary for good judgement, it was found that a high degree of motivation on the part of raters to secure reliable judgements was the most important quality. In this sense then it may be argued that the conscious development of a corporate approach described in section 7.5.4 and current evidence of collective understanding in the application of agreed upon norms has enhanced reliability in the application of the Five Factor
System. This greater degree of corporate concern has been evident in the present maintenance procedures of the system.

However, such variation as was evident between the pilot and full project may be traced to the lack of clarity of the factor scale definitions. The fact that 83% of re-evaluated jobs received different scores on appeal is also cause for concern from the point of view of the reliability of the system. (It will be recalled however that a significant part of this variation was also attributed to a conscious attempt at correction of inflated results.) On the other hand, the absence of significant differences in outcomes of the three evaluation panels within the full project provides a more encouraging sign of consistency. While a new set of norms and standards in the full project has become firmly set, the room for such variation of interpretation restricts use of the system to the experienced experts. It will thus be recommended that the factor scale definitions be redefined and all rules be comprehensively documented to reflect the interpretations that have become practice. This will enhance the likelihood of different assessors arriving at the same results when using the measuring instruments which is at present the preserve of a select group of panel members.

Low reliability adversely affects validity, although it does not follow that validity will be high if reliability is high. Validity is concerned with the accuracy of job evaluation as an instrument of measurement. The question posed in section 7.6.1.3 - does the system in fact measure differentials between jobs? - or does it in fact measure something else? - is pertinent at this point. The arbitrariness of factor choice and factor weightings discussed in section 7.6.1.3 most decidedly affects the validity of a point factor system. However, as Livy (1975) has pointed out, we need to accept making do with a system which is less than perfect because we can do no better, provided however, we are aware of its imperfections.
To answer the question of whether a system is valid or not, one must first specify what one is trying to measure. Because job evaluation has varying objectives, the validity of a system cannot be determined in general terms. Such a question also ignores the secondary benefits that derive from job evaluation. Officials involved in the process thus gained a valuable insight into the workings of the organisation and experienced personal growth and development. It facilitated identifying overlapping in job demarcation lines and imbalances in the mix of routine and skilled functions contained in a singular job. Other organisational imbalances in structure are also able to be identified. But because it meant different things to different interest groups - unions, EXCO, management, employees - the question of validity becomes a difficult one to answer. In the light however of the evidence discussed earlier in Chapter 3 of the high average intercorrelation across a variety of jobs using different job evaluation methods, it appears to make no difference what system is used. Does this not suggest that they all measure more or less the same thing?

Although it is often stated that point factor systems, because of the variety of criteria included, enjoy greater face validity, it has been shown that management and unions alike did not accept the criteria upon which the system was based. This aspect proved sufficient to cause the withdrawal of SAMWU from participation. It has been shown too that compensable factors are value laden - workers, trade unions, management all have differing views about what is compensable and by how much. In view of the findings in section 7.6.1.3 it will be recommended that the set of criteria be simplified in ongoing system maintenance. It is further recommended that a system be developed for the grading of "abnormal physical content" allowances. This will serve the dual purpose of introducing hardship factors as compensable, without contaminating basic pay, particularly in cases where such conditions are not continuous. This it is argued will be found acceptable to both union and management officials alike
who have indicated strong preference for the inclusion of such factors, while at the same time not further complicating the system by adding yet another factor.

Compensable factors included in the Five Factor System reflect a traditionalist value orientation. In this regard such evaluation systems often value managing large staff, and controlling large budgets. It has been suggested, however, that modern organisations place less value on these factors. Such value systems also conflict with the idea of getting the job done more economically and with fewer staff. There were indeed numerous instances where such traditional organisational structuring did not apply - in particular to high level specialists where creativity, problem solving etc. were of far greater importance than managing a large staff. In this respect it is therefore recommended that modification of the application of over narrowly defined factors be introduced with the atrophy of such factors as Factor 4A which specifically rewards presence of subordinate staff. This clearly encourages the uneconomic creation of additional jobs to ensure desired grading for the high level specialists. This was evident with the application of the Hay System as well where more easily quantifiable disciplines were seen to be favoured by the system. Traditional point factor systems almost never give as much value to high levels of technical skill as they do to breadth of managerial ability. For this reason it has been argued that they do not support the needs of the modern organisation (Candrilli and Armagast, 1987).

Significantly, there are currently examples of a rethink into the traditional static "value to the organisation" approach in favour of pay systems based on employees' "outputs" (e.g. Lawler, 1987; Snelgar, 1988). This provides an entirely different value orientation for organisations by focusing on people's skills and proficiencies in preference to the fundamental underlying principle of job evaluation - namely, people are worth what they do. This implies an approach to human resources which focuses on the people rather than on the job (Lawler,
Patten (1977(b): 7-8) has suggested that job evaluation needs to break out of its traditional frame of reference by looking to the behavioural elements inherent in the duties performed by the individual, rather than approach these as subdivisions of the organisation. Such an approach would require assessing how the position and its incumbent relate in a multi-dimensional organisational environment rather than focus on the job as separate from the individual performing it, as is prevailing job evaluation ideology. The incumbent's skills, experiences, attitudes and knowledge brought to the job and displayed in performing it, would be emphasised rather than adherence to the ideal requirements demanded of bureaucratic theory. Patten (1977(b):8) states that under these conditions job evaluation would make much more use of the concepts of role (based on the incumbent's perceptions of job objectives) and status (based on expectancies of formal and informal organisations).

10.2.1 The Job Description

The job description is technically the most important variable in the whole evaluation process. It is the fundamental starting point. Any error or bias in the presentation of the factual evidence will be compounded throughout the procedure, affecting reliability and more particularly, validity of the entire exercise (Livy, 1975:123). The variable quality of the job descriptions proved to be a fundamental flaw in the Five Factor System. This is empirically verifiable by inspection, and management and union representatives alike were found to be in full agreement. The perceptions of management in this regard have been documented in section 7.6.2.1 and can be supported by the facts. SAMWU identified this aspect early in the job describing phase (Memorandum 1984-03-11). It must further be concluded that the use of two separate job description forms - the abbreviated version for hourly paid occupations markedly affected validity.
quite apart from the discriminatory overtones which it implies. In practice, various standards were found to apply notwithstanding the checks and balances which were built into the procedure. Studies have shown that longer, more detailed descriptions tend to inflate assessments, but more important, provided job descriptions are of uniform length and detail, ratings will be consistent (U S Air Force Studies, Livy 1975:123). It will therefore be recommended that to attain descriptions of standardised depth and breadth, these be compiled by trained analysts. It will further be recommended that Union participation in the job analysis be implemented. While management may resist this on the ground that it remains its perogative to define and design jobs, and this is not disputed, where a de facto approach such as that in the City Council is adopted, in contrast to a prescriptive one, workers need to be satisfied that what they actually do is acknowledged and rewarded. It is considered that consensus on this fundamental edifice at an early stage will enhance the validity and thereby acceptability of the results. It provides further the secondary benefit of providing training to union officials and professional middle managers and thereby a mechanism which has the potential for contributing to improved employee-employer relations. It will further contribute to the stated objective of minimising employee grievances.

10.2.2 Massaging Process

One measure of the validity of a job evaluation system is whether the results achieved are accepted as just and fair. If it leads to a higher degree of satisfaction amongst employees and management, this would also serve to demonstrate validity. Rejection by senior management was quantified by the degree to which massaging took place. It could be argued however, that were validity of the instrument conclusively demonstrated, it is however doubtful that acceptance would have been at any higher a level. This poses serious problems with job evaluation per se since it thus suggests that the proviso for demonstrated validity would be a system which underwrites the status quo. Any deviation from
the existing hierarchy would be considered invalid. If this were indeed the case, Livy's suggestion that job evaluation is perhaps a myth may be taken more seriously.

The implication is that organisations need to display a preparedness to use job evaluation as a diagnostic aid in examining deviations from the status quo. It provides the opportunity for organisational review as a first step prior to considering restoring any former relativities that may be deemed warranted. It should therefore be stated that to judge job evaluation on the basis of capacity for perfect measurement misses the point completely. Job evaluation is about reaching organisational consensus on the relative value of jobs. Plachy (1987:31) has stated that "point factor evaluation is designed and implemented through concepts, and techniques of communications, perceptions and group dynamics, with measurement taking its proper place as a by-product".

10.3 RESISTANCE TO CHANGE

In section 1.8 the question of job evaluation's contribution to change was considered on three levels. Its impact on organisational team building was also discussed in section 7.5.4. Such evidence provided positive signs of change on the second level - that of providing management with an opportunity for a higher level of functioning (see section 1.8.2).

The question now to be considered is why did senior management display such resistance to job evaluation? Before offering some answers it should be restated that, although job evaluation was recognised in section 1.8.1 as a mechanism for identifying change rather than being an instrument of change, it is argued here that such differences are not distinguishable from the perspective of those
individuals to be affected. Indeed, a new mechanism for determining pay is in itself a change in procedure. That this procedure can lead to the introduction of a new structure, yet unknown, which has the potential to alter conditions of employment, status and earnings, almost inevitably provides a recipe for resistance on the common sense approach to human nature.

Generally, it can be stated that any change that is perceived as beneficial will be accepted, and any that is perceived as potentially harmful will be resisted. The reason for resistance may be examined from a number of relevant approaches.

Self interest theories argue that people have vested interests in the status quo and therefore any changes that threaten those interests are resisted (Moerdyk and Fone, 1988). Changes such as those related to administrative procedures or in conditions of employment are seen as disturbing the organisational equilibrium and thus homeostatic forces arise which counteract the change in order to restore the equilibrium of the status quo. Yet another within this group of theories sees resistance to change arising from uncertainty about the outcomes of the change process - the fear of loss of earnings or status is particularly relevant in this instance.

Various personality theories have attempted to explain the differences in individual responses to change. In the organisational context the 'traditionalist' of Barnes (1967) or the 'conserver' of Patti (1974) is identified as a change-averter, who is mainly concerned with maintaining his position and the routine within the organisation. Allied to this is the concept of conservatism as defined in the Penguin Dictionary of Psychology (1985:149) as a view which defends the status quo; argues that change is to be resisted; believes current modes of functioning should be maintained, and maintains that where change is necessary it should be gradual and within the existing framework. This latter view is exemplified by the
point raised in section 7.6.3.2 where one senior manager stated that changes that were indicated following job evaluation should be accommodated within the existing grading schedule.

Particularly relevant to the empirical data presented earlier, is the 'not invented here syndrome'. Mercer (1986) argues that this is the most important reason for accounting for resistance to change. Local circumstances are seen as special and 'imported' solutions are considered inappropriate for the particular problem. This NIH rationalisation thus requires that even if a problem is acknowledged, the solution needs to be worked out locally. In the case of the City Council, the examples of both the early attempts at employing external consultants by the Executive Committee, the experience of the HAY-MSL evaluation and the reaction to the change agent and the imported Five Factor System, provide sufficient evidence of the applicability of this theory.

Having regard to the foregoing and the evidence described in earlier chapters, it is proposed that the following factors contributed to the resistance to change by management:

- traditionalism (conservatism) prevalent in local government organisational culture;
- comfort with the status quo and the traditional methods for doing things;
- uncertainty/insecurity about possible outcomes;
- lack of identification that there was a problem which required solution;
- imposition of an "external" system;
- acceptability of the change agent;
- no commitment to either the need for solution or the method chosen to arrive at it.
10.4 ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES

The vital test relates to the attainment or otherwise of objectives. While this study does not purport to be a "value for money" audit, this issue is important from the point of view of principal actors. In section 1.4 the general consensus of objectives which are attainable by job evaluation were identified. It has also been pointed out in the discussion on reliability and validity earlier in this chapter that job evaluation can mean different things to different people.

10.4.1 The Executive Committee

From the Executive Committee's perspective, a comprehensive compensation plan did not materialise. A structure based on job content and relevant labour markets is indeed intact, but the improvement of efficiency, productivity and a competitive system of reward for excellence needs to go beyond the structural framework that has been implemented. To this extent it should be concluded that job evaluation did not provide the Executive Committee the panacea envisaged. Having arisen consistently out of deadlock on pay negotiations, it has provided however the means to implementing differential adjustments based on structural divisions. In the 1988 salary and wage negotiations, the Executive Committee was thus able to successfully negotiate a differentiated adjustment, thus providing a landmark move away from the traditional percentage across-the-board approaches of the past. This was specifically facilitated by the ability to align the evaluated job structure with market pay by enabling comparability with job evaluated salary surveys. This successfully concluded negotiation resulted in millions of rands in savings on the salary and wage budget for 1988/89 and could be argued to have offset to a large degree the considerable costs involved in implementing job evaluation. For the Executive Committee however, the implementation of job evaluation must also be understood as a political decision. For the investment
of time, money and expectations created, some result had to be demonstrated. The attainment of further efficiencies will depend however how in the future the structure is managed.

10.4.2 Compensation Specialists

From the perspective of the compensation specialists although management discretion had a significant effect on relativities, it could be said that a greater degree of internal consistency presently prevails. The attainment of a basis for a more objective and rational internal wage structure can be said therefore to have been partial.

A 26 grade structure with defined point ranges provides a framework for regulating the pay system and a means for ranking new and changing jobs. Creation of new posts and restructuring of existing organisation have been found to be addressed in more demanding a vein with greater degree of justification required. The means now exists whereby realistic comparisons of wage and salary rates of competing organisations and basic information for wage negotiations and wage determination can be exploited. The library of job descriptions provides job information for a variety of purposes.

Job evaluation has interestingly led to an upsurge in pay grievances arising therefrom. The objectives from management's point of view of limiting such grievances by providing an agreed upon procedure must however be carefully assessed. It must be understood that job evaluation has provided the vehicle through which pay grievances could be channelled. It thus has had the effect of bringing out dormant concerns about pay equity. It has also however given rise to concerns of perceived inequity in the new order. It is not possible to predict the outcome of the process at this point, but the successful resolution of such grievances has the potential for attaining a higher plane of pay equity than was
10.4.3 The Unions

The differing union perspectives as highlighted in chapter 8 reflect entirely different emphases and expectations of results. Whilst SAAME’s orientation was exclusively geared to overall monetary benefit, SAMWU was concerned with equity on the basis of job content. While the former attempted participative influence, the latter chose negotiation on the basis of results. From SAAME’s perspective, the large number of employees who were dissatisfied by the realisation of no immediate monetary benefit undermined its original motivation for participation. Paradoxically, from the perspective of goal attainment, the high profile participative approach of SAAME did not in a comparative sense contribute to any higher goal attainment than the non-participative role of SAMWU in terms of its own objectives. Indeed it could be argued that SAMWU membership had more to gain from a system which introduced job content as a major variable, even though factors more favourable to that class of work were not part of the system’s criteria: to an extent, benefit to SAMWU membership was ‘built in’ to the rationale for job evaluation. Again, a definitive assessment is not possible at this stage since the appeal process remains unresolved. It is only after completion of this phase that the new structure can be finally assessed.

10.4.3.1 Future of Unions Role in Job Evaluation

The general question that arises here is what future role is there for trade unions in job evaluation? Cogill (1984) has shown in the four countries studied, South Africa included, that although unions were often responsible for putting the pressure on management to reduce anomalies, management initiated and developed job evaluation. Unions then ‘bought into’ the system by way of accepting high general increases in return over and above those that would normally be negotiated. As has been shown, this was the expectation of SAAME.
Cogill (1984:61) reaffirms that unions, however, have not institutionalised job evaluation because it is seen as restricting collective bargaining. It has the potential for putting them into a pay structure straightjacket. This is something SAAME also discovered in its pay negotiations with the City Council in July 1988. While it had theoretically accepted Council's new declared policy of a market-related pay review, when confronted with the consequences of a differentiated pay structure based on different levels of market relationship that had been determined for key points in the structure, this created a split in SAAME leadership and a complete loss of credibility in the eyes of a large portion of the membership who were unable to accept lower increases as justified by a market-related approach. Indeed, this in a sense reinforced the perception of job evaluation being used as a manipulative tool in restricting pay increases. The subsequent pay demand was styled in such a manner as to reverse the 1988 settlement.

Interestingly, as has been noted from the survey of local government usage, it is the industrial councils that have taken the lead in job evaluation application. This forum also provides for a greater degree of what Cogill (1984) has identified as the joint management - labour participation phase in a developmental view of the stages leading to acceptance of job evaluation by Unions. This also reflects the need identified in local government to move to more competitive wage administration systems, and it is also linked to the relative strength of union presence in the local government sector. Zimmerman (1985) has also pointed out that any company which adheres to a code of employment practice embracing equitable pay systems is almost obliged to look at the advantages of job evaluation. From the independent union movements' point of view, it is felt that job evaluation is likely to continue to be treated cautiously as conflicting preconditions need to be carefully reconciled. If it does not permit flexibility in wage bargaining or the opportunity for lifting the lower part of the pay curve, it
is likely to be by passed over as a legitimate means for pay negotiations. As Cogill (1984) suggests, once it is used to successfully narrow or limit the pay gap, it would have served its purpose in that respect, and attention is then likely to be turned to other centres of conflict.

10.5 A COMMON CAUSE

The study has however shown that certain fundamental pre-requisites are necessary to successfully undertake job evaluation. The very first precondition that was not met was agreement by all parties on the need for job evaluation. Without this fundamental commitment, success is not attainable. In the second instance it requires enunciation of clearly spelt out objectives against which the path of the project can be tested, and more importantly, objectives with which all participating parties are able to identify. The pursuance of objectives as outlined above, clearly reflects divergence to a point where varying expectations could not be met simultaneously. This highlights the third prerequisite, namely participation in decisions by those parties affected who are required to 'live with' the results. From the organisation's point of view this represents somewhat of a paradox, since the underlying motivation was to establish a framework for negotiation with the Unions.

10.5.1 Operating of the System

The lack of corporate common cause is exemplified by the way the system operated. Much of the arguments of the grading forum, however motivated by interests, reflected inconsistencies between complex subjective assessments and an imperfect measuring system. Both these factors were relevant to a point where in many instances "measurement" represented a quantification of subjective opinion. The multi-faceted tension created an association with the job evaluation
process that contaminated all genuine intention that it succeed. Job evaluation was assessed as conflict generating since it brought into focus differing interests, departmentalism and traditionalism. Two separate sets of rationality prevailed - on the one hand the traditionalist school of managers who "knew" the organisation, the job structures and its history, and on the other hand, a readiness for a more rational approach that was prepared to examine the job structure and how it worked. The tensions generated by these two approaches highlighted the need for value consensus within the organisation. Preconditions for acceptance of greater rationality become fundamental. The organisation requires a cultural readiness to absorb changes. The local authority setting creates its own peculiar tensions - in particular that between the elected representatives and the appointed officials. This goes beyond the issue of acceptability already discussed. The elected representatives coming from diverse backgrounds and fields represent a 'private enterprise' oriented approach to administration - a more dynamic value system to that prevalent in a non-profit service organisation, while senior management traditionally are officials who have been socialised in bureaucratic administration. Although part of the socialisation does indeed require a sensitivity to demands of political office bearers, this is in a sense an accommodation to their own perspectives.

The evolution of a more conscious corporate approach in system operation has however highlighted the positive benefits which such an exercise can provide. The operation of the system has presently reached a state of expertise that in many aspects renders the need to labour through a cumbersome evaluation superfluous. It was pointed out in section 1.6.1.2 that many organisations after completing job evaluation by another method evolve a classification system for maintenance purposes. It will be recommended therefore that the City Council embark upon this route and where consensus is not possible only then would it be necessary to use the formal system. In this regard it has been further
recommended that further research be undertaken with a view to simplifying the system by reducing the number of factors. Useful hunches have been provided in section 7.6.1.3 for pursuance of this exercise.

The issue of discriminability of factors at the lower end of the structure was also discussed in depth and it will be further recommended that the number of grades at this end of the structure can be reduced. It has been established that job evaluation is a crude measuring device and the margin of error is such that the fine distinctions required of the narrow banded structure at the lower end are unrealistic and impractical. This will however require reconciliation with the historically important promotional pyramids that have been institutionalised in the unskilled category of work.

10.6 SUMMARY

The study has illustrated how the introduction of job evaluation in the City Council arose out of the need to provide a framework for pay negotiations which became protracted and conflict ridden. This has been historically traced to illustrate the inevitability from the perspective of the policy makers. In implementing such a plan, features of the Five Factor System have been examined in the context of established principles, practice and procedure. Relevant issues such as number and choice of factors, multi-tier committee rating systems, methods of job analysis and the like have been discussed. An analysis of the perspectives of the principal actors has provided valuable insight into the dynamics of such a process, with particular reference to the context of a local government institution and has illustrated the impact of different power resources.
In these respects the value of examining the process from 'insider knowledge' has been well demonstrated. It has underlined the fact that mutual trust and commonality of objective is paramount.
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GENERAL INFORMATION: Name of Local Authority: __________________________
Contact Person: __________________________

Would you be interested in feedback on the results of this survey? YES □ NO □

Job Evaluation is used in order to determine the relative importance of jobs within an organisation with the object of developing an internally consistent, externally competitive and personally rewarding salary and wage structure.

PLEASE TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOXES:

A. JOB EVALUATION SYSTEM

1. Does your local authority have a formal system of Job Evaluation? YES □ NO □

   NOTE: If 'YES', proceed to question 2; If 'NO' proceed to question 8.

2. If 'YES' which Job Evaluation System do you use? Please tick the appropriate box that applies in the respective columns in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB EVALUATION SYSTEM</th>
<th>LEVELS TO WHICH APPLIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peromnes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castellion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPR Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own In-House System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years in Operation __________________________

3. For how long has the system been in operation?

   NOTE: Please write in the number of years in the above table in the column corresponding to the one ticked in answer to question 2.

4. What is the degree of satisfaction with the performance of the system? Please tick the appropriate boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE OF SATISFACTION</th>
<th>PARTIES INVOLVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Are you considering changing your system? YES □ NO □

6. If 'YES', when is this likely to take place?

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
p.t.o.
7. If you are considering changing your system, which system do you intend to use?

NOTE: If you have answered questions 1 to 7, ignore questions 8, 9 and 10 and proceed to Section B.

8. If you do not have a job evaluation system:
   Are you considering introducing a formal system of job evaluation?  YES ☐ NO ☐

9. If 'YES' which system are you planning to introduce?

10. When is this likely to take place?

B. GRADING PROCESS

11. Are employees represented in the grading process?  YES ☐ NO ☐

12. What is the composition of the grading panel?

13. Are the job evaluation gradings communicated to your employees? YES ☐ NO ☐

C. JOB DESCRIPTIONS

14. Do you make use of formally written job descriptions?  YES ☐ NO ☐

15. Who writes the job descriptions?
   Job Analyst ☐
   Supervisor ☐
   Incumbent ☐
   Other ☐ Specify: .................................................................

16. By what method is the job information collected?
   Observation ☐
   Interview of job incumbent ☐
   Group interview of several incumbents ☐
   Questionnaire - structured ☐
   - open-ended ☐
   Technical Conference ☐
   Critical Incidents ☐
   Diary ☐
   Other ☐ Specify: .................................................................

D. PAY STRUCTURING

17. Do you adhere to a formal structure of salary grades and scales in your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVELS TO WHICH APPLIED</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Paid Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. If 'YES', how many grades does your organisation have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF STRUCTURE</th>
<th>NO OF GRADES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried Occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly paid staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What limits are placed on salaries in the respective grades?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIMITS</th>
<th>TOP STRUCTURE</th>
<th>SALARIED POSTS</th>
<th>HOURLY POSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum only for each grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum only for each grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum and maximum salary for each grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-grade rates with differential minima/maxima for specific occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How do you determine the minima and maxima for your grades? Please specify:

...................................................................................................................
...................................................................................................................

21. Are overlaps between grades accepted as being necessary? YES □ NO □

If 'YES', to what extent do grades overlap?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% OVERLAP</th>
<th>TICK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Is the pay structure characterised by a single or more than one pay curve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CURVES</th>
<th>TICK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any further comment: ..........................................................
NOTICE TO ALL EMPLOYEES

JOB DESCRIPTION/JOB EVALUATION

Nearly fifteen thousand employees are placed in many hundreds of different occupations in the service of the City Council.

Management is responsible to the Council for allocating and regulating functions and recommending equitable rates of pay for all occupations in accordance with the different levels of responsibility.

In order to gain uniformly organised information Council has authorised the recording of relevant job information in respect of every occupation on the authorised Fixed Establishment by Job Description.

In the near future you will receive an approved Job Description Schedule that contains a guide on how to write your own Job Description. In subsequent briefings by line superiors and members of the Personnel Office these procedures will be further clarified and a time limit set for completion.

Your Job Description is the first link in a chain of personnel management procedures and any delay in its completion will have a disruptive effect on the Job Evaluation project and subsequent revisions of the Grading Schedule.

It is, therefore, expected that you will apply yourself to the task of writing your Job Description by according it the deserved priority in order to ensure its completion by the date set - allowing time for scrutiny and adjustments by line superiors and members of the Personnel Office.

PLEASE NOTE:
Further information and guidance may be obtained from your Branch Head and from the person(s) designated by him for this purpose and any of the following members of the Personnel Office:-

Mr C du Plessis Tel. 2517; Mr B Joffe Tel. 3903; Mr F Scholtz Tel. 3903;
Mr A Reeder Tel. 3038; Mr D Stokes Tel. 2596; Mr R Hurt Tel. 2333;
Mr G Fraser Tel. 2233; Mr I Newall Tel. 2696.

Please take advantage of this facility.