CRANET – UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA SURVEY

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN SOUTH AFRICA

Report on the South African findings

2018

Authors

Prof. PA Grobler, Ms S Wärnich & Mr G Mokobane

Department of Human Resource Management
School of Management Sciences
College of Economic and Management Sciences

University of South Africa
Pretoria
South Africa

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to express our sincere appreciation to the many people who assisted with this project. We would like to thank the following in particular:

- Mr Godfrey Mokobane, who typed the manuscript and also provided assistance with the literature research;
- Ms Jacolize Poalses, researcher from the Bureau of Market Research at Unisa, who was responsible for the management of the data collection process for the project;
- Dr Dion van Zyl, manager, Information Services from the Directorate of Information & Analysis at Unisa, for his assistance with the statistical aspects of the research;
- Jackie Viljoen from the Professional Editors Guild, for editing the manuscript;
- the more than 120 companies who completed the questionnaire, and without whose cooperation and willingness to disclose their information, the research would not have been possible;
- Professor Emma Parry, Head: Changing World of Work Group (Human Resource Management), School of Management, Cranfield University, United Kingdom, for her support; and
- the University of South Africa, and the Research Committee of the School of Management Sciences, for financial assistance.

Prof. Pieter A Grobler; Ms Surette Wärnich & Mr Godfrey Mokobane

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD iii

INTRODUCTION v

RESPONDENTS' PROFILE 1

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY 4

SECTION I – HRM ACTIVITY IN THE ORGANISATION 5

SECTION II – RESOURCING PRACTICES 27

SECTION III – EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT 65

SECTION IV – COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS 85

SECTION V – EMPLOYEE RELATIONS AND COMMUNICATION 103

SECTION VI – ORGANISATIONAL DETAIL 120

GENERAL – PERSONAL DETAILS OF THE RESPONDENTS 137

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 141

APPENDIX A – QUESTIONNAIRE 173

APPENDIX B – DATABASES USED 185

APPENDIX C – REFERENCES 187

APPENDIX D – LANGUAGE EDITING CERTIFICATE 191

FOREWORD

This report provides the results of a survey of South African human resource management (HRM) practices in private and public organisations. The survey is part of a longitudinal, comparative study of human resource policies and practices, involving 35 countries worldwide. This is the third survey conducted in South Africa during 2014/2015, the previous two surveys were conducted in 1999/2000, and 2009/2010 respectively.

This report provides an overview of the key findings of the South African survey. The basis of the survey was a questionnaire completed by human resource (HR) managers on behalf of their organisations. The research reflects policies current in 2014.

This report affords organisations in South Africa an opportunity to benchmark themselves against other South African organisations, and to identify trends in HRM practices.

INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that in today's highly competitive marketplace, the management of people is one of the primary keys to organisational success (Saridakis & Cooper 2013:1). Unfortunately, in the past, for a number of reasons – such as the constant struggle for recognition as a legitimate organisational function – too little attention was paid to the effective management of human resources in South Africa (Wärnich, Carrell, Elbert & Hatfield 2018:3).

Awareness of the inadequacies of HRM emerged only as we started comparing our success with that of organisations in other countries where human resources are considered critical to success (Sparrow, Hird, Hesketh & Cooper 2010; Grobler & Wärnich 2016). In this regard, for example, one only has to look at the latest Global Competitiveness Report (World Economic Forum 2017:10). Of the 137 countries participating in the project, South Africa obtained an overall rating of 61 out of 137. The countries are evaluated on 12 different pillars. Although South Africa is still the highest ranked country in sub-Saharan Africa, and continues to receive excellent results in complex areas such as business sophistication (37), innovation (39) and financial market development (44), there are still a number of negative factors pertaining to the HRM environment, such as labour market efficiency (97) and higher education and training (85) (World Economic Forum 2017:268).

It is not enough to stay on top of the latest developments in this rapidly changing discipline. Managers in organisations must also realise that people, like money and other organisational resources, are human resources that have to be managed effectively (Meyer 2016). In addition, organisations and managers also need to realise that the proper management of human resources can be a major source of productivity improvement and growth (Burke & Cooper 2009), something which South Africa so desperately needs.

According to Marchington and Wilkinson (2012:4–5), HR practices are central in improving the capability of an organisation and thus its particular competitive advantage – enabling it to compete more successfully than other companies for markets and profits in its industry or marketplace.

HR practices are organisational processes that enhance individual competencies and organisational capabilities. When these practices are aligned with the needs of internal and external customers, companies as opposed to those not implementing these practices diligently are more likely to succeed (Zeuch 2016).

RESPONDENTS' PROFILE

Profile of companies participating in the survey

(a) Please indicate the type of company/organisation which you represent

Table (A): Type of company

Type of company	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Foreign	13*	10.8	10.8	10.8
Government	48	40.0	40.0	50.8
Local listed	42	35.0	35.0	85.8
Local unlisted	17	14.2	14.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

*Please see Appendix B for database used

The companies which participated in the survey comprised foreign companies doing business in South Africa (13), government departments (48), local listed companies (42) and local unlisted companies (17). A total of 120 organisations participated in the survey.

(b) Is your organisation part of a larger group of companies/institutions?

Table (B): Part of a larger group of companies/institutions

Part of a larger group of companies	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	50	41.7	46.3	46.3
Yes	58	48.3	53.7	100.0
Total	108	90.0	100.0	
Missing	12	10.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table B, it is indicated whether the organisation was part of a larger group of companies or institutions. The results show that 41.7% of the companies (50) answered 'No', while 48.3% of the companies (58) answered 'Yes'. From the results, it is clear that the majority of the companies were part of a larger group of companies. A total of 12 companies did not answer this question. In the case of the government departments, it can be assumed that the provincial or local government offices can be seen as part of the national government departments/structures.

(c) If yes (in the previous question), are you answering for the whole group in your country?

Table (C): Answering for the whole group in your country

Answering for the whole group in your country	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	28	23.3	51.9	51.9
Yes	26	21.7	48.1	100.0
Total	54	45.0	100.0	
Missing	66	55.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table C, it is indicated whether companies were answering the questionnaire on behalf of the whole group in their country. The results show that 23.3% of the companies (28) answered ‘No’, while 21.7% of the companies (26) answered ‘Yes’, and 66 organisations did not indicate their position. From the results, it is clear that 23.3% (28) of the companies were not answering for the whole group, while 55% of the companies (66) did not answer the question.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

SECTION I – HRM ACTIVITY IN THE ORGANISATION

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 1: Total number of employees

Table 1.1: Total number of employees

Number of employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Up to 250 (small)	26	21.7	22.0	22.0
251–999 (medium)	61	50.8	51.7	73.7
1 000+ (large)	31	25.8	26.3	100.0
Total	118	98.3	100.0	
Missing	2	1.7		
Total	120	100.0		

Table 1.1 indicates the approximate number of people employed by the companies/institutions participating in the survey. From the data, it would appear that the largest number of companies (61) had between 251 and 999 employees (50.8%), followed by 31 companies with 1 000+ employees (25.8%) and lastly, 26 companies (21.7%) had up to 250 employees. Hence, the respondents can be regarded as being fairly well representative of the small, medium and large companies in South Africa. Two companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 1(a): Total number of male employees

Table 1.2: Total number of male employees

Number of male employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Up to 250	46	38.3	43.8	43.8
251–999	44	36.7	41.9	85.7
1 000+	15	12.5	14.3	100
Total	105	87.5	100	
Missing	15	12.5		
Total	120	100		

In Table 1.2, the total number of male employees in the companies is indicated. From the data it would appear that fewer companies (46) have smaller numbers of males (up to 250) compared to females (61) (see Table 1.3). However, where companies have between 251–999 males, these represent 36.7% of the companies (44), while in the case of females (32) (see Table 1.3), these represent 26.7% of the companies. In the case of 1000 plus males (15), these represent 12.5% of the companies, while in the case of females (12) (see Table 1.3) these represent 10% of these companies. Fifteen companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 1(c): Total number of female employees

Table 1.3: Total number of female employees

Number of female employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Up to 250	61	50.8	58.1	58.1
251–999	32	26.7	30.5	88.6

Number of female employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
1 000+	12	10	11.4	100
Total	105	87.5	100	
Missing	15	12.5		
Total	120	100		

In Table 1.3, the total number of female employees in the companies is indicated. As discussed in the previous question more companies (61), compared to 46 companies in the case of males have up to 250 female employees. However, in the case of females between 251–999, more companies (44) have male employees than female employees (32). In the case of 1000 and more employees less companies (12, 10%) have female employees, than companies with male employees (15, 12%). Fifteen of the 120 companies who completed the questionnaire did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 2(a): Percentage of managers in the workforce

Table 1.4: Percentage of managers in the workforce

Percentage of managers	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
10 or fewer	55	45.8	52.4	52.4
11–20	22	18.3	21	73.3
21–30	18	15	17.1	90.5
31–40	5	4.2	4.8	95.2
41–50	2	1.7	1.9	97.1
71–80	2	1.7	1.9	99
81–90	1	0.8	1.0	100
Total	105	87.5	100	
Missing	15	12.5		
Total	120	100		

In Table 1.4, the total number of managers in the companies is indicated. From the data it would appear that most companies (55) (45.8%) had 10 or fewer managers, followed by 18.3% (22) having 11–20 managers. A total of 15% (18) had between 21 and 30 managers. Only 4.2% (5) had a total of 31–40 managers and only 1.7% (2) had between 41 and 50 managers and a further 1.7% (2) had between 71–80 managers. Only one had between 81 and 90 managers (0.8%). It thus seems that the company structures were flatter – thus less levels of managers – as fewer people were appointed in managerial positions.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 2(b): Percentage of professionals without managerial responsibilities

Table 1.5: Percentage of professionals without managerial responsibilities

Number of professionals without managerial responsibilities	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
10 or fewer	33	37.5	32.4	32.4
11–20	16	13.3	15.7	48
21–30	18	15	17.6	65.7
31–40	20	16.7	19.6	85.3
41–50	8	6.7	7.8	93.1
51–60	2	1.7	2	95.1
61–70	4	3.3	3.9	99
71–80	0	0	0	0
81–90	1	0.8	1	100
Total	102	85	100	
Missing	18	15		
Total	120	**100**		

From the information in Table 1.5, it is evident that 37.5% of the companies (33) that participated in the survey, had 10 or fewer professional employees who did not have managerial responsibilities. In 13.3% of the companies (16) this increased to between 11–20 professional staff, in 15% of the companies (18), the numbers increased to between 21–30 professional staff, in 16.7% of companies (20) the numbers were between 31–40 professional staff. In 6.7% of the companies (8), it increased to between 41–50 professional staff. In the case of 1.7% of the companies (2) the number of professional staff increased to between 51–60, while in 3.3% of the companies (4) this number increased to between 61–70 professional staff. No companies indicated that they had between 71 and 80 professional staff members, while only .8% of the companies (1) indicated the number of professional staff to be between 81–90. Thus, professional staff without managerial responsibilities appear to be fairly limited in companies. The variation in numbers make sense depending on the nature of the company.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 2(c): Percentage of clericals and/or manuals

Table 1.6: Percentage of clericals and/or manuals

Number of clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
10 or fewer	14	11.7	14	14
11–20	7	5.8	7	21
21–30	12	10	12	33
31–40	5	4.2	5	38
41–50	18	15	18	56
51–60	10	8.3	10	66
61–70	12	10	12	78
71–80	8	6.7	8	86
81–90	9	7.5	9	95

Number of clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
91–100	5	4.2	5	100
Total	100	83.3	100	
Missing	20	16.7		
Total	120	100		

Table 1.16 shows the number of clerical and/or manual employees. Of the total number of companies that answered this question (100), 11.7% (14) indicated that they had fewer than 10 employees in this category of workers, 5.8% (7) indicated that they had between 11–20 employees while 4.2% (5) indicated that they had between 31–40 employees in this group. A further 15% (18) indicated that they employed between 41 and 50 clericals and/or manual employees, 8.3% (10) employed between 51–60, followed by 10% of companies (12) who employed between 61 and 70, 6.7% (8) between 71–80 employees, 7.5% (9) between 81–90 employees and lastly 4.2% (5) having between 91–100 employees in this group. From the findings it is clear that the number of clericals/manual employees employed by the participating companies in this project differs widely. This can be attributed perhaps to the different nature of the organisations participating in the survey where some have a larger need for lower level employees than others. A total of 20 companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 3(a): Do you have an HR department?

Table 1.7: Existence of an HR department

Existence of an HR department	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	4	3.3	3.4	3.4
Yes	115	95.8	96.6	100.0
Total	119	99.2	100.0	
Missing	1	0.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.7 it is indicated whether companies had an HR department. The results indicate that 3.3% of the companies (4) did not have an HR department, while 95.8% of the companies (115) had an HR department within their companies. The findings are encouraging as the existence of an HR department in a company/institution is essential for the proper management of the workforce, especially in view of the number of staff these companies had as indicated in Table 1.1 earlier.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 3(b): Total number of staff employed by the HR department

Table 1.8: Total number of staff employed by the HR department

Number of staff in HR department	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
20 or fewer	82	68.3	74.5	74.5
21–50	17	14.2	15.5	90

Number of staff in HR department	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
51–100	4	3.3	3.6	93.6
Over 100	7	5.8	6.4	100
Total	110	91.7	100	
Missing	10	8.3		
Total	120	100		

From Table 1.8, it is clear that most organisations (82) (68.3%) had 20 or fewer employees in the HR department, followed by 14.2% (17) who had between 21 and 50 HR employees. Only 5.8% of the companies (7) had more than 100 HR employees, while 3.3% of organisations (4) employed between 51 and 100 employees in the HR department. Internationally, the ratio of HRM staff to the total number of staff of organisations ranges between 1 and 2 HRM employees for every 200 staff members (SHRM, 2015:1). From the findings, it would appear that a large number of organisations have excessive numbers of HR employees in their organisations compared to their staff members (see Table 1.1). This could perhaps be attributed to the inclusion of employees from specialised sections, such as payroll and training and development in their HRM employee head count (Bloomberg, 2015) which is not correct as only HR generalists need to be included.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 3(b)(1): Total number of males employed in the HR department

Table 1.9: Total number of males in the HR department

Males employed in the HR department	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
20 or fewer	96	80	90.6	90.6
21–50	5	4.2	4.7	95.3
51–100	1	0.8	0.9	96.2
Over 100	4	3.3	3.8	100
Total	106	88.3	100	
Missing	14	11.7		
20 or fewer	120	100		

In this question, respondents had to indicate the number of males employed in their HR department. From the findings, it is clear that in 80% of the companies, 20 or fewer males were employed in the HR department. Other findings indicate that in five companies (4.2%), this number was between 21 and 50, and in only one (0.8%), it was between 51 and 100, while in four (3.3%), it was over 100 male employees. It would therefore appear that males were fairly well represented in the HR departments of the participating companies. A total of 14 companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 3(b)(2): Total number of females employed in the HR department

Table 1.10: Total number of females employed in the HR department

Females employed in the HR department	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
20 or fewer	87	72.5	82.1	82.1
21–50	13	10.8	12.3	94.3
51–100	1	0.8	0.9	95.3
Over 100	5	4.2	4.7	100
Total	106	88.3	100	
Missing	14	11.7		
Total	120	100		

In this question, the respondents had to indicate the number of females employed in their HR department. From the findings, it is clear that in comparison with the previous table (Table 1.9), the participating companies had slightly more females than males in their HR department. This is not uncommon since females more often tend to pursue careers in the HR field (Choudhary, 2015). The findings indicate that in 72.5% of the companies (87), 20 or fewer females were found in the HR department; in 13 companies (10.8%), this figure increased to between 21 and 50; in only one company (0.8%) it increased to 51 to 100 female employees; while in five companies (4.2%), it was over 100. A total of 14 companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 4: Does the person responsible for HR issues have a seat on the Board or equivalent?

Table 1.11: The person responsible for HR issues has a seat on the Board or equivalent

Seat on board or equivalent	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	56	46.7	47.9	47.9
Yes	61	50.8	52.1	100.0
Total	117	97.5	100.0	
Missing	3	2.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.11, it is indicated whether the person(s) responsible for HR issues had a seat on the board of the company or equivalent. For HR to become a strategic partner, the participation in company activities at this level is absolutely essential. The results indicate that in 46.7% of the companies (56), the person(s) responsible for HR issues did not have seat on the board of the company, while in 50.8% of the companies (61), they did have a seat. Although this is still a relatively low percentage, it is a positive sign. It is important for the senior HR manager to be involved at the highest organisational level. This will improve the overall functioning of the organisation as the HR manager will be aware of the organisation's workforce requirements from its proposed strategies for the future. Three companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 5: From where was the person responsible for HR recruited?

Table 1.12: Where was the person responsible for HR recruited from?

Recruitment of the person responsible for HR	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
From within the HR department	50	41.7	45.9	45.9
From non-HR specialists in the organisation	12	10.0	11.0	56.9
From HR specialists outside the organisation	36	30.0	33.0	89.9
From non-HR specialists outside the organisation	11	9.2	10.1	100.0
Total	109	90.8	100.0	
Missing	11	9.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.12, is it indicated from where the person responsible for HR in the company was recruited. The results show that in 41.7% of the companies (50), the HR person was recruited from within the HR department, while in 30.0% of the companies (36), recruitment occurred from HR specialists outside the company. In only a small group of companies (11) or 9.2% of the companies, the recruitment occurred from a non-HR specialist outside the organisation, while in 12 companies (10.0%), the recruitment was from a non-HR specialist within the company. It is interesting to note that companies make use of both internal as well as external methods for the recruitment of their most senior HR managers. This avoids inbreeding to a large extent. Only in very limited cases are non-HR specialists recruited for these posts (internal as well as external). It is therefore clear that knowledgeable HR people are in charge of the HR function in these companies. A total of 11 companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 6(a): Does the organisation have a written mission statement?

Table 1.13: Existence of a written mission statement in the organisation

Organisation's mission statement	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	8	6.7	6.7	6.7
Yes	112	93.3	93.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.13, it is indicated whether the organisation had a mission statement. The results indicate that 6.7% of the companies (8) did not have a mission statement, while 93.3% of the companies (112) indicated they did have a written mission statement. The presence of a company mission statement is absolutely essential if a company is to operate in a focused manner. This mission statement provides guidelines for all the individual activities within an organisation, such as finance, marketing, HRM, research and development and logistics. To avoid any confusion, it is essential that the mission statement should be in written form. The

results therefore indicate that the majority of companies (93.3%) (112) did have a written mission statement, which is an extremely positive finding.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 6(b): Does the organisation have a written business/service strategy?

Table 1.14: Existence of a written business/service strategy in the organisation

Business/Service strategy	n	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
No	24	20.0	20.0	20.0
Yes	96	80.0	80.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.14, it is indicated whether the organisation had a written business/service strategy. The results indicate that 20.0% of the companies (24) did not have a written business/service strategy in place, while 80.0% of the companies (96) did have a written business/service strategy. This finding is not surprising, especially when one looks at the results for the previous question regarding the presence of a company mission statement. The business/service strategy is traditionally based on the mission statement of the company. It is clear that the majority of the companies had a written business/service strategy, which is a very positive finding.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 6(c): Does the organisation have a written personnel/HRM strategy?

Table 1.15: Existence of a written personnel/HRM strategy

Written personnel/HRM strategy	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	19	15.8	15.8	15.8
Yes	101	84.2	84.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.15, it is indicated whether the organisation had a written personnel/HRM strategy. The results indicate that in 15.8% of the companies (19), the organisation did not have a written personnel/HRM strategy, while 84.3% of the companies (101) had a written personnel/HRM strategy. This is an extremely positive finding. Without a written personnel/HRM strategy, companies will find it difficult to have the right people available at the right time and place. The existence of such a strategy will for example, assist in either the oversupply or undersupply of skills/competencies within the organisation as strategies will be coupled to specific goals/outputs.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 6(d): Does the organisation have a written HR recruitment strategy?

Table 1.16: Existence of a written HR recruitment strategy

Written HR recruitment strategy	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	19	15.8	15.8	15.8
Yes	101	84.2	84.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.16, it is indicated whether the organisation had a written HR recruitment strategy. The results indicate that 15.8% of the companies (19) did not have a written HR recruitment strategy, while 84.2% of the companies (101) did have a written HR recruitment strategy. This is an extremely positive finding. Without an HR recruitment strategy, companies will find it difficult to have the right people available at the right time and place. Such a strategy thus creates some stability within an organisation as a permanent pool of candidates can be built up. It will also impact positively on the talent management activities within an organisation.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 6(e): Does the organisation have a written HR training and development strategy?

Table 1.17: Existence of a written HR training and development strategy

HR training and development strategy	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	24	20.0	20.0	20.0
Yes	96	80.0	84.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.17, it is indicated whether the organisation had a written HR training and development strategy. The results indicate that in 20.0% of the companies (24), the organisations did not have a written HR training and development strategy, while 80.0% of the companies (96) did have such a strategy. This is an extremely positive finding. Without an HR training and development strategy, companies will find it difficult to undertake the appropriate training and development activities within the organisation. This could lead to ad hoc activities, which will have a negative effect on the organisation.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 6(f): Does the organisation have a written corporate social responsibility (CSR) statement?

Table 1.18: Existence of a written CSR statement in the organisation

CSR statement	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	55	45.8	45.8	45.8
Yes	65	54.2	54.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.18, it is indicated whether the organisation had a written CSR (corporate social responsibility) statement. The results show that 45.8% of the companies (55) had no written

CSR statement, while 54.2% of the companies (65) had a written CSR statement. A CSR statement generally refers to the practice of operating a business in a manner that goes beyond what is usually required by law to meet broader ethical and public expectations. Since the release of the King III report in 2009, increased pressure has been placed on companies in South Africa to adhere to these principles. Although the finding is positive, it is clear that more work needs to be done by companies in South Africa in this regard.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 6(g): Does the organisation have a written diversity statement?

Table 1.19: Existence of a written diversity statement in the organisation

Diversity statement	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	59	49.2	49.2	49.2
Yes	61	50.8	50.8	100
Total	120	100.0		

Table 1.19 reflects results on the question whether the companies had a diversity statement. The results show that 49.2% of the companies (59) had no diversity statement in place, while 50.8% of the companies (61) had a written diversity statement. With companies facing increasingly diverse workforces, the presence of a diversity statement is absolutely essential, as such a statement will give guidance to managers on how to manage their diverse workforce, and also how to provide training in this area in order to create a properly functioning workplace.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 7: If your organisation has a business/service strategy, at what stage is the person responsible for personnel/HR involved in its development?

Table 1.20: The stage at which the person responsible for personnel/HR is involved in the development of the business/service strategy, if the organisation has such a strategy

Stage of HR involvement in the development of the business/service strategy	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
From the outset	65	54.2	66.3	100.0
Through subsequent consultation	22	18.3	22.4	33.7
On implementation	6	5.0	6.1	11.2
Not consulted	5	4.2	5.1	5.1
Not applicable (do not have a business strategy)	6	5.0		
Total	78	81.2	100.0	
Missing	16	13.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.20, it is indicated at which stage the person responsible for HR in the organisation is involved with the development of the business/service strategy. The results show that in 54.2% of the companies (65) they were involved from the outset, while in 18.3% of the companies (22), they were involved during subsequent consultation, in 5.0% of the companies

(6) they were involved during the implementation stage. Only 4.2% of the companies (five) were not consulted at all, and lastly, 5.0% of the companies (six) indicated that this did not apply to them as they did not have a business strategy. Although this is a positive finding, it would seem that companies need to do much more in this area. It is essential for the HR person to be involved from the outset in the development of a business/service strategy. The reason is that HR can only implement realistic HR strategies that have been developed through a close involvement of all parties. If this does not happen, it will not be possible for HR to provide a good service to the organisation as strategies may then be developed which will be impossible for HRM to implement.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 8(a): Who has the primary responsibility for major policy decisions on pay and benefits?

Table 1.21: Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on pay and benefits

Responsibility for major policy decisions on pay and benefits	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Line management	29	24.2	25.9	25.9
Line management in consultation with HR Depart	13	10.8	11.6	37.5
HR dept. in consultation with line management	27	22.5	24.1	61.6
HR department	43	55.8	38.4	100.0
Total	112	93.3	100.0	
Missing	8	6.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.21, it is indicated who had the primary responsibility for major policy decisions on pay and benefits in the participating companies. The results show that in 43 companies (55.8%), the responsibility rested with the HR department, while in 29 companies (24.2%), it rested with line management, and in 27 companies (22.5%), it was the responsibility of HR in consultation with line management, while in 13 companies (10.8%), the responsibility rested with line management in consultation with HR. Besides the HR department taking the lead, it seemed that the second most popular option was the consultation between HR and line management and vice versa. This is a very important finding as the stakeholders are involved in the process, which will help implement the strategy easily. Of the 120 participating companies, eight did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 8(b): Who has primary responsibility for major policy decisions on recruitment and selection?

Table 1.22: Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on recruitment and selection

Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on recruitment and selection	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Line management	13	10.8	11.2	11.2
Line management in consultation with HR	31	25.8	26.7	37.9

Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on recruitment and selection	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
HR in consultation with line management	34	28.3	29.3	67.2
HR department	38	31.7	32.8	100.0
Total	116	96.7	100.0	
Missing	4	3.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.22, it is reflected who had the primary responsibility for major policy decisions on recruitment and selection. The results show that in 38 companies (31.7%), the responsibility rested with the HR department, while in 34 companies (28.3%), it rested with HR in consultation with line management. In 25.8% of the companies (31), the responsibility rested with line management in consultation with HR, while in 10.8% of the companies (13), it was with line management only. From the above, it seemed that in the majority of cases, consultation between line management and HR was deemed the most popular approach followed in this regard. Thus, neither line management only, nor HR only, is responsible for major policy decisions pertaining to recruitment and selection in the companies. This is an extremely positive finding as the requirements and/or needs of both groups are addressed in this regard. Four companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 8(c): Who has primary responsibility for major policy decisions on training and development?

Table 1.23: Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on training and development

Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on training and development	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Line management	10	8.3	8.5	8.5
Line management in consultation with HR	27	22.5	23.1	31.6
HR in consultation with line management	42	35.0	35.9	61.5
HR department	38	31.7	32.5	100.0
Total	117	97.5	100.0	
Missing	3	2.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.23, it is indicated who had primary responsibility for major policy decisions on training and development. The results show that in 42 companies (35.0%), the responsibility rested with HR in consultation with line management, while in 38 companies (31.7%), it rested with the HR department. In 22.5% of the companies (27), line management in consultation with HR was responsible, while in 8.3% of the companies (10), line management only was responsible. From the above, it would appear that in the majority of companies, consultation between HR and line management seemed to be the most popular approach in this regard. Thus, neither line management nor HR only is responsible for major policy decisions pertaining

to training and development. This is an extremely positive finding as the needs of both groups are considered in consultation with one another which would make the ultimate buy-in of the programmes/activities in this regard much easier. Three companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 8(d): Who has primary responsibility for major policy decisions on industrial relations?

Table 1.24: Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on industrial relations

Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on industrial relations	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Line management	12	10.0	11.0	11.0
Line management in consultation with HR	19	15.8	17.4	28.4
HR in consultation with line management	35	29.2	32.1	60.6
HR department	43	35.8	39.4	100.0
Total	109	90.8	100.0	
Missing	11	9.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.24, it is indicated who had primary responsibility for major policy decisions on industrial relations. The results show that in 43 companies (35.8%), the responsibility rested with the HR department only, while in 35 companies (29.2%), HR in consultation with line management was responsible. In 15.8% of the companies (19), the responsibility rested with line management in consultation with HR, while in 10.0% of the companies (12) line management was solely responsible. From the foregoing, it seemed that in the majority of cases, consultation between HR and line management was deemed the most popular approach to follow. Thus, neither line management nor HR only was responsible for major policy decisions pertaining to industrial relations. This is an extremely positive finding as consultation takes place between the two parties. This will have a positive impact on possible industrial action within the companies. Eleven companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 8(e): Who has primary responsibility for major policy decisions on workforce expansion/reduction?

Table 1.25: Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on workforce expansion/reduction

Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on workforce expansion/reduction	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Line management	19	15.8	17.3	17.3
Line management in consultation with HR	24	20.0	21.8	39.1
HR in consultation with line management	30	25.0	27.3	66.4

Primary responsibility for major policy decisions on workforce expansion/reduction	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
HR department	37	30.8	33.6	100.0
Total	110	91.7	100.0	
Missing	10	8.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.25, it is indicated who had primary responsibility for major policy decisions on workforce expansion/reduction. The results show that in 37 companies (30.8%), the responsibility rested with the HR department, while in 30 companies (25.0%), HR in consultation with line management was responsible. In 20.0% of the companies (24), the responsibility rested with line management in consultation with HR, while in 15.8% of the companies (19), line management only was responsible. From the foregoing, it would appear that in the majority of companies, consultation between line management and HR was the most popular approach. Thus, neither line management nor HR only was responsible for major policy decisions pertaining to workforce expansion/reduction. This is a positive finding and important for the effective functioning of the organisation. Ten companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 9(a): To what extent are external providers used for payroll activities?

Table 1.26: Use of external providers for payroll

Outsourcing of payroll	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not outsourced	99	82.5	83.9	83.9
Outsourced to a small extent	10	8.3	8.5	92.4
Outsourced to some extent	2	1.7	1.7	94.1
Outsourced to a great extent	2	1.7	1.7	95.8
Completely outsourced	5	4.2	4.2	100.0
Total	118	98.3	100.0	
Missing	2	1.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.26, it is indicated to which extent the companies outsourced payroll activities. The results show that in 82.5% of the companies (99), these activities were not outsourced, while in 8.3% of the companies (10), these activities were outsourced to a small extent, and in a further 1.7% of the companies (2), they were outsourced to some extent. Only in the case of 1.7% of the companies (2), were these activities outsourced to a great extent, while in 4.2% of the companies (5), they were outsourced completely. Hence, the management of the payroll activities in companies was done by the companies themselves, with only a small group of companies outsourcing this function. Two companies did not answer this question. This is an interesting finding, as companies seem to like to have direct control of their payroll activities.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 9(b): To what extent are external providers used for pensions?

Table 1.27: Use of external providers in pensions

Outsourcing of pensions	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not outsourced	61	50.8	53.5	53.5
Outsourced to a small extent	9	7.5	7.9	61.4
Outsourced to some extent	9	7.5	7.9	69.3
Outsourced to a great extent	2	1.7	1.8	71.1
Completely outsourced	33	27.5	28.9	100.0
Total	114	95.0	100.0	
Missing	6	5.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.27, it is indicated to which extent the company outsourced pensions. The results are fairly interesting when compared with the previous question on payroll. In the case of pensions, 50.8% of companies (61) did not outsource this function. In 7.5% of the companies (9), it was outsourced to a small extent, in a further 7.5% of the companies (9), it was outsourced to some extent, in 1.7% of the companies (2), it was outsourced to a great extent, and lastly, in 27.5% of the companies (33), it was outsourced completely. It would thus appear that only approximately 44.2% of companies (53) outsources their pensions from a small extent to completely. A word of caution is actually necessary here particularly the group of Government respondents 40% (48) who could have possibly seen the Government Pension Fund which is an independent body not being part of the outsourcing of their pension activity. Thus there is a possibility that the percentage being outsourced could well be higher. This is possible as the management of pensions is a highly specialised area and needs to be undertaken by people specifically trained in this field. This approach will avoid unnecessary losses and protect the company, as well as their employees, as the pensions will be the responsibility of expert organisations in this field. Six companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 9(c): To what extent are external providers used for benefits?

Table 1.28: Use of external providers for benefits

Outsourcing of benefits	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not outsourced	82	68.3	70.7	70.7
Outsourced to a small extent	10	8.3	8.6	79.3
Outsourced to some extent	7	5.8	6.0	85.3
Outsourced to a great extent	4	3.3	3.4	88.8
Outsourced completely	13	10.8	11.2	100.0
Total	166	96.7	100.0	
Missing	4	3.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.28, it is indicated to which extent benefits were outsourced by the company. A pattern similar to that in payroll is evident here, namely very low active outsourcing in this regard. This finding is not surprising because benefits are closely related to the payroll of a company. The results indicate that 68.3% of the companies (82) did not outsource their benefits activities at all. While 8.3% of the companies (10) outsourced benefits to a small extent, 5.8% of the companies (7) did so to some extent, 3.3% of the companies (4) did so to a great extent, while 10.8% of the companies (13) outsourced their benefits completely. Because benefits have a considerable financial impact on the budget of the company, it is probably in the interest of the company rather to be directly involved with the management of this activity. Four companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 9(d): To what extent are external providers used for training and development?

Table 1.29: Use of external providers in training and development

Outsourcing of training and development	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not outsourced	59	49.2	50.4	50.4
Outsourced to a small extent	18	15.0	15.4	65.8
Outsourced to some extent	17	14.2	14.5	80.3
Outsourced to a great extent	9	7.5	7.7	88.8
Completely outsourced	14	11.7	12.0	100.0
Total	119	97.5	100.0	
Missing	3	2.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.29, it is indicated to which extent the companies outsourced training and development. The data indicates that 49.2% of the companies (59) did not outsource their training and development activities at all. However, 15.0% of the companies (18) did so to a small extent, 14.2% of the companies (17) did so to some extent, and 7.5% of the companies (9) did so to a great extent. In only 11.7% of the companies (14) were training and development activities outsourced completely. In many instances, companies do not have the in-house expertise to provide all the training and development activities they desire, and thus they make use of outside consultants. Another reason for the various degrees of outsourcing of this function can be coupled with the financial cost of maintaining a fully staffed training and development section. Many companies simply do not have the finances for such a luxury. Three companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation – Question 9(e): To what extent are external providers used for workforce outplacement/reduction?

Table 1.30: Use of external providers in workforce outplacement/reduction

Outsourcing of workforce outplacement or reduction	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not outsourced	93	77.5	80.2	80.2
Outsourced to a small extent	9	7.5	7.8	87.9
Outsourced to some extent	6	5.0	5.2	93.1
Outsourced to a great extent	6	5.0	5.2	98.3

Outsourcing of workforce outplacement or reduction	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Completely outsourced	2	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total	116	96.7	100.0	
Missing	4	3.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.30, it is indicated to which extent the companies outsourced workforce outplacement or reduction activities. The results indicate that in 77.5% of the companies (93), this activity was not outsourced, while in 7.5% of the companies (9), it was outsourced to a small extent; in 5.0% of the companies (6), it was outsourced to some extent; while in a further 5.0% of the companies (6), it was outsourced to a great extent. In 1.7% of the companies (2), it was outsourced completely. Hence, the majority of the companies were involved in the workforce outplacement or reduction themselves. This is understandable because outplacement or reduction is a highly sensitive issue and needs to be addressed by the company personally. Four companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 9(f): Use of external providers for HR information systems

Table 1.31: Use of external providers for HR information systems

Use of external providers for HR information systems	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not outsourced	82	68.3	70.7	70.7
Outsourced to a small extent	12	10.0	10.3	81.0
Outsourced to some extent	8	6.7	6.9	87.9
Outsourced to a great extent	7	5.8	6.0	94.0
Completely outsourced	7	5.8	6.0	100.0
Total	116	96.7	100.0	
Missing	4	3.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.31, it is indicated to which extent external providers were used for the HR information systems of the companies. The results indicate that 68.3% of the companies (82) did not use external providers for this function. Hence, one may assume that they had purchased the system from an outside vendor and running it themselves internally. In 10.0% of the companies (12), external providers were used to a small extent for their HR systems, while in 6.7% of the companies (8), they were used to some extent. Only 5.8% of the companies (7) used external providers to a great extent, while 5.8% of the companies (7) used external providers completely. The role played by an HR information system in companies is of utmost importance. It enables companies to obtain the information necessary for decisions in various areas quickly and helps line managers to manage their staff better making the organisation efficient and effective. Four companies did not answer this question. This finding is also in line with the finding for payroll and benefits and the same for the other earlier activities. It would thus appear that all of the HR activities are in some way connected to the HR information system which makes sense from a management perspective with the exception being pensions which require highly skilled individuals.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 9(g): To what extent are external providers used for recruitment efforts?

Table 1.32: Use of external providers for recruitment

Use of external providers for recruitment	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not outsourced	91	75.8	76.5	76.5
Outsourced to a small extent	8	6.7	6.7	83.2
Outsourced to some extent	11	9.2	9.2	92.4
Outsourced to a great extent	5	4.2	4.2	96.6
Outsourced completely	4	3.3	3.4	100.0
Total	119	99.2	100.0	
Missing	1	0.8		
Total	120	100		

In Table 1.32, it is indicated to which extent external providers were used for the recruitment efforts of the companies. The results indicate that 75.8% of the companies (91) did not use external providers at all. However, 6.7% of the companies (8) used external recruiters to a small extent; 9.2% of the companies (11) used them to some extent, and 4.2% of the companies (5) used them to a great extent. Only 3.3% of the companies (4) used external providers completely. Hence, the majority of companies 75.8% (91) did not use external providers in their recruitment efforts, while 23.4% (28) utilised external providers to varying degrees. In many instances, these companies utilised the services of external providers for high-level positions in their companies (e.g. chief executive officers [CEOs]) or for more highly skilled persons such as engineers, accountants and computer experts. Only one company did not answer the question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 9(h): To what extent are external providers used for selection efforts?

Table 1.33: Use of external providers for selection efforts

Use of external providers for selection efforts	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not outsourced	100	83.3	84.7	84.7
Outsourced to a small extent	7	5.8	5.9	90.7
Outsourced to some extent	3	2.5	2.5	93.2
Outsourced to a great extent	5	4.2	4.2	97.5
Completely outsourced	3	2.5	2.5	100.0
Total	118	98.3	100.0	
Missing	2	1.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.33, it is indicated to which extent external providers were used for the selection efforts of the participating companies. The results indicate that 83.3% of the companies (100) did not use external providers at all. A total of 5.8% of the companies (7) used external providers to a small extent; 2.5% of the companies (3) utilised them to some extent; and 4.2% of the companies (5) used them to a great extent. Only a further 2.5% of the companies (3) utilised external providers completely. It is therefore clear that the majority of companies had

adequately trained staff, such as psychologists and psychometrists, to assist with the different selection tests to which potential new employees are subjected. Only an insignificant group of companies (2.5%) appeared to use the services of external providers in this regard. This could be related to the type of the company, and the decision will probably be based on a cost-effective aspect. Two companies did not answer this question. This finding is very similar to the previous finding, which makes sense as the recruitment and selection findings are closely related.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 9(i): To what extent are processing routine queries from managers/employees (e.g. an HR call centre) outsourced to external providers?

Table 1.34: Use of external providers for processing routine queries from managers/employees

External providers processing routine calls from managers/employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not outsourced	94	78.3	83.9	83.9
Outsourced to a small extent	7	5.8	6.3	90.2
Outsourced to some extent	4	3.3	3.6	93.8
Outsource to a great extent	3	2.5	2.7	97.3
Completely outsourced	4	3.3	3.6	100
Total	112	93.3	100.0	
Missing	8	6.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.34, it is indicated to which extent external providers were used to process routine queries from managers/employees (e.g. an HR call centre). The results indicate that 78.3% of the companies (94) did not use external providers at all; only 5.8% of the companies (7) used external providers to a small extent; a further 3.3% of the companies (4) used external providers to some extent; and 2.5% of the companies (3) used them to a great extent. Furthermore, 3.3% of the companies (4) used them completely. Hence, the majority of the participating companies did not make use of external providers to process internal routine queries. Following this approach will allow organisations to control the flow of information within the organisation better, which could have an advantage from a security point of view. Four companies did not answer this question.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 10: Do you use the following to deliver HRM activities?

Question 10(a) Human resource information system (HRIS) or electronic HRM system

Table 1.35: HRM information system (HRIS)

HRM information system (HRIS)	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	35	29.2	29.2	29.2
Yes	85	70.8	70.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.35, it is indicated whether the participating companies had used an HRM information system to deliver HRM activities in the organisation. The results show that 29.2% of the companies (35) did not use an HRM information system to deliver HRM activities in their organisations, while 70.8% of the companies (85) did use an HRM information system to deliver HRM activities in their organisation. This is a very important finding as this system will help to classify and store information needed properly and allow easy access to the information, which in turn will lead to efficiency and effectiveness within the organisation. This finding is in line with the finding reflected in Table 1.31 where the use of external providers for HR information systems was discussed.

Question 10(b) Manager self-service

Table 1.36: Manager self-service

Manager self-service	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	82	68.3	68.3	68.3
Yes	38	31.7	31.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 1.36, it is indicated whether the participating companies used manager self-service to deliver HRM activities in their organisation. The results show that 68.3% of the companies (82) did not use manager self-service to deliver HRM activities, while 31.7% of the companies (38) did make use of manager self-service to deliver HRM activities. This is a very low number of companies. The development of these types of systems is expensive, which might be the reason why companies are hesitant to implement them. However, the availability of these systems can assist managers greatly to become more efficient and effective in their jobs – thus having numerous benefits for both the individual and the organisation.

Question 10(c) Employee self-service

Table 1.37: Employee self-service

Employee self-service	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	80	66.7	66.7	66.7
Yes	40	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 1.37, it is indicated whether the participating companies used an employee self-service system to deliver HRM activities in their organisation. The results show that 66.7% of the companies (80) did not use an employee self-service system to deliver HRM activities in their organisation, while 33.3% of the companies (40) did use such a system. Again, having such a system available within the organisation will improve the flow of information between the parties, resulting in a more efficient and effective workplace. Although the cost to develop such a system is initially high, the system has the advantage of reducing paperwork. Its further advantage is that it provides top management with information, which makes the management of the workplace much easier. It could thus, as indicated in Table 1.8 be the reason for such a high number of HR staff within the HR Department as all the work flows to this Department instead of being decentralised to the individual employees.

Section I (HRM activity in the organisation) – Question 11: To what extent is the performance of the personnel/human resources function/department evaluated?

Table 1.38: Evaluation of the performance of the HRM department

Evaluation of the performance of the HRM department	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	3	2.5	2.5	2.5
To a small extent	4	3.3	3.4	5.9
To some extent	33	27.5	27.7	33.0
To a great extent	32	26.7	26.9	60.5
To a very great extent	47	39.2	39.5	100.0
Total	119	99.2	100.0	
Missing	1	0.8		
Total	120	10		

In Table 1.38, it is indicated to which extent the performance of the personnel or HR function or department was evaluated in the organisation. The results indicate that in 2.5% of the companies (3), this did not happen at all, while in 3.3% of the companies (4), it took place to a small extent; in 27.5% of the companies (33), it took place to some extent; and in 26.7% of the companies (32), it took place to a great extent. Only in 39.2% of the companies (47), it happened to a very great extent. One company did not answer the question. To become a competitive organisation, it is essential that all components of an organisation be evaluated on a regular basis to determine whether they are achieving their goals successfully. The HR department plays a crucial role within the organisation, as it is ultimately responsible for the management of the workforce of the organisation. For this reason, the evaluation of its performance is essential. The results thus show that in the case of 65.9% of the companies (79), the measurement of the performance of the personnel HR department took place from a great extent to a very great extent, which is a very positive finding. The participants in the survey were thus concerned about the performance of their HR department, which is an important finding. However, whether the criteria used for this purpose is applicable is a further area of research.

SECTION II – RESOURCING PRACTICES

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 1: Has the total number of employees (full time equivalent) in your organisation changed since three years ago?

Table 2.1: Change in the total number of employees in the past three years

Change in total number of employees in the last three years	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Decreased to a great extent	15	12.5	12.8	12.8
Decreased to some extent	16	13.3	13.7	26.5
Not changed	16	13.3	13.7	40.2
Increased to some extent	32	26.7	27.4	67.5
Increased to a great extent	38	31.7	32.5	100.0
Total	117	97.5	100.0	
Missing	3	2.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 2.1, it is indicated to which extent the number of their staff members had either increased or decreased during the previous three years. The results indicate that in 12.5% of the companies (15), employees decreased to a great extent, while in 13.3% of the companies (16), they decreased to some extent. In a further 13.3% of the companies (16), they did not change at all, while in 26.7% of the companies (32), employees increased to some extent over the previous three years, and in 31.7% of the companies (38), they increased to a great extent. The findings thus indicate that in the case of the majority of the companies (58.4%), their staff increased from some extent to a very great extent over the previous three years. The reason for this change could be the result of improved economic activity during the period of the research being undertaken, while in the case of government entities, this could be attributed to an increase in workload. Three companies did not answer the question.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2: Have you ever used any of the following methods to downsize the organisation (through reducing the number of people employed or other means to decrease cost)?

Table 2.2: Methods used to downsize the organisation

Method used to downsize the organisation	Managers		Professionals		Clericals and/or Manuals	
	Gene-rally not used	Yes	Gene-rally not used	Yes	Gene-rally not used	Yes
A Recruitment freeze	81.7%	18.3%	85.8%	14.2%	81.7%	18.3%
Number of companies	98	22	103	17	98	22
B Early retirement	80.0%	20.0%	83.3%	16.7%	85.8%	14.2%
Number of companies	96	24	100	20	103	17
C Internal transfer (redeployment)	80.0%	20.0%	80.0%	20.0%	78.3%	21.7%
Number of companies	96	24	96	24	94	26
D Voluntary redundancies/attrition	87.5%	12.5%	88.3%	11.7%	88.3%	11.7%
Number of companies	105	15	106	14	106	14
E No renewal of fixed term/temporary contracts	80.8%	19.2%	83.3%	16.7%	72.5%	27.5%
Number of companies	97	23	100	20	87	33

Method used to downsize the organisation	Managers		Professionals		Clericals and/or Manuals	
	Gene-rally not used	Yes	Gene-rally not used	Yes	Gene-rally not used	Yes
F Unpaid study leaves/vacancies	92.5%	7.5%	93.3%	6.7%	93.3%	6.7%
Number of companies	111	9	112	8	112	8
G Outsourcing	94.2%	5.8%	93.3%	6.7%	95.8%	4.2%
Number of companies	113	7	112	8	115	5
H Management pay-cut	96.0%	5.0%	96.7%	3.3%	98.3%	1.7%
Number of companies	114	6	116	4	118	2
I Ban on overtime	90.8%	9.2%	90.8%	9.2%	85.8%	14.2%
Number of companies	109	11	109	11	103	17
J Wage freeze	99.2%	0.8%	100.0%	–	100%	–
Number of companies	119	1	120	–	120	–
K Reduced job proportions	98.3%	1.7%	97.5%	2.5%	98.3%	1.7%
Number of companies	118	2	117	3	118	2
L Job sharing	95.8%	4.2%	95.8%	4.2%	96.7%	3.3%
Number of companies	115	5	115	5	116	4
M Reduced benefits	96.7%	3.3%	98.3%	1.7%	98.3%	1.7%
Number of companies	116	4	118	2	118	2
N Employee pay-cut	99.2%	0.8%	99.2%	0.8%	98.3%	1.7%
Number of companies	119	1	119	1	118	2
O Individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period)	95.0%	5.0%	95.0%	5.0%	95.0%	5.0%
Number of companies	114	6	114	6	114	6
P Concentration layoffs (5–9% laid off in a 12-month period)	97.5%	2.5%	97.5%	2.5%	96.7%	3.3%
Number of companies	117	3	117	3	117	4
Q Mass layoffs or compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3 month period)	96.7%	3.3%	96.7%	3.3%	96.7%	3.3%
Number of companies	116	4	116	4	116	4

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(a): Have you used recruitment freeze to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used recruitment freeze as a method to reduce the managers in their organisations. The results show that 81.7% of the companies (98) have not used recruitment freeze as a method to reduce managers, while 18.3% of the companies (22) indicated that they used recruitment freeze to reduce the managers in the organisation. It was interesting to see that the use of recruitment freeze as a method to reduce management staff was only used in a very limited way. The findings are in line with a finding for question 1 above, where the respondents indicated that there had been a steady increase in their staff numbers during the previous three years indicating that there had been a steady demand for more staff, not fewer.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(b): Have you used early retirement to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used early retirement as a method to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 80.0% of the companies (96) do not use early retirement to reduce managers to downsize the organisation, while 20.0% of the companies (24) indicated that they used early retirement to reduce managers in the organisation. As with the previous finding, these findings are in line with the findings in terms of question 1 where there appeared to be an increase in staff rather than a decrease during the previous three years.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(c): Have you used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce managers in the organisation. The results show that 80.0% of the companies (96) do not use internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce managers in the organisation, while 20.0% of the companies (24) indicated that they used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce managers in the organisation. Although this practice was used in a limited way, the organisation retained the expertise of the individuals through this process, and this can be seen as a win-win situation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(d): Have you used voluntary redundancies/attrition to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used voluntary redundancies or attrition to reduce managers in the organisation. The results show that 87.5% of the companies (105) do not use voluntary redundancies or attrition to reduce managers in the organisation, while 12.5% of the companies (15) indicated that they used voluntary redundancies or attrition to reduce managers in the organisation. The finding was not surprising as companies will not easily let their knowledgeable employees such as managers go by offering them packages. However, even if they do decide to reduce their managers, it appeared that this method was not very popular among the participating companies.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(e): Have you used no renewal of fixed term/temporary contracts to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used no renewal of fixed term/ temporary contracts to reduce managers in the organisation. The results show that 80.8% of the companies (97) do not use no renewal, fixed term/temporary contracts to reduce managers in the organisation, while 19.2% of the companies (23) indicated that they used no renewal, fixed term/temporary contracts to reduce managers in the organisation. The finding is again not surprising when one takes the findings in question 1 into consideration. Again, it is clear that this approach to reduce managerial staff was not very popular among the participating companies.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(f): Have you used unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 92.5% of the companies (111) do not use unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce managers in the organisation, while 7.5% of the companies (9) indicated that they used unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce managers in the organisation. Taking the previous findings into consideration, it is clear that this method to reduce management staff was also not very popular among participating companies.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(g): Have you used outsourcing to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used outsourcing to reduce managers in the organisation. The results show that 94.2% of the companies (113) do not use outsourcing to reduce managers in the organisation, while 5.8% of the companies (7) indicated that they used outsourcing to reduce managers in the organisation. Again, it is clear that considering the findings in the previous questions, this method to reduce managers was not very popular at all among the participating companies.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(h): Have you used management pay-cuts to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used management pay cuts to reduce managers in the organisation. The results show that 96.0% of the companies (114) do not use management pay cuts to reduce managers in the organisation, while 5.0% of the companies (6) indicated that they have used management pay cuts to reduce managers in the organisation. Again, taking the findings in the previous questions into consideration, this method to reduce the number of managers in the organisation was not very popular among participating companies.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(i): Have you used a ban on overtime to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used a ban on overtime to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 90.8% of the companies (109) do not use a ban on overtime to reduce managers in the organisation, while 9.2% of the companies (11) indicated that they had used a ban on overtime to reduce managers in the organisation. This finding is not surprising as overtime is only paid to managers in very exceptional cases; this method to reduce the numbers in the managerial group will therefore not be very practical.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2 (j): Have you used wage freeze to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used wage freeze to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 99.2% of the companies (119) do not use wage freeze to reduce managers in the organisation, while 0.8% of the companies (1)

indicated that they used wage freeze to reduce managers in the organisation. From the findings, it is clear that the use of this method to reduce staff members, especially within the ranks of managers, was not popular at all among the participating companies.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(k): Have you used reduced job propositions to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used reduced job propositions to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 98.3% of the companies (118) do not use reduced job propositions to reduce managers in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they used reduced job propositions to reduce managers in the organisation. Again, as was the case with the previous finding, this method to reduce the number of managers in the organisation did not seem popular at all among the participating companies.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(l): Have you used job sharing to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used job sharing to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 95.8% of the companies (118) do not use job sharing to reduce managers in the organisation, while 4.2% of the companies (5) indicated that they used job sharing to reduce managers in the organisation. As job sharing seemed to be more popular at lower levels within organisations, it is not surprising that this method was not used very often at managerial level in organisations to reduce staff numbers.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(m): Have you used reduced benefits to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used reduced benefits to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 96.7% of the companies (116) do not use reduced benefits to reduce managers in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they used reduced benefits to reduce managers in the organisation. Again, as indicated in the previous question, this also appears to be an unpopular method to reduce the numbers of managers within the organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(n): Have you used management pay-cuts to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used management pay-cuts to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 99.2% of the companies (119) do not use management pay-cuts to reduce managers in the organisation, while 0.8% of the companies (1) indicated that they did. Again, this did not seem to be a very popular method to use in South Africa, as is reflected by the findings.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(o): Have you used individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce managers in the organisation. The results

indicate that 95.0% of the companies (114) do not use individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce managers in the organisation, while 5.0% of the companies (6) indicated that they did. Again, as was the case with the findings in connection with earlier questions, this method to lay off managers in the organisation did not seem popular at all.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(p): Have you used concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in 12 months) to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 97.5% of the companies (117) do not use concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in 12 months) to reduce managers in the organisation, while 2.5% of the companies (3) indicated that they did. Again, it is clear that due to the important roles, which managers play within an organisation, lay-offs of this employee group are not considered lightly. The findings are also in line with the findings in connection with question 1 where staff members had increased during the previous 12 months and not decreased.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(q): Have you used mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce managers in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of the workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce managers in the organisation. The results indicate that 96.7% of the companies (116) do not use mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of the workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce managers in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they did. It was clear that the participating companies were hesitant to embark on massive lay-offs in the manager job category, which makes sense as these employees play an important role in the organisation and a sudden lay-off effort could have serious negative implications for the organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(a): Have you used recruitment freeze to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used recruitment freeze as a method to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results show that 85.8% of the companies (105) do not use recruitment freeze as a method to reduce professionals, while 14.2% of the companies (17) indicated that they used recruitment freeze to reduce professionals in the organisation. From the findings, it is clear that this method was not popular with the professional group. The professional group plays an important role within an organisation due to their skills, and consequently, this group would be the last group to be subjected to this practice.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(b): Have you used early retirement to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used early retirement as a method to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that 83.3% of the companies (100) do not use early retirement as a method to reduce professionals in their

organisation, while 16.7% of the companies (20) indicated that they used early retirement to reduce professionals in the organisation. Again, as mentioned in the previous question, staff in this category play an important role in the organisation and as such, it would not be practical to subject them to this process.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(c): Have you used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results show that 80.0% (96) do not use internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 20.0% of the companies (24) indicated that they used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce professionals in the organisation. Professionals usually have specific skills, which cannot be transferred easily; thus, the reason for the low use of this method by the organisation makes sense.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(d): Have you used voluntary redundancies/attrition to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used voluntary redundancies/ attrition to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results show that 88.3% of the companies (106) do not use voluntary redundancies or attrition to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 11.7% of the companies (14) indicated that they used this method. This finding is not surprising as professionals usually play a strategic role in the organisation and letting them go would be detrimental for the organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(e): Have you used no renewal of fixed-term/temporary contracts to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used no renewal of fixed-term or temporary contracts to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results show that 83.3% of the companies (100) do not use no renewal of fixed-term/temporary contracts to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 16.7% of the companies (20) indicated that they did. Again, this finding is not surprising as professionals play a vital role in the operation of an organisation, and thus, would either be retained than made redundant.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(f): Have you used unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used unpaid study leave or vacations to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that 93.3% of the companies (112) do not use unpaid study vacations or leave to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 6.7% of the companies (8) indicated that they did. Again, this finding makes sense. Professionals are an essential employee group within an organisation and there would be no rationale to grant them unpaid study leaves/vacations.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(g): Have you used outsourcing to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used outsourcing to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results show that 93.3% of the companies (112) do not use outsourcing to reduce the professionals in the organisation, while 6.7% of the companies (8) indicated that they did. It is sometimes to the advantage of an organisation to have their professional people working for them rather than outsourcing their services as there are always some risks involved in outsourcing. This also appeared to be the view of the respondents.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(h): Have you used management pay-cuts to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used management pay cuts to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results show that 96.7% of the companies (116) do not use management pay cuts to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they did. As indicated in the previous questions, professionals are an important employee group, and organisations will not easily use this type of punitive method to reduce their professional staff.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(i): Have you used a ban on overtime to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used a ban on overtime to reduce professionals in their organisations. The results indicate that 90.8% of the companies (109) do not use a ban on overtime to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 9.2% of the companies (11) indicated that they did. Professionals usually do not receive overtime payments due to the nature of their work and job classification. A ban on overtime is typically used at lower levels (clericals/manual employees) in the organisation. This finding is therefore not surprising.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(j): Have you used wage freeze to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used wage freeze to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that none of the participating companies had used wage freeze to reduce professionals in the organisation. This finding is not surprising as this type of method is not usually applicable to professional people.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(k): Have you used reduced job propositions to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used reduced job propositions to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that 97.5% of the companies (117) do not use reduced job propositions to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 2.5% of the companies (3) indicated that they did. Again, this finding is not surprising for the professional group of employees within an organisation as they are usually responsible for specific skilled activities in the organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(l): Have you used job sharing to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used job sharing to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that 95.8% of the companies (118) do not use job sharing to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 4.2% of the companies (5) indicated that they did. Again, this finding is not surprising as professionals are appointed for specific job opportunities, for which they are trained, and as such, job sharing will not be an appropriate method to use in their case.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(m): Have you used reduced benefits to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used reduced benefits to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that 98.3% of the companies (118) do not use reduced benefits to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they did. Again, the finding makes sense, as professionals receive specific packages, which are agreed on beforehand, and reducing such packages will not make any sense, especially in light of their continued employment.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(n): Have you used employee pay-cut to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used employee pay cuts to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that 99.2% of the companies (119) did not use management pay-cuts to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 0.8% of the companies (1) indicated that they had done so. As indicated earlier, organisations are hesitant to touch either the pay or benefits for this group as it can be seen as punitive, and it could result in strike action or acts of company sabotage.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(o): Have you used individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that 95.0% of the companies (114) do not use individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 5.0% of the companies (6) indicated that they did. This finding makes sense in view of the finding for question 1, where the respondents indicated a growth in the staff numbers over the previous three years.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(p): Have you used concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in 12 months) to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that 97.5% of the companies (117) do not use concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in 12 months) to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 2.5% of the companies (3) indicated that they

did. Again, this finding makes sense when taking the findings in terms of question 1 into consideration regarding the growth in staff numbers over the previous three years.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(g): Have you used mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce professionals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used mass layoffs and/or compulsory redundancies (10% or more of the workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce professionals in the organisation. The results indicate that 96.7% of the companies (116) do not use mass layoffs and/or compulsory redundancies (10% or more of the workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they did. Again, the finding makes sense due to the important role this employee group plays in an organisation and the fact that in question 1, respondents indicated that there had been growth in staff over the previous three years.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(a): Have you used recruitment freeze to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used recruitment freeze as a method to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results show that 81.7% of the companies (98) do not use recruitment freeze as a method to reduce clericals/manual employees, while 18.3% of the companies (22) indicated that they did. From Table 2.2, it is clear that the results for this group are similar to those for the managerial group, which is an interesting finding. However, when comparing the answer to a similar question professionals were asked earlier, it is clear that a tendency existed among respondents to apply this method to a greater extent to the clericals/manual employee group. This finding is in line with the trends in general for this group.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(b): Have you used early retirement to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used early retirement as a method to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 85.8% of the companies (103) do not use early retirement to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 14.2% of the companies (17) indicated that they did. This finding is interesting as this is usually the approach followed by companies in South Africa particularly for this group of employees (Paton, 2018). The relatively low usage of this method is questionable, especially when comparing it to the results for managers and professionals. However, taking the findings of question 1 above into consideration, the finding is not that surprising.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(c): Have you used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results show that 78.3% (94) do not use internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 21.7% of the companies (26) indicated that they did. This

finding makes sense as the South African labour law requires organisations to try to redeploy their staff before they can be retrenched; hence, the larger percentage of companies indicating that they had used this approach.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(d): Have you used voluntary redundancies/attrition to reduce clericals or manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used voluntary redundancies/attrition to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results show that 88.3% of the companies (106) do not use voluntary redundancies and/or attrition to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 11.7% of the companies (14) indicated that they did. The finding for this group of employees is again not surprising when considered against the background of the finding related to question 1. It is also interesting to note that the finding is very similar to that for the manager and professional groups.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(e): Have you used no renewal of fixed term/temporary contracts to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used no renewal of fixed-term/temporary contracts to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results show that 72.5% of the companies (87) do not use no renewal of fixed-term/temporary contracts to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 27.5% of the companies (33) indicated that they did. The high usage of this method by organisations in South Africa makes sense as a large portion of employees in this group are nowadays offered contract employment (Evans, 2018).

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(f): Have you used unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 93.3% of the companies (112) do not use unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 6.7% of the companies (8) indicated that they did. This finding is not surprising as this type of method is not popular at the lower levels within organisations.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(g): Have you used outsourcing to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used outsourcing to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results show that 95.2% of the companies (115) do not use outsourcing to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 4.2% of the companies (5) indicated that they did. This finding is not surprising as outsourcing is usually found for higher-skilled jobs where the organisation needs expert knowledge, which they sometimes cannot obtain easily.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(h): Have you used management pay-cut to reduce clericals or manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used management pay cuts to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results show that 98.3% of the companies (118) do not use management pay cuts to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they did. This finding is not surprising as this method is not really applicable to the clericals/manual employees in the organisation as the concept indicates.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(i): Have you used a ban on overtime to reduce clericals or manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used a ban on overtime to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 85.3% of the companies (103) do not use a ban on overtime to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 14.2% of the companies (17) indicated that they did. Compared to the manager or professional group as indicated in Table 2.2 above, the use of this method is prevalent with the clerical and manual employees in organisations due to the nature of their job e.g. routine tasks.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2 (j): Have you used wage freeze to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used wage freeze to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that none of the participating companies had used wage freeze to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. This finding is not surprising considering the level of employees. Organisations are generally sensitive to freeze the wages of lower-level employees as these employees could see it as a punitive method and react by sabotaging the organisation or going on strike

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(k): Have you used reduced job propositions to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used reduced job propositions to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 98.3% of the companies (118) do not use reduced job propositions to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they did. It is interesting to note that the finding here is similar to that for the managerial group, while the percentage is lower than that for the professional group. No real explanation for this situation can be provided.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(l): Have you used job sharing to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used job sharing to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 96.7% of the companies (116) do not use job sharing to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they did. The lack of use of this

method is somewhat surprising as it is normally popular at this employee level. The results however indicate that it is more popular for managers or professionals in organisations in South Africa, which is somewhat surprising for this job level.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(m): Have you used reduced benefits to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used reduced benefits to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 98.3% of the companies (118) do not use reduced benefits to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they did. Again, the finding here is similar to that for the professionals, which is somewhat unexpected as in many organisations the benefits offered are focused on the managerial and professional employees rather than on the clericals/manual employees in an organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(n): Have you used management pay-cuts to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used management pay cuts to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 98.3% of the companies (118) do not use management pay-cuts to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they had done so. As indicated earlier, organisations are hesitant to touch either the pay or benefits for this group as it can be seen as punitive, and it could result in strike action or acts of company sabotage.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(o): Have you used individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 95.0% of the companies (114) do not use individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 5.0% of the companies (6) indicated that they did. This makes sense against the findings for question 1 earlier regarding the growth in employee numbers during the previous three years instead of a decline in numbers.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(p): Have you used concentrated layoffs (5-9% laid off in 12 months' period) to reduce clericals or manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in 12 months) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 96.7% of the companies (116) do not use concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they did. Again, this finding was similar to that for the manager or professional group with only a slight increase for the manual/clerical group. This is in line with the finding for question 1 above regarding the growth in employee numbers in the companies the participating in survey.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 2(g): Have you used mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce clericals/manuals in the organisation?

In Table 2.2, it is indicated whether the participating companies used mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation. The results indicate that 96.7% of the companies (116) do not use mass layoffs/ compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in 1–3-month period) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they did. Again, it is interesting to note that the findings for the three groups, i.e. managers or professionals and clericals/manual employees as far as this aspect is concerned, are the same, which as mentioned before, makes sense when measured against the findings in question 1 above.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3: Please indicate which of the following recruitment methods are used in your organisation

Table 2.3: Methods used for recruitment in organisations

Methods used for recruitment in organisations	Managers		Professionals		Clerical/Manual	
	Not generally used	Yes	Not generally used	Yes	Not generally used	Yes
A Internally	39.2%	60.8%	40.0%	60.0%	30.0%	70.0%
Number of companies	47	73	48	72	36	84
B Word of mouth/employee referrals	70.0%	30.0%	70.8%	29.2%	68.3%	31.7%
Number of companies	84	36	85	35	82	38
C Vacancies in news papers	18.3%	81.7%	94.2%	5.8%	39.2%	60.8%
Number of companies	22	98	113	7	47	73
D Vacancy page on company website	29.2%	70.3%	32.5%	67.5%	40.0%	60.0%
Number of companies	35	85	39	81	48	72
E Vacancies on commercial job websites	56.7%	43.3%	57.5%	42.5%	71.7%	28.3%
Number of companies	68	52	69	51	86	34
F Social Media (e.g. Facebook)	84.2%	15.8%	84.2%	15.8%	83.3%	–
Number of companies	101	19	101	19	100	–
G Speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institution)	90.0%	10.0%	84.2%	15.8%	82.5%	17.5%
Number of companies	108	12	101	19	99	21
H Career fairs	91.7%	8.3%	88.3%	11.7%	91.7%	8.3%
Number of companies	110	10	106	14	110	10
I Recruitment agencies/ consultancies/executive search	73.3%	26.7%	76.7%	23.3%	85.0%	15.0%
Number of companies	88	32	92	28	102	18
J Job centres (public)	93.3%	6.7%	70.0%	30.0%	92.5%	7.5%
Number of companies	112	8	84	36	111	9
K Trainee program	84.2%	15.8%	–	–	62.5%	37.5%
Number of companies	101	19	–	–	75	45

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(a): Do you use internal recruitment to appoint managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used internal recruitment as a method to recruit managers. The results show that 39.2% of the companies (47) did not use internal recruitment as a method to recruit managers, while 60.8% of the companies (73) indicated that they did. Although recruiting managers from inside the organisation does have benefits, such as the fact that they know how the company operates, there is also a negative side in that no new ideas are brought into the organisation from outside, which could ultimately lead to inbreeding. This method appeared popular in the case of the majority of the companies. According to labour legislation, organisations are compelled to advertise widely in the media when a vacancy occurs it could possibly be presumed that this did not occur within these organisations.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(b): Do you use word of mouth/employee referrals to appoint managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the word-of-mouth method and/or employee referrals as a way to recruit managers. The results indicate that 70.0% of the companies (84) do not use the word-of-mouth method or employee referrals to recruit managers, while 30.0% (36) indicated that they did. As indicated in the previous question, it is a legal requirement for companies to recruit as widely as possible (multiple media) so the assumption can thus be made that the companies are doing this. From the findings it is clear that this is not a popular method to use.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(c): Do you use vacancies in newspapers to recruit managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used newspapers to recruit managers. The results show that 18.3% of the companies (22) do not use newspapers as a method to recruit managers, while 81.3% of the companies (99) indicated that they did. This finding appears to be in line with the requirements of the labour legislation in the country.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(d): Do you use a vacancy page on the company website to recruit managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used a vacancy page on the company website to recruit managers. The results show that 29.2% of the companies (35) do not use a company website as a method to recruit managers, while 70.3% of the companies (85) indicated that they did. Besides being a cheaper option than advertising in newspapers for example, the company website is also accessible to anyone anywhere in the world, which makes it an extremely effective method and in line with the labour legislation. This method thus broadens the pool from which to recruit. Normally additional information about the company is also available on this type of webpage such as for example frequently asked questions.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(e): Do you use the vacancies on commercial job websites to recruit managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the commercial job websites to recruit managers. The results show that 56.7% of the companies (68) do not use commercial job websites as a method to recruit managers, while 43.3% of the companies (52) indicated that they did. Although placing an advertisement on a popular commercial job website does have its advantages, especially because of the number of job seekers usually visiting such sites, it does remove the personal company contact a job seeker would have when visiting a company website. The company website also usually has links to important areas such as the company's policies, organisational structure, products and/or services and many other areas of interest, which are not always available on commercial job websites.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(f): Do you use social media (e.g. Facebook) to recruit managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used social media to recruit managers. The results indicate that 84.2% of the companies (101) do not use social media as a method to recruit managers, while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they did. This is a new approach being followed worldwide, which perhaps will become popular with local companies in the future as this method of recruitment proves to be viable.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(g): Do you use speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used speculative applications and/or walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit managers. The results show that 90.0% of the companies (108) do not use speculative applications and/or walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit managers, while 10.0% of the companies (12) indicated that they did. This type of recruitment method does not appear to be very popular among companies, although use of this method allows companies to recruit young managers with the latest theoretical knowledge but not necessarily with substantial work experience.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(h): Do you use career fairs to recruit managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used career fairs to recruit managers. The results show that 91.7% of the companies (110) do not use career fairs to recruit managers, while 8.3% of the companies (10) indicated that they did. From the results, it is clear that this type of recruitment method is not at all popular for the recruitment of managers. Career fairs are usually focused on young or junior employees and as such would not normally be a method used to recruit managers, i.e. those with considerable experience.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(i): Do you use recruitment agencies/consultancies/executive search to recruit managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used recruitment agencies, consultancies and/or an executive search to recruit managers. The results indicate that 73.3% of the companies (88) do not use recruitment agencies, consultancies and/or an executive

search to recruit managers, while 26.7% of the companies (32) indicated that they did. This finding is somewhat surprising as companies usually use this method to recruit especially managerial staff. The reason is that these organisations have extensive databases of potential employees, which they have built up over years and this would save the company time and effort in their quest to search for specific type of managers they require.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(j): Do you use job centres (public) to recruit managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used job centres (public) to recruit managers. The results indicate that 93.3% of the companies (112) do not use job centres (public) to recruit managers, while 6.7% of the companies (8) indicated that they did. Again, this is not a popular method to recruit managers, as suitable candidates are not necessarily found at public job centres. Usually lower-level unskilled workers tend to frequent these centres.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(k): Do you use a trainee program to recruit managers?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used a trainee programme to recruit managers. The results indicate that 84.2% of the companies (101) do not use a trainee programme to recruit managers, while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they did. It would thus appear that this type of recruitment method is not that popular with companies. One advantage of such a programme however is that the company can specifically train the type of manager which it needs. However, this approach would be time consuming and in many instances also costly. It also does not a guarantee the trainee would stay with the company after the training has been completed.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(a): Do you use internal recruitment to appoint professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used internal recruitment as a method to recruit professionals. The results show that 40.0% of the companies (48) do not use this method to recruit professionals, while 60.0% of the companies (72) indicated that they did. This finding is somewhat surprising as professionals are usually specifically skilled, and not necessarily trained internally. It would appear that the respondents might have interpreted the word 'professional' not as was intended i.e. a person normally registered with a professional body for example engineers, accountants, attorneys etc.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(b): Do you use word of mouth/employee referrals to appoint professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the word-of-mouth method and/or employee referrals as a way to recruit professionals. The results indicate that 70.8% of the companies (85) do not use the word-of-mouth method and/or employee referrals to recruit professionals, while 29.0% of the companies (25) indicated that they did. Again, due to the nature of professional employees, this finding is questionable. Usually, professionals can be contacted through the professional bodies to which they belong.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(c): Do you use vacancies in newspapers to recruit professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used newspapers to recruit professionals. The results show that 94.2% of the companies (113) do not use newspapers to recruit professionals, while 5.8% of the companies (7) indicated that they did. To use the media and/or newspapers to recruit professional staff increases the scope of finding a suitable qualified person. It is also in line with the labour legislation to recruit as wide as possible. However, the low use of this method is questionable.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(d): Do you use the vacancy page on the company website to recruit professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used a vacancy page on the company website to recruit professionals. The results show that 32.5% of the companies (39) do not use the vacancy page on the company website to recruit professionals, while 67.5% of the companies (81) indicated that they did. It would appear that this is a popular method used by the companies for the recruitment of professional group staff.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(e): Do you use the vacancies on commercial job websites to recruit professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies advertised the vacancies for professionals on commercial job websites. The results show that 57.5% of the companies (69) do not use this method, while 42.5% of the companies (51) indicated that they did. It would appear that this method is used by a large number of companies. This makes sense as this type of website can provide access to a very large group of potential professional employees.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(f): Do you use social media (e.g. Facebook) to recruit professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the social media to recruit professionals. The results indicate that 84.2% of the companies (101) do not use social media to recruit professionals, while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they did. As indicated earlier, this is a relatively new method used by companies internationally. Perhaps, as local companies become more accustomed to the method, its popularity will expand.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(g): Do you use speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used speculative applications and/or walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit professionals. The results show that 84.2% of the companies (101) do not use speculative applications and/or walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit professionals, while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they did. This type of recruitment method does not appear to be very popular among companies. This finding makes sense as professionals usually work through their professional bodies to look for employment, and as indicated earlier, they also make use of other media, such as company websites.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(h): Do you use career fairs to recruit professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used career fairs to recruit professionals. The results show that 88.3% of the companies (106) do not use career fairs to recruit professionals, while 11.7% of the companies (17) indicated that they did. From the results, it is clear that this type of recruitment method is not at all popular for the recruitment of professionals. This finding makes sense, as fairs are usually used to recruit qualified young inexperienced employees.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(i): Do you use recruitment agencies/consultancies/executive search to recruit professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used recruitment agencies/ consultancies/executive search to recruit professionals. The results indicate that 76.7% of the companies (92) do not use recruitment agencies/consultancies/executive search to recruit professionals, while 23.3% of the companies (28) indicated that they did. It is clear that there is limited use of this type of recruitment method for professionals. The advantage of using this type of method is that these agencies have access to a very large group of possible candidates, which they have built up over the years. Access to this type of numbers of professionals will thus not necessary be possible by a single company.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(j): Do you use job centres (public) to recruit professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used job centres (public) to recruit professionals. The results indicate that 70.0% of the companies (84) do not use job centres (public) to recruit professionals, while 30.0% of the companies (27) indicated that they did. This finding is interesting, as it appears more popular than the previous option using recruitment agencies. As mentioned earlier, it is not the general practice for companies to recruit professionals through public job centres as these centres are normally used more by unskilled type of employees. However, with a scarcity of work in South Africa, professionals might also try to use this alternative to find work.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(k): Do you use a trainee program to recruit professionals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used a trainee programme to recruit professionals. From the findings, it would appear that none of the companies used this method to recruit professional employees, which makes sense as these employees are already trained in a specific discipline or field.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(a): Do you use internal recruitment to appoint clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used internal recruitment as a method to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results show that 30.0% (36) do not use internal recruitment as a method to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 70% (84) indicated that they did. It would thus appear that this method is very popular especially for the recruitment of clericals/manual employees. This makes sense, as this type of method provides

these employees with an opportunity to move to another section of his or her choice within the organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(b): Do you use word of mouth/employee referrals to appoint clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the word-of-mouth or employee referral method to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results indicate that 68.3% of the companies (82) do not use this method, while 31.7% of the companies (38) indicated that they did. This type of method is usually very popular with lower-level employees such as clericals/manual employees and the finding is somewhat surprising. Again, the impact of the labour legislation could be a consideration affecting the limited use of this method by companies.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(c): Do you use vacancies in newspapers to recruit clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used vacancies in newspapers to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results show that 39.2% of the companies (47) do not use vacancies in newspapers to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 60.8% of the companies (73) indicated that they did. This finding is in line with the labour legislation as discussed earlier. It allows the organisation to consider all possible candidates available.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(d): Do you use a vacancy page on the company website to recruit clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used a vacancy page on the company website to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results show that 40.0% of the companies (48) do not use a vacancy page on the company website to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 60.0% of the companies (72) indicated that they did. As most prospective employees have access to computers, the use of this method to recruit makes sense and is thus popular with clericals/manuals.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(e): Do you use the vacancies on commercial job websites to recruit clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the vacancies on commercial job websites to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results show that 71.7% of the companies (86) do not use the vacancies on commercial job websites to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 28.3% of the companies (34) indicated that they did. This figure is somewhat low as it is this type of media where the unemployed, such as clericals/manual employees will look for jobs by either using a family member or friends' computer.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(f): Do you use social media (e.g. Facebook) to recruit clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used social media (e.g. Facebook) to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results indicate that 83.3% (100) do not use this method. It would appear from the findings that no participating company attempted to use this method to recruit clerical or manual staff at all. It therefore seems that the use of social

media was not a popular method to recruit clericals/manual employees at the time of the research. As indicated earlier, this is a new medium for most companies to use, and perhaps as it proves to be a viable option in the future, its popularity might increase in this area.

Section I (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(g): Do you use speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit clericals/ manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results show that 82.5% of the companies (99) do not use speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 17.5% of the companies (21) indicated that they did. This type of recruitment method is generally popular, especially among lower-level employers, and the low frequency use of this method by this group is surprising.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(h): Do you use career fairs to recruit clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used career fairs to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results show that 91.7% of the companies (110) do not use career fairs to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 8.3% of the companies (10) indicated that they did. From the results, it is clear that this type of recruitment method is not at all popular for the recruitment of clericals/manual employees, which makes sense as these types of employees are not usually recruited at career fairs (Smith, 2014).

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(i): Do you use recruitment agencies/ consultancies/executive search to recruit clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used recruitment agencies/consultancies and/or an executive search to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results indicate that 85.0% of the companies (102) do not use this method, while 15.0% of the companies (18) indicated that they did. Due to the cost implications of this method, it is not typically used for lower-skilled employees such as clericals/manual employees.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(j): Do you use job centres (public) to recruit clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used job centres (public) to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results indicate that 92.5% of the companies (111) do not use job centres (public) to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 7.5% of the companies (9) indicated that they did. This finding is somewhat surprising as this method is normally used to recruit employees in the clerical/manual job category.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 3(k): Do you use the trainee program to recruit clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the trainee programme to recruit clericals/manual employees. The results indicate that 62.5% of the companies (75) do not use the trainee programme to recruit clericals/manuals, while 37.5% of the companies (45) indicated that they did. This is usually a popular method to recruit clerical or manual staff

as the company can train the employees to their specific requirements, especially staff at the lower level, such as clericals/manual employees.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4: Please indicate which of the following selection methods are used in your organisation

Table 2.4: Methods used for selection in organisations

Methods used for selection in organisations	Managers		Professionals		Clericals/ Manuals	
	Gene-rally not used	Yes	Gene-rally not used	Yes	Gene-rally not used	Yes
A Panel interview	12.5%	87.5%	16.7%	83.3%	27.2%	70.8%
Number of companies	15	105	20	100	35	85
B One-to-one interviews	63.3%	36.7%	67.5%	32.5%	71.7%	28.3%
Number of companies	76	44	81	39	86	34
C Application form	28.3%	71.7%	69.2%	30.8%	35.0%	65.0%
Number of companies	34	86	83	37	42	78
D Psychometric test	55.0%	45.0%	73.3%	26.7%	90.0%	10.0%
Number of companies	66	54	88	32	108	12
E Assessment centre	69.2%	30.8%	79.2%	20.8%	87.5%	12.5%
Number of companies	83	37	95	25	105	15
F Social media profiles	89.2%	10.8%	90.0%	10.0%	98.3%	1.7
Number of companies	107	13	108	12	118	2
G References	14.2%	85.8%	17.5%	82.5%	31.7%	68.3%
Number of companies	17	103	21	99	38	82
H Ability tests/Work sample	61.7%	38.3%	61.7%	38.3%	66.7%	33.3%
Number of companies	74	46	74	46	80	40
I Technical tests	68.3%	31.7%	55.8%	44.2%	70.0%	30.0%
Number of companies	82	38	67	53	84	36
J Numerical test	83.3%	16.7%	77.5%	22.5%	77.5%	22.5%
Number of companies	100	20	93	27	93	27
K Online selection tests	90.8%	9.2%	91.7%	8.3%	95.8%	4.2%
Number of companies	109	11	110	10	115	5

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(a): Do you use the panel interview to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the interview method to select managers. The results show that 12.5% of the companies (15) do not use interview panels to select managers, while 87.5% of the companies (105) indicated that they did. Appointing managers in an organisation is critical, as they usually supervise a large number of staff, and a wrong decision in this regard could have serious consequences for the company. Using the interview method minimises individual bias, since the interviewing panel members score the applicant individually, which usually results in a good balanced decision. From the results, it is clear that the majority of participating companies in South Africa use this method to select their managers.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(b): Do you use one-on-one interviews to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used one-on-one interviews to select managers. The results show that 63.3% of the companies (76) do not use one-on-one interviews to select managers, while 36.7% of the companies (44) indicated that they did. Compared with the results in the previous question, it is clear that the participating companies do not depend fully on the one-to-one interview method to appoint managers. This is encouraging, as the issue of individual bias could become a real problem, which would ultimately be to the disadvantage of the organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(c): Do you use application forms to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used application forms to select managers. The results show that 28.3% of the companies (34) do not use application forms to select managers, while 71.7% of the companies (86) indicated that they did. The use of the application form is the only method to gain an overall picture of the candidate's profile as it is structured into categories indicating educational qualifications and work experience as well as other relevant aspects such as community involvement and hobbies engagement. It is clear from the findings that the majority of the participating companies realise the value of using application forms to select managers.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(d): Do you use psychometric tests to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used psychometric tests to select managers. The results show that 55.0% of the companies (66) do not use psychometric tests, while 45.0% of the companies (54) indicated that they did. The use of testing in the selection process has had periods of growth and periods of decline (Paterson & Uys, 2005). Some tests are unreliable, while others have been found not to predict employee job performance accurately. In terms of Section 8 of the Employment Equity Act No. 55 of 1998, psychological testing and other similar assessments of an employee in South Africa, are prohibited unless the test or assessment used:

(1) has been shown scientifically to be valid and reliable;
(2) can be administered fairly to all employees; and
(3) is not biased against any employee or group.

Hence, the use of tests can play a key role, especially at managerial level, but the tests will have to comply with the above requirements. It is clear that the majority of participating companies have seen value in their use. However, since these tests can be expensive, and because they can only be conducted by professional people, many small companies cannot afford to use them and outsource this activity to consultants (Health Professions Act amended 1974 amended, 2008).

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(e): Do you use assessment centres to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used assessment centres to select managers. The results show that 69.2% of the companies (83) do not use this method

to select managers, while 30.8% of the companies (37) indicated that they did. This finding is somewhat surprising – assessment centres were designed to be used specifically in the evaluation of managers (American Psychological Association, 2004). Assessment centres are usually conducted off the premises, and assessment takes from one day to one week. Assessments may include up to 12 candidates at a time. Trained professional evaluators, known as assessors, observe, record and evaluate how a candidate performs in simulated job situations (Belcourt, Bohlander, Snell, 2011:186). This evaluation system is quite expensive, and in many instances, only large organisations have in-house staff to run these centres. Small companies tend to make use of outside consultants, which is extremely costly. This approach is usually used to evaluate higher-level managers.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(f): Do you use social media profiles to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used social media profiles to select managers. The results show that 89.2% of the companies (107) do not use this method to select managers, while 10.8% of the companies (13) indicated that they did. As indicated earlier, the use of social media for recruitment or selection is still relatively new, and until companies develop confidence in the use of this type of media, it will only have limited value in the selection process of candidates.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(g): Do you use references to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used references to select managers. The results show that 14.2% of the companies (17) do not use references for this purpose, while 85.8% of the companies (103) indicated that they did. This finding corresponds to the findings in Table 2.48 regarding the use of application forms. Reference checking is extremely popular in South African companies. In recent years, thoroughly checking the backgrounds of prospective employees has become increasingly necessary because of the high level of fraud (i.e. false educational certificates) among potential employees. An investigation like a reference check can be both an energy-saving and cost-effective method to screen out undesirable applicants (Israelstam, 2013).

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(h): Do you use ability tests/work samples to select managers

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used ability tests or work samples to select managers. The results show that 61.7% of the companies (74) do not use this method to select managers, while 38.3% of the companies (46) indicated that they did. Besides the assessment centres, companies can use ability test/worksamples to test the ability of managers. Different types of ability tests for selecting managers exist. Here, only two types, that is, the mental ability test, and the leadership ability test, are discussed. The major types of mental ability tests used in business today include measures of general intelligence, verbal, nonverbal and numerical skills, spatial relations ability and the ability to visualise the effects of manipulating or changing the position of objects. Regarding the selection of managers, 70 years of research indicate that successful managers are forecast most accurately by tests of their intellectual ability, by their ability to draw conclusions from verbal or numerical information, and by their interests (Cascio 2003:251). Scales designed to

measure two key aspects of leadership behaviour – consideration and initiating structure – have been developed and are used in many situations. Consideration reflects management actions aimed at developing mutual trust, respect for subordinates' ideas and consideration of their feelings. Initiating structure, on the other hand, reflects the extent to which an individual defines and structures his or her role, and the roles of his or her subordinates in performing tasks (Cascio 2003:254). Thus, the value of those tests cannot be underestimated. From the findings, it was clear that the respondents had not yet fully embraced the use of this method in the selection of their managers.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(i): Do you use technical tests to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used technical tests to select managers. The results show that 68.3% of the companies (82) do not use this method to select managers, while 31.7% of the companies (38) indicated that they did. This finding is not surprising because technical tests are usually used only for technically oriented jobs and not for managerial positions. However, since 31.7% of the participating companies indicated that they used this type of test to select managers, one can assume that they used them for positions of managers working in a technical environment of the company.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(j): Do you use numeracy tests to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used numeracy tests to select managers. The results show that 83.3% of the companies (100) do not use this method to select managers, while 16.7% of the companies (20) indicated that they did. This finding is not surprising especially at the managerial level where this aspect of a person's numerical ability is taken for granted in many cases.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(k): Do you use online selection tests to select managers?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used online selection tests to select managers. The results show that 90.8% of the companies (109) do not use this method to select managers, while 9.2% of the participating companies (11) indicated that they did. Companies usually make use of outside professionals to undertake these tests on their behalf due to their complexity. These professionals usually use a combination of tests in the process. From the finding, it would appear that these tests are not very popular. One reason could be the costs involved.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(a): Do you use the interview panel to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used interview panels to select professionals. The results show that 16.7% of the companies (20) do not use this method to select professionals, while 83.3% of the companies (100) indicated that they did. Appointing professionals in an organisation is important because these people play a crucial role in assisting the company to become more competitive. They are usually people with creative ideas who take the initiative. Using a panel interview in the selection process, ensures that the best person is selected for the job, as it eliminates a biased opinion from one interviewer.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(b): Do you use one-on-one interviews to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the one-on-one interviews method to select professionals. The results show that 67.5% of the companies (81) do not use this method, while 32.5% of the companies (39) indicated that they did. Compared with the results in the previous question, it is clear that companies do not depend on the one-on-one interview method only to appoint professionals but rather use panels of employees see question 4(a). This is encouraging because the issue of individual bias could become a real problem.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(c): Do you use application forms to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used application forms to select professionals. The results show that 30.8% of the companies (37) do not use this method, while 69.2% of the companies (83) indicated that they did. This finding is surprising, as in the case of managers, the use of the application form was in the region of 71.7%. This finding is similar to the findings for managers.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(d): Do you use psychometric tests to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used psychometric tests to select professionals. The results show that 73.3% of the companies (88) do not use psychometric tests, while 26.7% of the companies (32) indicated that they did. Compared to the manager group, the finding here is extremely low. It is not clear why this would be. The reason might perhaps be that as these are professionals, the companies might have felt that these types of tests were unnecessary. However, it is important to remember that these employees do not work in isolation, and for example need social and other behavioural attributes, which can only be identified through tests.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(e): Do you use assessment centres to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used assessment centres to select professionals. The results show that 79.2% of the companies (95) do not use this method to select professionals, while 20.8% of the companies (25) indicated that they did. This finding is somewhat unexpected – assessment centres are designed to be used specifically in the evaluation of managers and/or professionals. Assessment centres are usually conducted off the premises, assessments last from one day to one week, and may include up to 12 candidates at a time. Trained professional evaluators, known as assessors, observe, record and evaluate how a candidate performs in simulated job situations. This evaluation system is quite expensive, and in many instances, only large organisations have in-house staff to run these centres. Small companies tend to make use of outside consultants, which is extremely costly. Thus, the use of assessment centres for the selection of professionals can play an important role for the organisation as it would assist in the appointment of the most suitable candidate.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(f): Do you use social media profiles to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used social media profiles to select professionals. The results show that 90.0% of the companies (108) do not use this method to select professionals, while 10.0% of the companies (12) indicated that they did. As mentioned earlier, this method is still relatively new in this area, and as such is not being implemented fully by companies at this stage.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(g): Do you use references to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used references to select professionals. The results show that 17.5% of the companies (21) do not use references for this purpose, while 82.5% of the companies (99) indicated that they did. This finding contradicts the earlier finding regarding the use of application forms. It is unclear how the participating companies had obtained the references from the prospective employees in the absence of an application form.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(h): Do you use ability tests/work samples to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used ability tests/work samples to select professionals. The results show that 61.7% of the companies (74) do not use this method to select professionals, while 38.3% of the companies (46) indicated that they did. This low response rate is in line with the earlier finding for psychometric tests. It might be that the companies do not see the need for these tests to be undertaken for their professional employees as they comply with the requirements for the professional body to which they belong to act in a specific occupation e.g. accountant, lawyer etc.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(i): Do you use technical tests to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used technical tests to select professionals. The results show that 55.8% of the companies (67) do not use this method to select professionals, while 44.2% of the companies (53) indicated that they did. This finding is surprising because technical tests are usually used for technically oriented jobs and not for professional positions. What is of concern is that the response for this method is the highest compared to the findings in terms of ability tests and psychometric tests for this group. Perhaps as indicated earlier, the concept ‘professional’ was interpreted differently by the respective respondents.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(j): Do you use numeracy tests to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used numeracy tests to select professionals. The results show that 77.5% of the companies (93) do not use this method to select professionals, while 22.5% of the companies (27) indicated that they did. In contrast to the previous finding, this finding is in line with the findings for ability tests and for psychometric

tests. It therefore seems as if companies are in two minds regarding the value of those tests for their professional employees.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(k): Do you use online selection tests to select professionals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used online selection tests to select professionals. The results show that 91.7% of the companies (110) do not use this method to select professionals, while 8.3% of the companies (10) indicated that they did. This finding is not surprising, as it would appear that the participating companies do not see the need for any specific test as far it pertains to the appointment of their professional employees.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(a): Do you use the interview panel to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used the interview panel method to select clericals/manual employees. The results show that 27.2% of the companies (35) do not use this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 70.8% of the companies (85) indicated that they did. Appointing clericals/manuals in an organisation is important because these people play a crucial role in the company becoming increasingly competitive, for example, by being administratively efficient and productive. The use of this method of selection in the clerical/manual area is thus very popular.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(b): Do you use one-on-one interviews to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used one-on-one interviews to select clericals/manual employees. The results show that 71.7% of the companies (86) do not use this method, while 28.3% of the companies (34) indicated that they did. Compared with the results in the previous question, it is clear that the participating companies do not depend fully on the one-on-one interview method to appoint clericals/manual employees. This is encouraging, because the issue of individual bias could become a real problem when using this method.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(c): Do you use application forms to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used application forms to select clericals/manual employees. The results show that 35.0% of the companies (42) do not use this method, while 65.0% of the companies (78) indicated that they did. Application forms are important instruments to use as they contain valuable information about the employee's work history and qualifications. It can also indicate to the organisation whether the prospective employee is a regular job hopper and possibly not a good candidate to consider for appointment.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(d): Do you use psychometric tests to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used psychometric tests to select clericals/manual employees. The results show that 90.0% of the companies (108) did

not use psychometric tests, while 10.0% of the companies (12) indicated that they did. This finding is not surprising, as these tests are not usually administered to persons at these lower job levels.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(e): Do you use assessment centres to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used assessment centres to select clericals/manual employees. The results show that 87.5% of the companies (105) do not use this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 12.5% of the companies (15) indicated that they did. Again, this finding is not surprising, especially not in terms of these job levels. An assessment centre is a very expensive technique to use and the cost must justify the means such as for employees at the senior/managerial level.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(f): Do you use social media profiles to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used social media profiles to select clericals/manual employees. The results show that 98.3% of the companies (118) do not use this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they did. Again, this finding is not surprising, especially when considering the level of employees involved.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(g): Do you use references to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used references to select clerical/manual employees. The results show that 31.7% of the companies (38) do not use references, while 68.3% of the companies (82) indicated that they did. This finding corresponds to the findings regarding the use of application forms for this job category. Reference checking is extremely popular in South African companies for clericals/manual employees as these job groups usually have a high level of job mobility (Edmonds, 2013).

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(h): Do you use ability tests to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, the respondents were required to indicate whether they used ability tests to select clericals/manual employees. The results show that 66.7% of the companies (80) do not use this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 33.3% of the companies (40) indicated that they did. It is interesting to see that the findings regarding this method are very similar to those for the manager and professional groups. It would have been thought that this method would be especially important for this specific group, which appeared not to be the case.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(i): Do you use technical tests to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used technical tests to select clericals/manual employees. These results show that 70.0% of the companies (84) do not use

this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 30.0% of the companies (36) indicated that they did. Again, this finding is somewhat strange as manual workers are usually involved with work of a technical nature in organisations and these tests would be most appropriate to use for this purpose.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(j): Do you use numeracy tests to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, it is indicated whether the participating companies used numeracy tests to select clericals/manual employees. The results show that 77.5% of the companies (93) do not use this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 22.5% of the companies (27) indicated that they did. Again, the low level of application of these tests is interesting. These tests are usually carried out in terms of employees within this group to establish whether they have the ability to function within the organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 4(k): Do you use online selection tests to select clericals/manuals?

In Table 2.4, the respondents were required to indicate whether they used online selection tests to select clericals/manual employees. The results show that 95.8% of the companies (115) do not use this method to select clericals/manuals, while 4.2% of the companies (5) indicated that they did. From the findings, it seems that the participating companies might have refrained from using this method for their clerical or manual workers. Because the cost is relatively high, companies might not regard it as appropriate for this group.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(a): Does your organisation have action programmes covering any of the following groups to improve their participation in the workplace

Table 2.5: Action programmes in the workplace

Action programmes covering the following groups to improve participation in the workplace	Recruitment		Training		Career pro-gression	
	Gene-rally not used	Yes	Gene-rally not used	Yes	Gene-rally not used	Yes
A Minority ethnics	70.0%	30.0%	73.3%	26.7%	78.3%	21.1%
Number of companies	84	36	88	32	94	26
B Older workers (aged 50 plus)	84.2%	15.8%	78.3%	21.7%	89.2%	10.8%
Number of companies	101	19	94	26	107	13
C People with disabilities	45.8%	54.2%	60.0%	40.0%	75.8%	24.2%
Number of companies	55	65	72	48	91	29
D Women	48.3%	51.7%	55.8%	44.2%	66.7%	33.3%
Number of companies	58	62	67	53	80	40
E Women returners	78.3%	21.7%	75.8%	24.2%	85.0%	15.0%
Number of companies	94	26	91	29	102	18
F Low-skilled labour	72.5%	27.5%	49.2%	50.8%	73.3%	26.7%
Number of companies	87	33	59	61	88	32
G Younger workers (aged under 25)	58.3%	41.7%	47.5%	52.5%	68.3%	31.7%
Number of companies	70	50	57	63	82	38

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(a): Do you use action programmes to recruit minority ethnics?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had action programmes in place to recruit minority ethnics. The results show that 70.0% of the companies (84) do not have any action programmes in place at the time of the research, while 30.0% of the companies (36) indicated that they had such programmes. In South Africa, the position is somewhat different to that of European and most other countries in the world. Before 1994, during the apartheid years, the minority groups (whites) were appointed in almost all the jobs, while the majority groups (Blacks, Coloured, Indians) were not allowed to be appointed due to the race classification aspect. Since 1994, the new democratically elected government has enacted the Employment Equity Act (No. 55 of 1998), and the opposite now applies – that is, the majority of the population receives preferential treatment in the filling of posts, while the minority (in this case, whites) are not appointed. This could thus be the reason for this specific finding.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(b): Do you have action programmes to recruit older workers (aged 50 plus)?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to recruit older workers (aged 50 plus). The results show that 84.2% of the companies (101) do not have any such programmes in place at the time of the research, while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they had such programmes. This finding is not completely surprising considering the large group of unemployed people between the ages of 18 and 34 years at present in the country. It would thus appear that the respondents are possibly focusing on this younger group rather than on the older groups of employees.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(c): Do you have action programmes to recruit people with disabilities?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to recruit people with disabilities. The results indicate that 45.8% of the companies (55) do not have any such programmes in place, while 54.2% of the companies (65) indicated that they had such programmes. This finding is encouraging as in the past, persons with disabilities were mostly excluded from job opportunities. It would appear that the positive approach in this regard could be related to numerous pieces of legislation enacted, such as the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998, to improve the situation regarding these groups. This legislation was based mainly on the legislation enacted in other countries at the time of promulgation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(d): Do you have action programmes to recruit women?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to recruit women. The results show that 48.3% of the companies (58) do not have any such programmes in place, while 51.7% of the companies (62) indicated that they had such programmes in place. This result is not surprising as legislation, especially the Employment Equity Act, requires that the workplace be representative of gender and race.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(e): Do you have action programmes to recruit women returners?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place for the recruitment of women returners. The results show that 78.3% of the companies (94) do not have any such programmes in place, while 21.7% of the companies (26) indicated that they had such programmes. This is an interesting finding, which could perhaps be related to the lack of possible new skills required by the companies, which women returners, who have been out of the work environment for some time, in some cases not necessarily have.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(f): Do you have action programmes to recruit low-skilled labour?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to recruit low-skilled labour. The results show that 72.5% of the companies (87) do not have any such programmes in place, while 27.5% of the companies (33) indicated that they had such programmes available. Depending on the type of company, low-skilled labour would probably constitute a significant part of the workforce of a company in industries such as manufacturing. As not all the participating companies were in the manufacturing sector, this might have affected the response.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(g): Do you have action programmes to recruit younger workers (aged under 25)?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to recruit younger workers. The results show that 58.3% of the companies (70) do not have any such programmes in place, while 41.7% of the companies (50) indicated that they had such programmes in place. As mentioned earlier, South Africa is faced with a very high unemployment rate (26.7% at the time of the research especially in the age group 18–35 years of age) (Statistics South Africa, 2017) and companies thus have a social responsibility to get involved in the recruitment of those employees. As indicated from the results earlier, in terms of the 50 plus group, it would appear that the respondents were moving in this direction.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(a): Do you have action programmes for the training of minority ethnics?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to train minority ethnics. The results show that 73.3% of the companies (88) do not have any such action programmes in place, while 26.7% of the companies (32) indicated that they had such programmes available. This finding is somewhat surprising as the training of all employees within the organisation is necessary if the company is to remain efficient and effective. Taking into account the earlier answer relating to minority ethnics, this finding is however not surprising.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(b): Do you have action programmes to train older workers (aged 50 plus)

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place relating to the training of older workers (aged 50 plus). The results show that 78.3% of the companies (94) do not have any such programmes in place, while 21.7% of the companies (26) indicated that they had such programmes available. As was the case with the

previous question, this finding is again not surprising, as companies indicated earlier that their focus was not on this age group, but rather on younger employees.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(c): Do you have action programmes to train people with disabilities?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place for the training of people with disabilities. The results show that 60.0% of the companies (72) do not have any such programmes in place, while 40.0% of the companies (48) indicated that they had such programmes available. Again, the selective training of staff as indicated in the previous two questions cannot be a viable option for companies in the very competitive environment within which they find themselves, especially regarding the plight of the disabled employee.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(d): Do you have action programmes to train women?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to train women. The results show that 55.8% of the companies (46) do not have any such programmes in place, while 44.2% of the companies (53) indicated that they had such programmes in place. Again, as indicated previously, this is a very worrying situation, as it might be regarded as gender discrimination in the workplace. All types of staff need training in companies and not only selected groups.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(e): Do you have action programmes to train women returners?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to train women returners. The results show that 75.8% of the companies (91) do not have any such programmes in place, while 24.2% of the companies (29) indicated that they had such programmes in place. Again, the finding is disappointing. All employees within an organisation need to undergo training in order to become productive employees. If this does not take place, it will be to the detriment of the organisation. However, the findings are not altogether surprising considering respondents' view on recruiting women returners earlier.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(f): Do you have action programmes to train low-skilled labour?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to train low-skilled labour. The results show that 49.2% of the companies (59) do not have any such programmes in place, while 50.8% (61) indicated that they had such programmes in place. Low-skilled labour within an organisation needs to attend a very well designed training programme, otherwise their contribution to the organisation will be minimal. It is important that when training is provided, the value added to the organisation be monitored and constantly improved. From the findings, it would appear that the majority of companies were pursuing this approach.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(g): Do you have action programmes to train younger workers (aged under 25)?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place to train younger workers (aged under 25). The results show that 47.5% of the companies (57) do not have any such programmes in place, while 52.5% of the companies

(63) indicated that they had such programmes in place. Although the majority of the participating companies did provide training to this group, the percentage is still very low. The employees in this age group will play an important role in the future, and their training thus needs to be watched closely.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(a): Do you have action programmes for the career progression of minority ethnics?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place for the career progression of minority groups. The results show that 78.3% of the companies (94) do not have any such action programmes in place, while 21.1% of the companies (26) indicated that they had such programmes in place. As indicated earlier, this finding is not surprising as these groups (whites) are no longer the focus due to legislation such as Employment Equity.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(b): Do you have action programmes for the career progression of older workers (aged 50 plus)?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes available for the career progression of older workers (aged 50 plus). The results show that 89.2% of the companies (107) do not have any such programmes in place, while 10.8% of the companies (13) indicated that they had such programmes in place. Again, this finding is not surprising, as workers beyond 50 years of age, appear not to be focus of companies any longer due to the high unemployment rate within the younger age group (between 18–35).

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(c): Do you have action programmes for the career progression of people with disabilities?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place for the career progression of people with disabilities. The results show that 75.8% of the companies (91) do not have any such action programmes in place, while 24.2% of the companies (29) indicated that they had such programmes in place. Again, this is worrying, as it appears that only a very small number of companies addressed this aspect. All employees need to grow within the organisation, and this can only take place with proper career progression for all.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(d): Do you have action programmes for the career progression of women?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place for the career progression of women. The results show that 66.7% of the companies (80) do not have any such action programmes in place, while 33.3% of the companies (40) indicated that they had such programmes in place. Again, only a small number of participating companies had career progression programmes in place for women. This cannot be a viable option, as work needs to be undertaken as a team to achieve the goals of the organisation successfully. All groups need to be considered from a career progression perspective for the long-term success and survival of the business.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(e): Do you have action programmes for the career progression of women returners?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place for the career progression of women returners. The results show the 85.0% of the

companies (102) do not have any such action programmes in place, while 15.0% of the companies (18) indicated that they had such programmes in place. This finding is not surprising considering the findings in the previous question regarding the role of women returners in general in the organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(f): Do you have action programmes for the career progression of low-skilled labour?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place for the career progression of low-skilled labour. The results show that 73.3% of the companies (88) do not have any such action programmes in place, while 26.7% of the companies (32) indicated that they had such programmes in place. Although low-skilled workers have in general limited moverability, same effort needs to be made by the organisation to provide some growth for these employees and their fellow workers to keep them engaged in their workplace.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 5(g): Do you have action programmes for the career progression of younger workers (aged under 25)?

In Table 2.5, it is indicated whether the participating companies had any action programmes in place for the career progression of younger workers. The results show that 68.3% of the companies (82) do not have any such action programmes in place, while 31.7% of the companies (38) indicated that they had such programmes in place. There is no doubt that younger workers need to have a very clear career path, which they are able to follow within an organisation if they are to stay committed and engaged in the company. If this does not take place, it will result in high turnover and low morale affecting the employee's productivity and ultimately impacting on the overall success of the organisation.

Section II (Resourcing practices) – Question 6: Working arrangements of employees in companies

Table 2.6: Working arrangements of employees

Flexible work practices	% of employees using this practice							Number of companies using this practice	Missing companies
	(%) Not used	1–5%	6–10%	11–15%	16–20%	21–50%	>50%		
A Weekend work (working on Saturdays and/or Sundays)	34.2	20.0	13.3	6.7	4.2	5.8	10.8	73	6
Companies (responded)	41	24	16	8	5	7	13		
B Shift work (working blocks of hours which include time outside normal working hours)	23.3	24.2	13.3	9.2	5.8	7.5	13.3	94	4
Companies (responded)	28	29	16	11	9	16			
C Overtime (extra time beyond employees' normal time, added on to a day or shift)	13.3	25.8	9.2	7.5	6.7	18.3	13.3	101	3
Companies (responded)	16	31	11	13	8	22	16		
D Annual hours contract (agreement to work number of hours annually)	54.2	8.3	7.5	5.8	6.7	1.7	9.2	47	8
Companies (responded)	65	10	9	7	8	2	11		

Flexible work practices	% of employees using this practice							Number of companies using this practice	Missing companies
	(%) Not used	1–5%	6–10%	11–15%	16–20%	21–50%	>50%		
E Part-time work (hours of work defined as part-time by employer or legislation)	55.8	21.7	4.2	6.7	4.2	–	3.3	48	5
Companies (responded)	67	26	5	8	5	–	4		
F Job sharing (dividing one job between two or more employees)	78.3	7.5	2.5	1.7	0.8	0.8	2.5	19	7
Companies (responded)	94	9	3	2	1	1	3		
G Flexitime (some working hours may be determined by employees, around a fixed 'core' time)	60.8	10.8	5.0	6.7	5.0	2.5	2.5	39	8
Companies (responded)	73	13	6	8	6	3	3		
H Temporary/casual (workers employed on a temporary basis for a number of hours, weeks or months)	31.7	29.2	15.0	9.2	4.2	2.5	3.3	76	6
Companies (responded)	38	35	18	11	3	4			
I Fixed-term contracts (workers employed for a fixed number of months or years)	10.0	40.8	19.2	10.0	6.7	3.3	5.0	102	6
Companies (responded)	12	49	23	12	8	4	6		
J Home-based work (workers whose normal workplace is home but who do not have permanent electronic links to a fixed workplace)	86.7	4.2	0.8	5.0	0	0		12	4
Companies (responded)	104	5	1	6	0	0			
K Teleworking (technology-based) (workers who can link electronically to a fixed workplace)	85.8	5.0	1.7	2.5	1.7	0.8	0	14	3
Companies (responded)	103	6	2	3	2	1	0		
L Compressed working week (workers whose working week totals a standard number of hours compressed into a reduced number of shifts)	70.8	3.3	3.3	0.8	1.7	1.7	14.2	30	5
Companies (responded)	85	4	4	1	2	2	17		

The findings reflected in Table 2.6 show that the working practices used by the largest number of companies (102) was fixed-term contracts. This is not surprising, as this practice has been in use globally for many years. The practice provides flexibility to organisations to address their needs, as they become available (Lepak & Gowan 2017:201–202). It also in many instances impacts positively on the budget of an organisation. This practice is followed by the following practices in order of popularity (i.e. number of companies who reported using them):

- overtime (101);
- shift work (94);
- temporary or casual work (76);
- weekend work (73);

- annual hours contract (47);
- flexitime (39);
- compressed working week (30);
- telework (21);
- job sharing (19);
- teleworking (14); and
- home-based work (10).

Despite the large number of companies utilising the different types of working arrangements, one should note that few companies actually have more than 20% of their staff participating in any particular option – the only exception being overtime. Hence, no large numbers of staff in the companies were utilising the different working practices at the time of the research, which do not make the organisations very flexible.

SECTION III – EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT

Section III (Employee Development) – Question 1(a): Do you have a formal appraisal system for management staff?

Table 3.1: Formal appraisal system for management staff

Formal appraisal system for management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	16	13.3	13.3	13.3
Yes	104	86.7	86.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.1, it is indicated whether the respondents had a formal appraisal system in place for their management staff. The results show that 13.3% of the companies (16) do not have such a system for their management staff in place, while 86.7% of the companies (104) indicated that they had such a system. There is no doubt that, at the time of the research, virtually all the respondents, whether in the private or public sector, had a performance management system for their management staff in place. This is an important finding as the effective management of the performance for this group of staff members may be the difference between the success and failure of the organisation as the management group play an important leadership role in the organisation. Employees in this group are usually responsible for implementing and developing the strategies for their organisations, thus their performance needs to be monitored through good appraisal systems.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 1(b): Do you have a formal appraisal system for professionals without managerial responsibility?

Table 3.2: Formal appraisal system for professional staff without managerial responsibility

Formal appraisal system for professional staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	41	34.2	35.7	35.7
Yes	74	61.7	64.3	100.0
Total	115	95.8	100.0	
Missing	5	4.2	100.0	
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.2, it is indicated whether the respondents had a formal appraisal system in place for their professional staff without managerial responsibility. The results show that in the case of 34.2% of the companies (41) they do not have such a system in place, while 61.7% of the companies (74) indicated that they had such a system available. Monitoring the performance of professional staff is vital as these employees have special skills and knowledge, which need to be applied to the advantage of the organisation. This process can only be achieved through the proper monitoring of their performance. It is vital that all employees' performance is monitored on a regular basis to ensure that they are contributing to the achievement of the company goals in an effective and efficient manner. A total of five companies did not answer this question. This finding differs to some extent from the previous finding relating to management staff. It is unclear why the percentage of the availability of a formal appraisal system for professional staff should be so different to that of management staff within an organisation. The staff should be managed holistically.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 1(c): Do you have a formal appraisal system for clericals/manual employees?

Table 3.3: Formal appraisal system for clericals/manual staff

Formal appraisal system for clericals/manual staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	43	35.8	37.7	37.7
Yes	71	59.2	62.3	100.0
Total	114	95.0	100.0	
Missing	6	5.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.3, it is indicated whether the participating companies had a formal appraisal system in place for their clericals/manual employees. The results show that 35.8% of the companies (43) do not have such a system in place, while 59.2% of the companies (71) indicated that they did have such a system in place. Clericals/manual employees who usually make up a large component of the workforce, need to be properly monitored if they are to be utilised as a group to the advantage of the company. From the findings, it would appear that the participating companies had not yet fully embraced this process for their clericals/manual staff, which is of some concern. Six companies did not answer the question.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(a): Does the immediate supervisor contribute to the appraisal of management staff?

Table 3.4: Contribution of the immediate supervisor to the performance appraisal of management staff

Contribution of the immediate supervisor to the appraisal of management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	33	27.5	27.5	27.5
Yes	87	72.5	72.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.4, it is indicated whether the immediate supervisor played a role in the appraisal of the management staff. The results show that in 27.5% of the companies (33), the immediate supervisor does not play a role in the performance appraisal of the management staff, while in 72.5% of the companies (87), he or she did play a role.

This is a particularly positive finding because the immediate supervisor is in an excellent position to provide a true reflection of his or her subordinates' performance. This process will enhance the management of this staff level to the advantage of the organisation.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(b): Does the supervisor's supervisor contribute to the performance appraisal of management staff?

Table 3.5: Contribution of the supervisor's supervisor to the performance appraisal of management staff

Contribution of the supervisor's supervisor to the performance appraisal of management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	62	51.7	51.7	51.7
Yes	58	48.3	48.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.5, it is indicated whether the supervisor's supervisor played a role in the appraisal of the management staff. The results indicate that in 51.7% of the companies (62), the supervisor's supervisor does not play a role in the appraisal of the management staff, while in 48.3% of the companies (58) he or she did play a role in the appraisal of the management staff. The overall results therefore indicate that in the participating companies, the supervisor's supervisor does not contribute to the appraisal of the management staff, which can be a problem as the managerial staff need to be developed properly for the future success of the company and senior members of the company are in a very good position to do this as they normally are the visionaries of the company.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(c): Does the employee himself/herself contribute to the appraisal of management staff?

Table 3.6: Contribution of the employee him- or herself to the performance appraisal of the management staff

Contribution of the employee him- or herself to the performance appraisal of management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	62	51.7	51.7	51.7
Yes	58	48.3	48.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.6, it is indicated whether the employee him- or herself contributed to the appraisal of the management staff. The results show that in the case of 51.7% of the companies (62), the employees do not contribute to the appraisal of the management staff, while in 48.3% of the companies (58), they did contribute to the appraisal of the management staff. This is an interesting finding as the minority of the respondents contributed to the appraisal of the management staff, while the majority did not. In order to develop a cohesive workforce, it is important that the views of the junior staff members be taken into account. This will help to identify possible problems between the groups, and might also help to build a more cohesive workforce.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(d): Do subordinates contribute to the appraisal of management staff?

Table 3.7: Contribution of subordinates to the appraisal of management staff

Contribution of subordinates to the performance appraisal of management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	98	81.7	81.7	81.7
Yes	22	18.3	18.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.7, it is indicated whether the subordinates contributed to the appraisal of the management staff. The results indicate that in 81.7% of the companies (98), the subordinates do not contribute to the appraisal of the management staff, while in 18.3% of the companies (22), they did contribute. It would thus appear that in the majority of the participating companies, subordinates did not contribute to the appraisal of the management staff. This finding is somewhat disturbing as, especially in the case of 360-degree assessment, it is vital that all employees, subordinates included, be involved in the appraisal process – which do not appear to be the case at the time of the research.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(e): Do peers contribute to the appraisal of management staff?

Table 3.8: Contributions of peers to the appraisal of management staff

Contribution of peers to the appraisal of management staff	N	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	107	89.2	89.2	89.2
Yes	13	10.8	10.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.8, it is indicated whether peers contributed to the appraisal of the management staff. The results show that in 89.2% of the companies (107), peers do not contribute to the appraisal of management staff, while in 10.8% of the companies (13), they did contribute to such an appraisal. From the results, it is therefore clear that in the majority of the participating companies, peers do not contribute to the appraisal of management staff. This is a disturbing finding.

It would be to the advantage of the organisation if employees could get involved in the appraisal process, especially at managerial level as these employees also play a leadership role and their influence at lower levels need to be felt in a positive light. Thus, the involvement of the peers as a stakeholder group, in this regard is important.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(a): Does the immediate supervisor contribute to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility?

Table 3.9: Contribution of the immediate supervisor to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility

Contribution of the immediate supervisor to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	56	46.7	46.7	46.7
Yes	64	53.3	53.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.9, it is indicated whether the immediate supervisor played a role in the appraisal of the professional staff without managerial responsibility. The results show that in 46.7% of the participating companies (56), the immediate supervisor does not play a role in the appraisal of the professional staff, while in 53.3% of the companies (64), he or she did play a role in the appraisal of the professional staff. The results indicate that in the majority of the participating companies, the immediate supervisor played a role in the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility, although at present in a diminished level. In many instances, the immediate supervisor is the most suitable person to appraise the work of his or her subordinates, and this finding is somewhat surprising as this is one of the responsibilities of the immediate supervisor.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(b): Does the supervisor's supervisor contribute to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility?

Table 3.10: Contribution of the supervisor's supervisor to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility

Contribution of the supervisor's supervisor to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	73	60.8	60.8	60.8
Yes	47	39.2	39.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.10, it is indicated whether the supervisor's supervisor played a role in the appraisal of professional staff. The results show that in 60.8% of the companies (73), the supervisor's supervisor does not play a role in this regard, while in 39.2% of the companies (47), he or she did play a role in the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility. The results therefore indicate that in the majority of the participating companies, the supervisor's supervisor did not play a role in the appraisal of the professional staff. This finding is disturbing as the supervisor's supervisor needs to get involved in the appraisal of all staff if they are to be managed efficiently and effectively.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(c): Does the employee himself/herself contribute to the appraisal of the professional staff without managerial responsibility?

Table 3.11: Contribution of the employee him- or herself to the appraisal of the professional staff without managerial responsibility

Contribution of the employee him- or herself to the appraisal of the professional staff without managerial responsibility	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	78	65.0	65.0	65.0
Yes	42	35.0	35.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.11, it is indicated whether the employee him- or herself contributed to the appraisal of the professional staff. The results show that in 65.0% of the participating companies (78), the employee him- or herself does not contribute to the appraisal of the professional group, while in 35.0% of the companies (42), the employee him- or herself did contribute to the appraisal of the group. From the results, it is clear that in the majority of the participating companies, the employee him- or herself did not contribute to the appraisal of the professional staff. It is important, especially when conducting a 360-degree appraisal, that all groups be involved in the appraisal. If this happens, stronger bonds could develop within the organisation to the overall advantage of the organisation.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(d): Do subordinates contribute to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility?

Table 3.12: Contribution of subordinates to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility

Contribution of subordinates to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	99	82.5	82.5	82.5
Yes	21	17.5	17.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.12, it is indicated whether subordinates contributed to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility. The results show that in 82.5% of the companies (99), subordinates do not contribute to the appraisal of the professional staff, while in 17.5% of the companies (21), they did contribute to the appraisal of professional staff. Therefore, in the majority of the participating companies, subordinates did not contribute to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility. This finding is somewhat disturbing, as the role played by the professional staff affects all employees in the organisation and it is therefore correct to let the employees indicate their views on the performance of this group. Subordinate involvement is therefore essential.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(e): Do peers contribute to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility?

Table 3.13: Contribution of peers to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility

Contribution of peers to the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	112	93.3	93.3	93.3
Yes	8	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.13, it is indicated whether peers contributed to the appraisal of the professional staff without managerial responsibility. The results show that in 93.3% of the participating companies (112), peers do not contribute to the appraisal of professional staff, while in 6.7% of the companies (8) they did contribute to the appraisal of professional staff. The findings indicate that in the majority of the participating companies, peers did not contribute to the appraisal of the professional staff. Peers could play an important role in this regard and need to get involved in this process. This will improve the performance of the organisation.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(a): Does the immediate supervisor contribute to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees?

Table 3.14: Contribution of immediate supervisor to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees

Contribution of immediate supervisor to the appraisal of clericals/manual staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	77	64.2	64.2	64.2
Yes	43	35.8	35.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.14, it is indicated whether the immediate supervisor played a role in the appraisal of clericals/manual employees. The results show that in 64.2% of the companies (77), the immediate supervisor does not play a role in the appraisal of the clericals/manual staff, while in 35.8% of the participating companies (43), the immediate supervisor did play a role in the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees. The results indicate that in the majority of companies, the immediate supervisor did not play a role in the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees. This is somewhat disturbing as this group generally forms the biggest component in the organisation and the monitoring of their performance by their immediate supervisor is essential.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 2(b): Does the supervisor's supervisor contribute to the appraisal of manual/clerical staff?

Table 3.15: Contribution of the supervisor's supervisor to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees

Contribution of the supervisor's supervisor to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	86	71.7	71.7	71.7
Yes	34	28.3	28.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.15, it is indicated whether their supervisor's supervisor played a role in the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees. The results show that in 71.7% of the companies (86), the supervisor's supervisor does not play a role in the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees, while in 28.3% of the companies (34), he or she played a role in the appraisal of this group. The results therefore indicate that in the majority of the participating companies, the supervisor's supervisor did not play a role in the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees. Again, this is somewhat disturbing, as this group plays a vital role within any organisation and they are also usually the largest group in an organisation. The involvement of the supervisor's supervisor is important as he or she has a broad view of the direction into which the organisation will move, and this group therefore plays an important role in this regard.

Section III (Employee development – Question 2(c): Does the employee himself/herself contribute to the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees?

Table 3.16: Contribution of the employee him- or herself to the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees

Contribution of the employee him- or herself to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	84	70.0	70.0	70.0
Yes	36	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.16, it is indicated whether the employee him- or herself contributed to the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees. The results show that in 70.0% of the participating companies (84), the employee him- or herself does not contribute to the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees group, while in 30.0% of the companies (36), the employee him- or herself did contribute to the appraisal of this group. The results indicate that in the majority of the participating companies, the employee him- or herself did not contribute to the appraisal of the manual or clerical group. As indicated earlier, this group, which usually forms the largest group within the company, plays an important role in the success of the company. It is thus important that other employees rate the performance of these employees with a view to help improve the contribution of this group to the organisation.

Section III (Employee development – Question 2(d): Do subordinates contribute to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees?

Table 3.17: Contribution of subordinates to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees

Contribution of subordinates to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	107	89.2	89.2	89.2
Yes	13	10.8	10.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.17, it is indicated whether subordinates contributed to the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees in the participating companies. The results indicate that in 89.2% of the companies (107), the subordinates do not contribute to the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees, while in 10.8% of the companies (13), the subordinates indicated that they did contribute to the process. The results therefore indicate that in the majority of participating companies, subordinates did not contribute to the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees. Where a 360-degree performance system is used, all the stakeholders need to contribute to the appraisal, whether they are managers or clericals/manual employees. This is necessary to ensure that each group being evaluated is performing to the required levels of the other group as well as the overall organisation.

Section III (Employee development – Question 2(e): Do peers contribute to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees?

Table 3.18: Contribution of peers to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees

Contribution of peers to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	111	92.5	92.5	92.5
Yes	9	7.5	7.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.18, it is indicated whether peers contributed to the appraisal of the clericals/manual employees in the participating companies. The results show that in 92.5% of the companies (111), peers do not contribute to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees, while in 7.5% of the participating companies (9), they did contribute.

The results indicate that in the majority of the companies, peers did not contribute to the appraisal of clericals/manual employees. As indicated in the earlier answer (see Table 3.13), the involvement of peers in the appraisal process is important to improve the general functioning of the company as they have a wealth of experience, which can be used to the advantage of all.

Section III (Employee development – Question 3(a): Are appraisal data used to inform pay decisions?

Table 3.19: Use of appraisal data to inform pay decisions

Use of appraisal data to inform pay decisions	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	40	33.3	33.3	33.3
Yes	80	66.7	66.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.19, it is indicated whether the appraisal data obtained were used to inform pay decisions. The results show that in 33.3% of the participating companies (40), the appraisal data obtained is not used to inform pay decisions, while in 66.7% of the companies (80), appraisal data were used to inform pay decisions. This is a positive finding. It would thus appear from the results that in the majority of the participating companies, appraisal data were used to inform pay decisions. This is especially important when performance-related pay is implemented within an organisation. In general, pay is linked to the performance required of an individual within a specific job. This is done to improve the motivation of the staff (Brewster & Hegeswisch, 2017; Noe, Hollenbeck, Gerhart & Wright, 2017).

Section III (Employee development – Question 3(b): Are appraisal data used to inform training and development decisions?

Table 3.20: Use of appraisal data to inform training and development decisions

Use of appraisal data to inform training and development decisions	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	33	27.5	27.5	27.5
Yes	87	72.5	72.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.20, it is indicated whether the appraisal data obtained were used to inform training and development decisions. The results show that in 27.5% of the companies (33), the appraisal data obtained is not used to inform training and development decisions, while in 72.5% of the companies (87), the appraisal data obtained were used to inform training and development decisions. This is a positive finding. Determining why the employees are not functioning could help in rectifying the employees' performance problems through either further training or another intervention.

From the results, it is clear that the majority of the participating companies utilised appraisal data to adjust their training and development activities, which could contribute to the general improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation (Brewster & Hegeswisch, 2017; Noe et al., 2017).

Section III (Employee development – Question 3(c): Are appraisal data used to inform career moves?

Table 3.21: Use of appraisal data to inform career moves

Use of appraisal data to inform career moves	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	66	55.0	55.0	55.0
Yes	54	45.0	45.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.21, it is indicated whether the appraisal data obtained were used to inform the career moves of staff. The results show that in 55.0% of the participating companies (66), the appraisal data obtained is not used to inform the career moves, while in 45.0% of the companies (54), the data obtained were used to inform career moves. The results therefore indicate that the majority of companies did not utilise appraisal data for career moves. This finding is of great concern, because if the appraisal results are not taken into consideration, employees may be placed in positions for which they are not suited. Employees need to have the necessary skills, knowledge and ability to do a job in order to move up the corporate ladder. If any problems in this regard exist, their movement might be disastrous.

Section III (Employee development – Question 3(d): Are appraisal data used to inform workforce planning?

Table 3.22: Use of appraisal data to inform workforce planning

Use of appraisal data to inform workforce planning	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	63	52.5	52.5	52.5
Yes	57	47.5	47.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3.22, it is indicated whether the appraisal data obtained were used to inform workforce planning. The results show that in 52.5% of the participating companies (63), the appraisal data obtained is not used to inform workforce planning, while in 47.5% of the companies (57), the appraisal data obtained were used to inform workforce planning. Workforce planning is vital for the organisation because it helps predict the number of staff the organisation needs to realise its future goals. Should the appraisal data indicate that the present staff cannot cope with the workload, the company will have to create new posts, which will ultimately have an influence on its workforce planning process i.e. the number of new posts needed. It would thus appear that, at the time of the research, the majority of the participating companies did not make use of the appraisal data to inform the workforce planning process within their organisations. This is problematic, as it could lead to too few employees resulting in them being overworked, or it could result in too many employees being appointed, leading to a larger salary budget and lower productivity (Brewster & Hegeswisch, 2017; Noe et al., 2017; Ono, Lafortune & Schoenstein, 2013).

Section III (Employee development – Question 4: Do you systematically estimate the need for training of personnel in your organisation?

Table 3.23: Systematic estimate of training needs

Systematic estimate of training needs	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	16	13.3	13.7	13.7
Yes	101	84.2	86.3	100.0
Total	117	97.5	100.0	
Missing	3	2.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.23, it is indicated whether a systematic estimation of training needs take place. The results show that in 13.3% of the companies (16) this does not happen, while in 84.2% of the companies (101), this was done. The results therefore indicate that the majority of the participating companies systematically estimated the need for training of the personnel in their organisation, which is an important finding. If the skills and/or knowledge of employees are not continually updated in line with the changing environment within which the organisation functions, the goals of the organisation will not be realised. This will result in the organisation soon losing market share and becoming uncompetitive.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 5: Approximately what proportion of the annual payroll costs is spent on training?

Table 3.24: Proportion of the annual payroll costs spent on training

Proportion of the annual payroll costs spent on training	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
0%	3	2.5	2.6	2.6
1%	45	37.5	38.5	42.0
2%	12	10.0	10.3	51.3
3%	17	14.2	14.5	65.8
4%	2	1.7	1.7	67.5
5%	9	7.5	7.7	75.2
6%	4	3.3	3.4	78.6
7%	1	0.8	0.9	79.5
8%	1	0.8	0.9	80.3
9%	1	0.8	0.9	81.2
10%	6	5.0	5.1	86.3
> 11%	16	13.3	13.7	100.0
Total	117	97.5	100.0	
Missing	3	2.5	120	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.24, it is indicated which percentage of the annual payroll budget was spent on training at the time of the research. The results show that a great difference exists between the companies regarding this aspect. Areas of concentration are: at 1% of the budget, 45

companies were involved (37.5%), at 2% of the budget, 12 companies (10%), followed by 17 companies at 3% of the budget (14.2%), at 5%, 9 companies (7.5%), and at 10%, 6 companies (5.0%) and 16 companies at more than 11% (13.3%). Thus, a great variation was found regarding the money being spent on training within the participating companies. This can be understood, as it is coupled with employee numbers and the type of training involved. Measured against the general international norm of 11% (Staff, 2017), it would appear that 50% of the South African companies are below the norm. This is worrying, the developing country should spend more than the norm of 11% on training.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 6(a): Approximately how many days' training per year do managers receive

Table 3.25: Days training per year (managers)

Days training per year – managers	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
< 5 days	23	19.2	24	24
5–10 days	38	31.7	39.6	63.5
11+ days	35	29.2	36.5	100
Total	96	80	100	
Missing	24	20		
Total	120	100		

In Table 3.25, the number of days training per year that managers receive is indicated. In 23 companies (19.2%), managers received fewer than five days training, while in 38 companies (31.7%), the number of days ranged between 5 and 10 days per year, 35 companies (29.2%) indicated that, at the time of the research, their managers were receiving more than 11 days training per year. It is clear that training for managers is regarded as important as most managers received five or more days training per year.

In South Africa, companies may claim back a part of their training expenditure according to the Skills Development Levies Act as amended (No. 9 of 1999). The number of days spent on training could be affected by this.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 6(b): Approximately how many days' training per year do professional employees receive?

Table 3.26: Days training per year (professionals)

Days training per year – professionals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
< 5 days	20	16.7	21.5	21.5
5–10 days	39	32.5	41.9	63.4
11+ days	34	28.3	36.6	100
Total	93	77.5	100	
Missing	27	22.5		
Total	120	100		

In Table 3.26, the total number of days training that professional staff members in the participating companies were receiving per annum is indicated. In 39 companies (32.5%), professional employees were receiving between 5 and 10 days training per year, while 34 companies (28.3%) indicated that these staff members were receiving more than 11 days per annum at the time of the research. In 20 organisations (16.7%), these staff members were receiving fewer than five days training per year. From the findings it is clear that a large range of days are used for the training of professional staff ranging from less than 5 days per year to more than 11 days per year. This finding is interesting as it can be assumed that the training will be focussed more on managerial training as they are in a sense already trained as professionals for their jobs.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 6(c): How many days' training do the clerical staff undergo per annum?

Table 3.27: Days training per year (clerical)

Days training per year – clerical	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
< 5 days	43	35.8	44.8	44.8
5–10 days	17	14.2	17.7	62.5
11+ days	36	30	37.5	100
Total	96	80	100	
Missing	24	20		
Total	120	100		

In Table 3.27, the total number of days' training that clerical staff were receiving per annum is indicated. Most companies (43) (35.8%) indicated that, at the time of the research, their clerical employees were receiving fewer than five days' of training, followed by 36 companies (30%) of the 96 companies who answered this question by indicating that their clerical staff were receiving more than 11 days training per annum. Seventeen companies (14.2%) indicated that these employees were receiving between 5 and 10 days' training per year. It is interesting to note that most participating organisations indicated that their clerical employees were receiving fewer than five days' training. This could perhaps be linked to the level of these jobs, as these employees are on a lower level than professional and managerial staff with more repetitive work. It is possible that clerical workers require less training as a result of fewer changes in their job requirements and the environment in which they operate in.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 7(a): Do you systematically evaluate the effectiveness of the training of personnel in the organisation?

Table 3.28: Systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of training

Systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of training	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	48	40.0	42.5	41.0
Yes	65	54.2	59.0	100.0
Total	113	94.2	100.0	
Missing	7	5.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.28, it is indicated whether organisations systematically evaluated the effectiveness of the training of personnel in their organisation. The results show that in 40.0% of the companies (48), they did not evaluate the effectiveness of the training of their personnel, while 54.2% of the companies (65) evaluated the effectiveness of the training of their personnel. This is a positive finding although not reflected by a very large percentage of the companies. A number of reasons for evaluating the effectiveness of the training of staff can be identified, namely –

- to establish whether the training is appropriate and cost-effective;
- to identify any shortcomings in the training programme;
- and to receive feedback from the employees directly on how they feel (Noe et al., 2017).

Seven companies did not answer this question.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 7(b): If yes, which of the following techniques do you use?

Several techniques that the participating organisations used to evaluate the effectiveness of the training of their staff are discussed in tables 3.29-3.36 below.

Table 3.29: Total number of days' training undertaken per employee per year

Total number of days' training undertaken per employee per year	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not used	14	11.7	23.7	23.7
Yes	45	37.5	76.3	100.0
Total	59	49.2	100.0	
Missing	81	50.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.29, it is indicated whether the organisations used the total number of days per employee per year to evaluate the training of their staff. The results show that in 11.7% of the companies (14), they do not use the total number of days' training provided per employee per year to evaluate their training effort, while 37.5% of the companies (45) used the total number of days' training provided to evaluate their training effort. This finding is not surprising because the total number of days' training provided does not actually indicate whether a transfer of knowledge had taken place. The use of this method is thus not really valuable for this purpose. A total of 81 companies did not answer this question, which is interesting.

Table 3.30: Meeting the objectives set out in the training and development plan

Meeting the objectives set out in the training and development plan	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	6	5.0	9.8	9.8
Yes	55	45.8	90.2	100.0
Total	61	50.8	100.0	
Missing	59	49.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.30, it is indicated whether the organisations used the training objectives formulated in the training plan to evaluate their training effort. The results show that 5.0% of the companies (6), had not used the objectives formulated in the training plan to evaluate their training effort, while 45.8% of the companies (55) used the objectives formulated in the training plan to evaluate their training effort. Usually, the objectives formulated in the training plan are agreed upon together with the input from top management. Meeting these objectives would thus be an acceptable method to evaluate the training effort. The reason is that goal achievement affects the survival of the organisation. A total of 59 companies did not answer this question, which again is an interesting finding.

Table 3.31: Reaction evaluation immediately after training to evaluate training efforts

Reaction evaluation immediately after training to evaluate training efforts	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not used	19	15.8	31.1	31.1
Used	42	35.0	68.9	100.0
Total	61	50.8	100.0	
Missing	59	49.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.31, it is indicated whether the organisations used the reaction evaluation method immediately after training in order to evaluate their training efforts. The results show that 15.8% of the companies (19), had not used the reaction evaluation method to evaluate their training efforts, while 35.0% of the companies (42) used the reaction evaluation method immediately after training in order to evaluate their training efforts. This is a positive finding although the percentage of companies, is low. Although a popular method to determine immediately whether the training was valuable, the ultimate test would be the effect it will have on the work performance of the employees in the long term. A total of 59 companies did not answer this question which is worrying as it represents 49.2% of the sample.

Table 3.32: Measuring job performance before and immediately after training

Measuring job performance before and immediately after training	N	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not used	28	23.3	46.7	46.7
Yes	32	26.7	53.3	100.0
Total	60	50.0	100.0	
Missing	60	50.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.32, it is indicated whether organisations were measuring job performance before and immediately after the training had taken place. The results show that 23.3% of the companies (28) did not measure job performance before and immediately after training, while in 26.7% of the companies (32), this method was used. To use this method properly, entails a lot of work prior as well as after the training had taken place. The low responses obtained is not surprising as this method is heavily burdened with administrative work. A total of 60 companies did not answer this.

Table 3.33: Measuring job performance before and some months after training

Measuring job performance before and some months after training	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not used	13	10.8	21.0	21.0
Used	49	40.8	79.0	100.0
Total	62	51.7	100.0	
Missing	58	48.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.33, it is indicated whether the organisations were measuring job performance before and some months after the training had occurred. The results show that, at the time of the research, 10.8% of the companies (13) did not measure job performance before and some months after training, while in 40.8% of the companies (49), this method was used. As with the previous approach, this method is also time-consuming and involves substantial administration. Tied to the appraisal of the employee, it will be possible to see whether there was any significant improvement between two appraisal periods. A total of 58 companies did not answer this question.

Table 3.34: Informal feedback from line managers

Informal feedback from line managers	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not used	7	14.2	27.0	27.0
Used	46	38.3	73.0	100.0
Total	63	52.5	100.0	
Missing	57	47.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.34, it is indicated whether organisations used the informal feedback from line managers to evaluate the training efforts. The results show that in 14.2% of the companies (7), they did not use the informal feedback from line managers to evaluate their training efforts, while in 38.3% of the companies (46) they used the informal feedback from line managers to evaluate their training efforts. Feedback from line managers to evaluate the training effort is important, as it is usually these managers that identify the training requirements for the individual sections within the company. They are thus the correct people to approach for feedback. It is interesting to note that only a relative small percentage of the companies (38.3%) follow this approach. A total of 57 companies did not respond to this question.

Table 3.35: Informal feedback from employees

Informal feedback from employees to evaluate training efforts	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not used	18	15.0	28.6	28.6
Used	45	37.5	71.4	100.0
Total	63	52.5	100.0	
Missing	57	47.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.35, it is indicated whether organisations used the informal feedback from employees to evaluate the training efforts. The results show that in 15.0% of the companies (18), they did not use informal feedback from employees to evaluate their training efforts, while in 37.5% of the companies (45), they used this method. Feedback from the employees themselves is vital because they are the ones who have to operate in their jobs. It is interesting to note that only 37.5% of the companies used this valuable approach. A total of 57 companies did not respond to this question.

Table 3.36: Return on investment (ROI)

Return on investment (ROI)	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not used	28	23.3	53.3	46.7
Used	32	26.7	100.0	100.0
Total	60	50.0		
Missing	60	50.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 3.36, it is indicated whether the organisations used the return on investment (ROI) method to evaluate the training efforts. The results show that 23.3% of the companies (28) do not use the ROI method to evaluate their training efforts, while 26.7% of the companies (32) used this method to evaluate the training efforts. Although this method has been popular to use over the years, it is complicated and cost- and time-intensive (Moffat-Bruce et al., 2017; Avidson Lyon, McKay & Mro, 2013; Mullar & Hall, 2013). The question can thus be asked whether it really produces the answers required as numerous other methods have been developed since its use, which can be seen as less cumbersome and are thus more cost effective. A total of 60 companies did not answer this question.

Section III (Employee development) – Question 8(a): To what extent do you use the following methods for career development?

Table 3.37: Career development methods used by companies

Career development methods	Percentage of companies using the method (%)					Missing
	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent	
A Special tasks	40.0	11.7	20.0	8.3	10.8	11
Number of companies	48	14	24	10	13	
B Projects to stimulate learning	35.0	13.3	19.2	13.3	10.8	10
Number of companies	42	16	23	16	13	
C Training on-the-job	5.0	14.2	25.0	23.3	26.7	7
Number of companies	6	17	30	28	32	
D Participation in project team work	16.7	23.3	22.5	16.7	13.3	9
Number of companies	20	28	27	20	16	
E Formal networking schemes	43.3	15.0	15.8	8.3	8.3	11
Number of companies	52	18	19	10	10	
F Formal career plans	34.2	15.8	17.5	14.2	12.5	7
Number of companies	41	19	21	17	15	
G Development centres	45.8	16.7	7.5	10.8	9.2	12
Number of companies	55	20	9	13	11	

Career development methods	Percentage of companies using the method (%)					Missing
	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent	
H Succession plans	31.7	15.8	17.5	15.0	11.7	10
Number of companies	38	19	21	18	14	
I Planned job rotation	40.8	20.0	12.5	7.5	12.5	8
Number of companies	49	24	15	7	15	
J 'High flier' schemes/High potentials	49.2	10.0	9.2	7.5	11.7	15
Number of companies	59	12	11	9	14	
K International work assignments (experience)	53.3	11.7	5.8	14.2	6.7	10
Number of companies	64	14	7	17	8	
L Coaching	17.5	18.3	25.8	16.7	15.8	7
Number of companies	21	22	31	20	19	
M Mentoring	15.0	15.8	30.0	15.8	16.7	8
Number of companies	18	19	36	19	20	
N Computer based packages/e-learning	41.7	15.8	9.2	11.7	11.7	12
Number of companies	50	19	11	14	14	

In Table 3.37, the companies had to indicate to which extent they used the different career development methods within their organisations. The findings which indicate the general usage of the methods (from a small extent to a very great extent) are placed in order from the most popular to the least popular according to the number of companies using them. Please see the list below:

- training on-the-job – 107 companies (89.2%);
- mentoring – 94 companies (78.3%);
- coaching – 92 companies (76.6%);
- participation in project team work – 91 companies (75.8%);
- formal career plans – 72 companies (60%);
- succession plans – 72 companies (60%);
- projects to stimulate learning – 68 companies (56.6%);
- planned job rotation – 61 companies (52.5%);
- special tasks – 61 companies (52.5%);
- computer based package learning – 58 companies (48.4%);
- formal networking schemes – 57 companies (47.4%);
- development centres – 53 companies (44.2%);
- high flyer schemes – 46 companies (38.4%); and
- international work assignments – 46 companies (38.4%).

At the time of the research, it would appear that training on the job appears to be the most popular method used by the participating companies.

SECTION IV – COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(a): Is the basic pay for management staff determined at national/industry-wide level?

Table 4.1: Basic pay for management staff determined at national and/or industry level

Basic pay for management staff determined at national/industry-wide level	N	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	44	36.7	36.7	36.7
Yes	76	63.3	63.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.1, it is indicated whether the basic pay for management staff was determined at national/industry level. The results show that in 36.7% of the companies (44) this does not happen, while in 63.3% of the companies (76) it does. Establishing equity with similar jobs in organisations at national and industry level is crucial. Employees will then be treated fairly because they will be receiving more or less the same salary as their counterparts in other companies.

This can also be used as a benchmark for companies either to pay higher direct salaries or to improve the fringe benefits of the jobs. This finding is somewhat encouraging as it shows that equity is still happening, as the basic pay for management staff is determined at national and/or industry level.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(b): Is the basic pay for management staff determined through regional collective bargaining?

Table 4.2: Basic pay for management staff determined through regional collective bargaining

Basic pay for management staff determined through regional collective bargaining	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	83	69.2	69.2	69.2
Yes	37	30.8	30.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.2, it is indicated whether the basic pay for management staff was determined through regional collective bargaining. The results show that in 69.2% of the companies (83), this does not happen, while in 30.0% of the companies (37), it does.

From the findings, it is clear that when determining pay for management staff, the use of regional collective bargaining was not deemed to be very popular among participating companies. It is further important to note that managerial staff are usually not part of the collective bargaining process; hence, the low popularly of this approach.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(c): Is the basic pay for management staff determined at company/division level?

Table 4.3: Basic pay for management staff determined at company/and/or division level

Basic pay for management staff determined at company/division level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	89	74.2	74.2	74.2
Yes	31	25.8	25.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.3, it is indicated whether the basic pay for management staff was determined at the company/division level. The results show that in 74.2% of the companies (89), this does not happen, while in 25.8% of the companies (31), it does. This finding is not surprising when considering the findings in questions 1(a) and 1(b) above. The general trend for determining the salaries of managerial staff appear to be at the national/industry-wide level, followed to a lesser extent by a combination at the regional/company/division level.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(d): Is the basic pay for management staff determined at establishment/site level?

Table 4.4: Basic pay for management staff determined at establishment/site level

Basic pay for management staff determined at establishment/site level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	101	84.2	84.2	84.2
Yes	19	15.8	15.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.4, it is indicated whether the basic pay for management staff was determined at establishment/site level. The results show that in 84.2% of the companies (101), this does not happen, while in 15.8% of the companies (19), it does. Again, this finding is in line with the findings for questions 1(a)–1(c) above where the focus was on the national/industry level in terms of management pay.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(e): Is the basic pay for management staff determined at individual level?

Table 4.5: Basic pay for management staff determined at the individual level

Basic pay for management staff determined at individual level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	94	78.3	78.3	78.3
Yes	26	21.7	21.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.5, it is indicated whether the basic pay for management staff was determined at individual level. The results show that in 78.3% of the companies (94), this does not happen, while in 21.7% of the companies (26) it does. This finding is not surprising when considering the finding for question 1(d) above. It could well be that the respondents saw this question as similar to the previous question; hence, more or less the same results were found.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(a): Is the basic pay for professionals determined at national/industry level?

Table 4.6: Basic pay for professionals determined at national/industry level

Basic pay for professionals determined at national/industry level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	48	40.0	40.0	40.0
Yes	72	60.0	60.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.6, it is indicated whether the basic pay for professional staff was determined at national/industry level. The results indicate that in 40.0% of the companies (48), this does not happen, while in 60.0% of the companies (72), it does. Once again, establishing equity with similar jobs in other organisations at national/industry level is vital as it leads to fair treatment in many instances of staff of the company, this might also reduce staff turnover at this post level as the salaries offered will then not be the reason for quitting the organisation.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(b): Is the basic pay for professionals determined through regional collective bargaining?

Table 4.7: Basic pay for professionals determined through regional collective bargaining

Basic pay for professionals determined through regional collective bargaining	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	83	69.2	69.2	69.2
Yes	37	30.8	30.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.7, it is indicated whether the basic pay for professional staff was determined through regional collective bargaining. The results show that in 69.2% of the companies (83), this does not happen, while in 30.8% of the companies (37), it does. The findings indicate that when determining pay for professional staff, the use of regional collective bargaining does not seem a popular method among participating companies. This finding comes as no surprise because in many instances, the salary rates for professional staff are determined largely by their professional bodies/societies at national level as indicated in question 1(a). The professionals are also not usually members of unions, and as such, their salaries are not determined through collective bargaining processes.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(c): Is the basic pay for professionals determined at company/division level?

Table 4.8: Basic pay for professionals determined at company/division level

Basic pay for professionals determined at company/division level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	95	79.2	79.2	79.2
Yes	25	20.8	20.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.8, it is indicated whether the basic pay for professional staff was determined at the company/division level. The results show that in 79.2% of the companies (95), this does not happen, while in 20.8% of the companies (25), it does. This result is not surprising when reading the findings together with the results for questions 1(a) and 1(b) above.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(d): Is the basic pay for professionals determined at establishment/site level?

Table 4.9: Basic pay for professionals determined at establishment/site level

Basic pay for professionals determined at establishment/site level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	104	86.7	86.7	86.7
Yes	16	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.9, it is indicated whether the basic pay for professional staff was determined at establishment and/or site level. The results show that in 86.7% of the companies (104), this does not happen, while in 13.3% of the companies (16), it does. Again, this finding is not surprising, especially when one studies the findings in Tables 4.6–4.8.

Section IV (Compensation and Benefits) – Question 1(e): Is the basic pay for professionals determined at individual level?

Table 4.10: Basic pay for professionals determined at individual level

Basic for professionals pay determined at individual level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	101	84.2	84.2	84.2
Yes	19	15.8	15.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.10, it is indicated whether the basic pay for professional staff was determined at individual level. The results show that in 84.2% of the companies (101), this does not happen, while in 15.8% of the companies (19), it does. This finding is not surprising, when taking the results for questions 1(a)–1(d) into consideration.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(a): Is the basic pay for clerical/manual staff determined at national/industry level?

Table 4.11: Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at national/industry level

Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at national/industry level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	39	32.5	32.5	32.5
Yes	81	67.5	67.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 4.11, it is indicated whether the basic pay for clericals/manual employees was determined at national and/or industry level. The results show that in 32.5% of the companies (39) this was not the case, while in 67.5% of the companies (81), they answered 'Yes'. This finding is interesting because at this post level, a high percentage of the employees belong to unions. For the major industries, the unions are amalgamated into federations, which determine the basic wages for their members at this level.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(b): Is the basic pay for clerical/manual staff determined through regional collective bargaining?

Table 4.12: Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined through regional collective bargaining

Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined through regional collective bargaining	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	82	68.3	68.3	68.3
Yes	38	31.7	31.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.12, it is indicated whether the basic pay for clericals/manual employees was determined through regional collective bargaining. The results show that in 68.3% of the companies (82), this does not happen, while in 31.7% of the companies (38), it does. This finding is not surprising. If the unions to which members belong, are not affiliated to a federal structure, they would, for example, bargain at this level for their members.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(c): Is the basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at company/division level?

Table 4.13: Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at company/ division level

Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at company or division level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	104	86.7	86.7	86.7

Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at company or division level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Yes	16	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.13, it is indicated whether the basic pay for clericals/manual employees was determined at the company or division level. The results show that in 86.7% of participating companies (104), this does not happen, while in 13.3% of the companies (16), it does. This finding is in line with the findings for questions 1(a) and 1(b) as indicated above. These members could for example not belong to a union and are then in a position to bargain directly with the company or division.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(d): Is the basic pay for clerical/manual staff determined at the establishment/site level?

Table 4.14: Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at the establishment/site level

Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at the establishment or site level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	109	90.8	90.8	90.8
Yes	11	9.2	9.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.14, it is indicated whether the basic pay for clericals/manual employees was determined at the establishment or site level. The results show that in 90.8% of participating companies (109), this does not happen, while in 9.2% of the companies (11), it does. Again, this finding is in line with the findings for questions 1(a)–1(c). This could have been either non-unionised members or union members preferring to bargain at this level.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 1(e): Is the basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at individual level?

Table 4.15: Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at individual level

Basic pay for clericals/manual employees determined at individual level	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	112	93.3	93.3	93.3
Yes	8	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.15, it is indicated whether the basic pay for clericals/manual employees was determined at individual level. The results show that in 93.3% of participating companies (112), this does not happen, while in 6.7% of the companies (8) it does. Again, this finding is in line with the previous findings. It would appear that at this level, a very small number of staff bargain with their employers in respect of their pay increases.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(a): Do you offer employee share schemes for management staff?

Table 4.16: Employee share schemes for management staff

Employee share schemes for management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	99	82.5	82.5	82.5
Yes	21	17.5	17.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.16, it is indicated whether their management staff are offered any employee share schemes. These are voluntary schemes offered by companies mainly to their management staff based on the profitability of the company. These shares are offered free but employees may only sell them after a certain period of time. The results indicate that in 82.5% of participating companies (99), these schemes are not offered, while they are offered in 17.5% of the companies (21). It is clear from the findings that at this stage, the majority of the companies who participated in the survey do not offer managerial employees share schemes. It would therefore seem that, at the time of this survey, share schemes were not popular among participating companies for their management staff.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(b): Do you offer profit sharing for management staff?

Table 4.17: Profit sharing for management staff

Profit sharing for management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	104	86.7	86.7	86.7
Yes	16	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.17, it is indicated whether organisations offered their management staff any type of profit sharing. The results show that 86.7% of the companies (104) do not offer any profit sharing to their staff, while 13.3% of the companies (16) do. Profit sharing plans are intended to afford employees the opportunity to increase their earnings by contributing to the growth of their organisation's profits. These contributions may be directed towards improving product quality, reducing operating costs, improving work methods and building goodwill rather than just increasing rates of production (Snell, Morris & Bohlander, 2016:402–408; Wärnich et al., 2018:446). From the findings, it is clear that in the majority of the companies participating in this survey, no profit sharing scheme for management staff existed.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(c): Do you offer your management staff stock options?

Table 4.18: Stock options for management staff

Stock options for management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	112	93.3	93.3	93.3
Yes	8	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.18, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their management staff stock options. The results show that 93.3% of the companies (112) do not, while 6.7% of the companies (8) do. Stock option plans grant the employee the right to purchase a specific number of shares of the company's stock at a guaranteed price (the option price) during a designated time. The price at which the option is provided is called the 'grant price' and this is usually the market price at the time the options are granted (Snell et al., 2016:402–408; Wärnich et al., 2018:449). The findings clearly indicate that the majority of companies in this survey did not offer their management staff stock option schemes which is an interesting finding as this is also a method to help retain its management employees.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(d): Do you have flexible benefits for management staff?

Table 4.19: Flexible benefits for management staff

Flexible benefits for management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	91	75.8	75.8	75.8
Yes	29	24.2	24.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.19, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their management staff the option of flexible benefits. The results show that 75.8% of the companies (91) do not, while 24.2% of the companies (29) do. To accommodate the individual needs of employees, organisations may offer flexible benefit plans (also known as 'cafeteria plans' (Wärnich et al., 2018:457). These plans enable individual employees to choose the benefits that best suit their particular needs (Snell et al., 2016:402–408; Wärnich et al., 2018:457). The findings clearly indicate that flexible benefit packages were only available in a very small number of the companies. It can thus be assumed that the majority of companies had fixed benefits for their staff.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(e): Do you have individual performance-related pay for management staff?

Table 4.20: Individual performance-related pay for management staff

Individual performance-related pay for management staff	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	66	55.0	55.0	55.0
Yes	54	45.0	45.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.20, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their management staff performance-related pay. The results show that 55.0% of the companies (66) do not, while 45.0% of the companies (54) do. This is an interesting finding as performance-related pay plays an important role in the motivation of staff. Looking at the earlier findings (i.e. Tables 4.17, 4.18 and 4.19), it would appear that very limited incentives were given to their management staff in the companies participating in this survey.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(f): Is the bonus for management staff based on individual goals?

Table 4.21: Bonus for management staff based on individual goals

Bonus for management staff based on individual goals	N	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	54	45.0	45.0	45.0
Yes	66	55.0	55.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.21, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their management staff bonuses according to individual goals. The results show that in 45.0% of the companies (54), this did not happen, while in 55.0% of the companies (66) it does. This is a positive finding. A bonus is an incentive payment given to an employee beyond his or her normal base salary (Snell et al., 2016:402–425), i.e. as a once-off payment. The findings clearly indicate that the majority of participating companies do offer their management staff bonuses according to the individual goals set. This can be seen as an important motivating and retainment policy for companies.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(g): Is the bonus for management staff based on team goals?

Table 4.22: Bonus for management staff based on team goals

Bonus for management staff based on team goals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	89	74.2	74.2	74.2
Yes	31	25.8	25.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.22, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their management staff bonuses on the basis of team goals. The results show that in 74.2% of the companies (89), this does not happen, while in 25.8% of the companies (31) it does. During the last two decades, the role of teams in the functioning of companies has become very important, and bonuses tied to the performance of those teams are an essential part of strengthening these teams. These plans foster a cooperative instead of an individualistic spirit among employees (Snell et al., 2016:402–425; Wärnich et al., 2018:445). The findings clearly indicate that the majority of companies in this survey do not follow this approach at the time of the research, which is an interesting finding considering the popularity of teams worldwide.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(h): Is the bonus for management staff based on organisational goals?

Table 4.23: Bonus for management staff based on organisational goals

Bonus for management staff based on organisational goals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	70	58.3	58.3	58.3
Yes	50	41.7	41.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.23, it is indicated whether organisations paid their management staff bonuses based on the organisational goals. The results show that in 58.3% of the companies (70), this does not happen, while in 41.7% of the companies (50) it does. Companies follow this strategy to improve the commitment of their staff (Snell et al., 2016:402–440; Wärnich et al., 2018:445). The findings clearly indicate that the majority of companies in this survey were not following this approach at the time of the research.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(i): Is the bonus for management staff based on non-monetary incentives?

Table 4.24: Bonus for management staff based on non-monetary incentives

Bonus for management staff based on team goals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	91	75.8	75.8	75.8
Yes	20	24.2	24.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.24, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their management staff bonuses based on non-monetary incentives. The results show that in 75.8% of the companies (91), this does not happen, while in 24.2% of the companies (20) it does. Non-monetary incentives are often referred to as 'perks' and could consist of membership of a gym, etc. (Snell et al., 2016:402–440). The findings clearly indicate that the majority of companies in this survey did not follow this approach, and that this was still only applicable to a very small group of employees.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(a): Do you offer employee share schemes for professionals?

Table 4.25: Employee share schemes for professionals

Employee share schemes for professionals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	104	86.7	86.7	86.7
Yes	16	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.25, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their professional staff any share schemes. The results show that 86.7% of the companies (104) do not, while 13.3% of the companies (16) do. The findings clearly indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of the companies did not offer share schemes to their professional staff.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(b): Do you offer profit sharing for professionals?

Table 4.26: Profit sharing for professionals

Profit sharing for professionals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	110	91.7	91.7	91.7
Yes	10	8.3	8.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.26, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their professional staff any sort of profit sharing. The results show that 91.7% of the companies (110) do not offer any profit sharing to their professional staff, while 8.3% of the companies (10) do. The findings clearly indicate that the majority of the companies do not offer their professional staff any profit sharing schemes at this stage.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(c): Do you have stock options for professionals?

Table 4.27: Stock options for professionals

Stock options for professionals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	112	93.3	93.3	93.3
Yes	8	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.27, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their professional staff stock options. The results show that in 93.3% of the companies (112), this does not happen, while in 6.7% of the companies (8) it does. The findings clearly indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of companies did not offer stock options to their professional staff.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(d): Do you have flexible benefits for professionals?

Table 4.28: Flexible benefits for professionals

Flexible benefits for professionals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	102	85.0	85.0	85.0
Yes	18	15.0	15.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.28, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their professional staff the option of flexible benefits. The results show that in 85.0% of the companies (102), this does not happen, while in 15.0% of the companies (18) it does. The findings clearly indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of the participating companies did not offer flexible benefits to their professional staff.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(e): Do you have individual performance-related pay for professionals?

Table 4.29: Individual performance-related pay for professionals

Performance-related pay for professionals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	83	69.2	69.2	69.2
Yes	37	30.8	30.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.29, it is indicated whether the participating companies offer their professional staff performance-related pay. The results show that in 69.2% of the companies (83), this does not happen, while in 30.8% of the companies (37), it does. This can have an influence on the commitment of professional staff, and the absence of this practice, could result in poor company performance. The findings clearly indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of the participating companies did not offer their professional staff performance-related pay. Based on the previous questions relating to professional workers, it would appear that there was an increase in the application of incentives for professionals in the form of performance-related pay, although still in a very low percentage of companies.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(f): Is the bonus for professionals based on individual goals/performance?

Table 4.30: Bonus for professionals based on individual goals/performance

Bonus for professionals based on individual goals/performance	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	75	62.5	62.5	62.5
Yes	45	37.5	37.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.30, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid bonuses to their professional staff based on their individual goals. The results show that 62.5% of the companies (75) do not, while 37.5% of the companies (45) do. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of the participating companies did not paid their professional staff bonuses based on their individual goals. However, as was the case with the previous question with performance-related pay, there appears to be a slight improvement regarding the application of this practice within participating companies amongst professional employees.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(g): Is the bonus for professionals based on team goals/performance?

Table 4.31: Bonus for professionals based on team goals/performance

Bonus for professionals based on team goals/performance	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	96	80.0	80.0	80.0
Yes	24	20.0	20.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.31, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their professional staff bonuses based on team goals. The results indicate that 80.0% of the companies (96) do not, while 20.0% of the companies (24) do. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of the companies did not pay their professionals bonuses based on team goals. As mentioned earlier, using teams within organisations is becoming a vital part of organisations, and companies should thus consider using teams at all levels, even at the professional level.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(h): Is the bonus for professional staff based on organisational goals?

Table 4.32: Bonus for professionals based on organisational goals

Bonus for professionals based on organisational goals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	87	72.5	72.5	72.5
Yes	33	27.5	27.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.32, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their professional staff bonuses based on organisational goals. The results show that in 72.5% of the companies (87), this does not happen, while in 27.5% of the companies (33) it does. The finding indicates that the majority of companies in this survey were not following this approach at the time of the research. This finding relates to the findings in Table 4.30 regarding individual goals. Both organisational and individual goals need to interface with one another; otherwise, the organisation will not achieve success. This also ties in with the aspect of performance-related pay, see Table 4.30.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(i): Is the bonus for professional staff based on non-monetary incentives?

Table 4.33: Bonus for professional staff based on non-monetary incentives

Bonus for professional staff based on non-monetary incentives	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	92	76.7	76.7	76.7
Yes	28	23.3	23.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.33, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their professional staff bonuses based on non-monetary incentives. The results show that in 76.7% of the companies (92) this does not happen, while it applied in 23.3% of the companies (28). The findings clearly indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of companies in this survey did not follow this approach in terms of their professional staff.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(a): Do you have employee share schemes for clericals/manual employees?

Table 4.34: Employee share schemes for clericals/manual employees

Employee share schemes for clerical/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	113	94.2	94.2	94.2
Yes	7	5.8	5.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.34, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered any share schemes to their clericals/manual employees. The results indicate that 94.2% of the companies (113)

do not, while 5.8% of the companies (7) do. This finding is not surprising as these types of schemes are usually only offered to staff groups higher up in the organisation, such as management staff. At the time of the research, share schemes for clerical or manual staff did not appear to be popular among the participating companies.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(b): Do you have profit sharing for clericals/manual employees?

Table 4.35: Profit sharing for clericals/manual employees

Profit sharing for clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	117	97.5	97.5	97.5
Yes	3	2.5	2.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.35, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their clericals/manual employees any type of profit sharing. The results show that 97.5% of the companies (117) do not, while 2.5% of the companies (3) do. Usually, this type of incentive is not offered to staff at the lower levels of the organisation. The findings thus clearly indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of the companies participating in this survey did not have this option for their clericals/manual employees.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(c): Do you have stock options for clericals/manual employees?

Table 4.36: Stock options for clericals/manual employees

Stock options for clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	119	99.2	99.2	99.2
Yes	1	0.8	0.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.36, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered clericals/manual employees stock options. The results show that in 99.2% of the companies (119), this does not happen, while in 0.8% of the companies (1), it does. Again, as in the previous case, this type of incentive is not offered to staff at the lower levels of organisations. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, this was not an option for the majority of companies in terms of their clericals/manual employees.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(d): Do you have flexible benefits for clericals/manual employees?

Table 4.37: Flexible benefits for clericals/manual employees

Flexible benefits for clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	111	92.5	92.5	92.5
Yes	9	7.5	7.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.37, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their clericals/manual employees the option of flexible benefits. The results show that 92.5% of the companies (111) do not, while 7.5% of the companies (9) do. Again, as in the previous case, this type of incentive is not offered to staff at the lower levels of the organisations. The findings therefore clearly indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of participating companies did not offer flexible benefits to their clericals/manual employees. It would thus appear that only fixed benefits are provided to these members of staff.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(e): Do you have individual performance-related pay for clericals/manual employees?

Table 4.38: Individual performance-related pay for clericals/manual employees

Performance-related pay for clericals/manual employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	93	77.5	77.5	77.5
Yes	27	22.5	22.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.38, it is indicated whether the participating companies offer their clericals/manual employees individual performance-related pay. The results show that 77.5% of the companies (93) do not, while 22.5% of the companies (27) do. This finding is somewhat surprising as employees at this level in the organisation need to be motivated to perform, and performance-related pay is one of the ways of achieving this goal. The findings clearly indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of participating companies did not offer their clericals/manual employees individual performance-related pay.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(f): Is the bonus for clericals/ manual employees based on individual goals?

Table 4.39: Bonus for clerical or manual staff based on individual goals

Bonus for clericals/manual employees based on individual goals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	83	69.2	69.2	69.2
Yes	37	30.8	30.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.39, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their clericals/manual employees bonuses based on individual goals. The results show that 69.2% of the companies (83) do not, while 30.8% of the companies (37) do. A bonus is an incentive payment given to an employee beyond his or her normal base wage based on performance (Snell et al., 2016:402–425). The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of participating companies did not offer their clericals/manual employees bonuses based on their individual goals. It is important to note from the findings for this question compared to earlier findings in terms of clericals/manual employees that there appears to be a slight increase in the application of this practice within this group.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(g): Is the bonus for clericals/manual employees based on team goals?

Table 4.40: Bonus for clerical or manual staff based on team goals

Bonus for clericals/manual employees based on team goals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	99	82.5	82.5	82.5
Yes	21	17.5	17.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.40, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their clericals/manual employees bonuses on the basis of their team goals. The results show that in 82.5% of the companies (99), they do not, while 17.5% of the companies (21) do. The role of teams – especially at the lower levels within organisations – is important. One way of encouraging team performance is through bonuses based on the performance of the team. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of the companies did not follow this approach in respect of their clericals/manual employees.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(h): Is the bonus for clericals/manual employees based on organisational goals?

Table 4.41: Bonus for clericals/manual employees based on organisational goals

Bonus for clericals/manual employees based on organisational goals	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	92	76.7	76.7	76.7
Yes	28	23.3	23.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.41, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their clericals/manual employees bonuses based on organisational goals. The results show that in 76.7% of the companies (92) this does not happen, while it applied in 23.3% of the companies (28). The findings indicate that the majority of companies in this survey did not follow this approach regarding their clericals/manual employees.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 2(i): Is the bonus for clericals/manual employees based on non-monetary incentives?

Table 4.42: Bonus for clericals/manual employees based on non- monetary incentives

Bonus for clericals/manual employees based on non-monetary incentives	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	94	78.3	78.3	78.3
Yes	26	21.7	21.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 4.42, it is indicated whether the participating companies paid their clericals/manual employees bonuses based on non-monetary incentives. The results show that in 78.3% of the companies (94) this does not happen, while it applied in 21.7% of the companies (26). These bonuses could include, for example, gym membership. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of companies participating in the survey did not follow this approach regarding their clericals/manual employees. It is important to note that this type of benefit is typically given to higher-level staff and not to clericals/manual employees.

Section IV (Compensation and benefits) – Question 3: Do you offer any of the following schemes in excess of statutory requirements?

Table 4.43: Benefits offered by companies in excess of statutory requirements

Benefit	Yes		No	
	n	Valid percentage	n	Valid percentage
A Workplace childcare (subsidised or not)	6	5.0	114	95.0
B Childcare allowances	4	3.3	116	96.7
C Career break schemes	10	8.3	110	91.7
D Maternity leave	110	91.7	10	8.3
E Paternity leave	89	74.2	31	25.0
F Parental leave (leave to care for a child outside of maternity leave)	79	65.8	41	34.2
G Pension schemes	101	84.2	19	15.8
H Education/training break	92	76.7	28	23.3
I Private healthcare scheme	80	66.7	40	33.3
J Flexible/cafeteria benefits	15	12.5	105	87.5

In Table 4.43, it is indicated whether the participating companies offered their employees any other benefits over and above the statutory requirements. The results show that participating companies offered quite a few other benefits in varying degrees. For example, in order of importance, the following were offered by the participating companies over and above the statutory requirements:

- maternity leave with 91.7% of the companies (110);
- pension schemes in 84.2% of the companies (101);
- education/training break in 76.7% of the companies (92);
- paternity leave in 74.2% of the companies (89);
- private health care schemes in 66.7% of the companies (80);
- parental leave in 65.8% of the companies (79); and
- flexible cafeteria benefits in 12.5% of companies (15).

As can be seen in Table 4.45, some other benefits are also offered to employees but at a much lower percentage.

SECTION V – EMPLOYEE RELATIONS AND COMMUNICATION

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 1: What proportion of the total number of employees in your organisation are members of a trade union?

Table 5.1: Proportion of the total employees who are members of a trade union

Proportion of employees who are members of a trade union	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
0	12	10.0	10.3	10.3
1–10%	11	9.2	9.5	19.8
11–25%	5	4.2	4.3	24.1
26–50%	5	4.2	4.3	28.4
51–75%	22	18.3	19.0	47.4
76–100%	61	50.8	52.6	100.0
Total	116	96.7	100.0	
Missing	2	1.7		
Total	120	100.0		

Table 5.1 indicates the percentage of the total number of employees of the participating companies who are members of a trade union. From the data, it appears that in 12 companies (10% of the respondents), none of the employees were members of a trade union. Other findings indicate the following:

- in 11 companies (9.2%), between 1 and 10%; of the employees were members of a trade union;
- in 5 companies (4.2%), membership was between 11 and 25%;
- in a further 5 companies (4.2%), membership was between 26 and 50%;
- in 22 companies (18.3%), membership was between 51 and 75%; and lastly,
- in 61 companies (50.8%), membership was between 76 and 100%.

From the findings, it would appear that, at the time of the research, the majority of the employees of the participating companies were members of a trade union. Thus, in South Africa, as in other developing countries, employees feel the need for protection from their employers despite the fact that South Africa has sophisticated labour legislation. Two companies did not answer the question.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 2(a): To what extent do trade unions influence your organisation?

Table 5.2: Extent to which trade unions influence organisations

Extent to which trade unions influence organisations	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	16	13.3	13.8	13.8
To a small extent	10	8.3	8.6	22.4
To some extent	26	21.7	22.4	44.8
To a great extent	22	18.3	19.0	63.8
To a very great extent	42	35.0	36.2	100.0
Total	116	96.7	100.0	
Missing	4	3.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.2, it is indicated to which extent trade unions influence the organisations where they are represented. The results indicate that in 13.3% of the participating companies (16), trade unions did not influence the companies at all, while in 8.3% of the companies (10), they did so to a small extent. In 21.7% of the companies (26), they influenced the companies to some extent, while in 18.3% of the companies (22), they influenced companies to a great extent, and in 35.0% of the companies (42), they influenced the companies to a very great extent. Thus, in the majority of the companies, the trade unions influenced the organisations from a small to a very great extent. It would thus appear that at the time of the research, the trade unions were very effective in their responsibilities towards their members as they had a varied influencing effect on the employers where they are represented. Only four companies did not answer this question.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 3: Do you recognise trade unions for the purpose of collective bargaining?

Table 5.3: Do you recognise trade unions for the purpose of collective bargaining?

Recognition of trade unions for the purpose of collective bargaining	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	15	12.5	12.8	12.8
Yes	102	85.0	87.2	100.0
Total	117	97.6	100.0	
Missing	3	2.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.3, it is indicated whether participating companies recognised trade unions for collective bargaining purposes. The results show that in 12.5% of the respondents (15), the answer was 'No', while 85.0% of the respondents (102), answered 'Yes'. The findings thus indicate that at the time of the research, the majority of companies recognised trade unions for collective bargaining purposes. This finding comes as no surprise, because the labour legislation promulgated on 13 December 1995 (Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995) greatly facilitates this process.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 4: Do you have a joint consultative committee or works council?

Table 5.4: Do you have a joint consultative committee or works council?

Do you have a joint consultative committee or works council?	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	28	23.3	24.3	24.3
Yes	87	72.5	75.7	100.0
Total	115	95.8	100.0	
Missing	5	4.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.4, it is indicated whether participating companies had a joint consultative committee or works council. The results show that 23.3% of the respondents (28), answered 'No', while

72.5% of the respondents (87), said 'Yes'. The findings thus indicate that the majority of companies (72.5%) had a joint consultative committee or works council. Five companies did not answer the question. This is an important finding, as this structure (joint consultative committee/works council) provides a formal structure for the employer and employees to discuss matters of importance to both parties.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 5(a): Methods of communication to employees: Direct to employees.

Table 5.5(a): Direct communication with employees

Direct communication with employees	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	6	5.0	5.1	5.1
To a small extent	7	5.8	5.9	11.0
To some extent	17	14.2	14.4	25.4
To a great extent	29	24.2	24.6	50.0
To a very great extent	59	49.2	50.0	100.0
Total	118	98.3	100.0	
Missing	2	1.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.5(a), it is indicated whether participating companies communicated directly with their employees. The results indicate that 5.0% of the respondents (6) did not at all communicate directly with their employees, while 5.8% of the respondents (7) communicated directly to a small extent with their employees. Another 14.2% of the respondents (17), communicated to some extent directly with their employees, while 24.2% of the respondents (29) communicated to a great extent directly with their employees, and 49.2% of the respondents (59) communicated to a very great extent directly with their employees. The findings indicate that at the time of the research, the majority of participating companies (93.4%) communicated from a small to a very great extent directly with their employees. Two companies did not answer the question. These findings are not surprising, when taking the results of question 4 into consideration where the majority of companies had a consultative committee or works council in their organisation.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 5(b): Methods of communication to employees: Through immediate superior

Table 5.5(b): Communication through immediate superior

Communication through immediate superior	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	5	4.2	4.4	4.4
To a small extent	10	8.3	8.8	13.2
To some extent	18	15.0	15.0	28.9
To a great extent	31	25.8	27.2	56.1
To a very great extent	50	41.7	43.9	100.0
Total	114	95.0	100.0	
Missing	6	5.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.5(b), it is indicated whether participating companies communicated through an immediate superior with their employees. The results indicate that 4.2% of the respondents (5) did not at all communicate through an immediate superior with their employees, while 8.3% of the respondents (10) communicated to a small extent through the immediate superior. Another 15.0% of the respondents (18) communicated to some extent through the immediate superior, while 25.8% of the respondents (31) communicated to a great extent with their employees through the immediate superior, and 41.7% of the respondents (50) communicated to a very great extent with the employees through the immediate superior. The findings indicate that at the time of the research, the majority of the companies (90.8%) communicated with their employees from a small to a very great extent through the immediate superior. Six companies did not answer the question. This finding is somewhat surprising when considering the results for question 5(a). The respondents might have felt that they communicate directly with their employees although they go through the immediate supervisor. They might have felt that they only follow the hierarchical communication lines.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 5(c): Methods of communication to employees: Through trade union representative

Table 5.5(c): Communication through trade union representative

Communication through trade union representative	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	16	13.3	14.2	14.2
To a small extent	14	11.7	12.4	20.5
To some extent	18	15.0	15.9	42.5
To a great extent	29	24.2	25.7	68.1
To a very great extent	36	30.0	31.9	100.0
Total	113	94.2	100.0	
Missing	7	6.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.5(c), it is indicated whether participating companies communicated with their employees through a trade union representative. The results show that 13.3% of the respondents (16) did not at all communicate with their employees through a trade union representative, while 11.7% of the respondents (14) communicated to a small extent through a trade union representative. Another 15.0% of the respondents (18) communicated to some extent through a trade union representative, and 24.2% of the respondents (29) communicated with their employees to a great extent through a trade union representative, while 30.0% of the respondents (36) communicated to a very great extent with their employees through a trade union representative. The findings indicate that the majority of companies (70.9%) communicate from a small to a very great extent with their employees through a trade union representative. Seven companies did not answer the question. Again, this finding is surprising. The only interpretation that can be given is that, as was the case in the previous question, the companies felt that they communicated directly with the employees even though the trade union represented them.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 5(d): Methods of communication to employees: Through works council

Table 5.5(d): Communication through works council

Communication through works council	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	43	35.8	39.8	39.8
To a small extent	8	6.7	7.4	47.2
To some extent	20	16.7	18.5	65.7
To a great extent	15	12.5	13.9	79.6
To a very great extent	22	18.3	20.4	100.0
Total	108	90.0	100.0	
Missing	12	10		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.5(d), it is indicated whether participating companies communicated with their staff through works councils. The results indicate that 35.8% of the respondents (43) did not at all communicated with their staff through works councils, while 6.7% of the respondents (8) communicated to a small extent with their staff through works councils. Another 16.7% of the respondents (20) communicated to some extent with their staff through a works council, while 12.5% of the respondents (15) did so to a great extent, and in 18.3% of the companies (22), this happened to a very great extent. The findings indicate that 54.2% of the respondents communicated with their employees through works councils from a small to a very great extent. It is however important to note that, at the time of the research, almost a third of the respondents, had not used this method at all. Twelve companies did not answer the question. This finding is again somewhat surprising considering the findings reported for question 4 where 72.5% of the companies indicated that, at the time of the research, they had works councils in their organisations. The question thus remains whether they were actually using this body for consultation with the staff or whether it was just there in name.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 5(e): Methods of communication to employees: Through regular workforce meetings

Table 5.5(e): Communication through regular workforce meetings

Communication through regular workforce meetings	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	13	10.8	11.5	11.5
To a small extent	13	10.8	11.5	23.0
To some extent	24	20.0	21.2	44.2
To a great extent	27	22.5	23.9	68.1
To a very great extent	36	30.0	31.9	100.0
Total	113	94.2	100.0	
Missing	7	5.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.5(e), it is indicated whether participating companies communicated with their employees through regular workforce meetings. The results show that 10.8% of the respondents (13) did not at all communicate with their staff through regular workforce

meetings, while 10.8% of the respondents (13) communicated with them to a small extent through regular workforce meetings. Another 20.0% of the respondents (24) communicated with their staff to some extent through regular workforce meetings, and 22.5% of the respondents (27) communicated with their staff to a great extent through this method, while 30.0% of the respondents (36) used this method to a very great extent to communicate with their staff. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of companies (83.3%) communicated with their staff through regular workforce meetings from a small to a very great extent. Seven companies did not answer the question. This finding makes sense considering the findings of questions 4, 5(a) and d.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 5(f): Methods of communication to employees: Through team briefings

Table 5.5(f): Communication through team briefings

Communication through team briefings	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	16	13.3	14.0	14.0
To a small extent	12	10.0	10.5	24.6
To some extent	21	17.5	18.4	43.0
To a great extent	30	25.0	26.3	69.3
To a very great extent	35	29.2	30.7	100.0
Total	114	95.0	100.0	
Missing	6	5.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.5(f), it is indicated whether participating companies communicated with their employees through team briefings. The results show that 13.3% of the respondents (16) did not at all communicate with their staff through team briefings, while 10.0% of the respondents (12) communicated with their staff to a small extent through team briefings. Another 17.5% of the respondents (21) communicated with their staff to some extent through team briefings, while 25.0% of the respondents (30), communicated with their staff to a great extent through this method, and 29.2% of the respondents (35) used this method to a very great extent to communicate with their staff. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of companies (81.7%) communicated with their staff from a small to a very great extent through team briefings. Six companies did not answer the question. Again, this finding is in line with earlier findings in this regard.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 5(g): Methods of communication to employees: Through electronic communication

Table 5.5(g): Using electronic communication

Using electronic communication	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	12	10.0	10.4	10.4
To a small extent	8	6.7	7.0	17.4
To some extent	12	10.0	10.4	27.8
To a great extent	24	20.0	20.9	48.7
To a very great extent	59	49.2	51.3	100.0

Using electronic communication	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Total	115	95.8	100.0	
Missing	5	4.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.5(g), it is indicated whether participating companies communicated with their employees by using electronic means. The results indicate that 10.0% of the respondents (12) did not at all communicate with their staff through electronic means, while 6.7% of the respondents (8) communicated to a small extent by using electronic means. Another 10.0% of the respondents (12) communicated to some extent by using electronic means, while 20.0% of the respondents (24) communicated to a great extent through electronic means, and 49.2% of the respondents (59) communicated with their staff to a very great extent by using electronic means. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of companies (85.9%) communicated with their staff from a small to a very great extent by using electronic means. Five companies did not answer the question. Again, with the prevalence of computers within organisations it makes sense from a cost and efficiency point of view, to use this method of communication with staff.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 6(a): Managers: Formally briefed about: Business strategy

Table 5.6(a): Briefing managers about business strategy

Briefing managers about business strategy	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	10	8.3	8.3	8.3
Yes	110	91.7	91.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 5.6(a), it is indicated whether managers of the participating companies were formally briefed about their business strategy. The results indicate that 8.3% of the respondents (10) were not generally briefed about the business strategy, while in 91.7% of the participating companies (110), this did happen. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of managers were formally briefed about the business strategy. This process is essential if the managers of the organisation are to focus their work efforts on achieving the goals of the organisation and energising their staff in a specific direction. They must thus be aware of the direction and nature of the strategy of the organisation.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 6(b): Managers: Formally briefed about: Financial performance

Table 5.6(b): Managers briefed about financial performance

Managers briefed about financial performance	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	11	9.2	9.2	9.2
Yes	109	90.8	90.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 5.6(b), it is indicated whether managers of the participating companies were formally briefed about the financial performance of the company. The results indicate that in 9.2% of the companies (11), this did not happen, while 90.8% of the respondents (109) answered 'Yes'. The findings show that, at the time of the research, the managers in the majority of the companies were formally briefed about the financial performance of the company. As in the case of the previous question, this is essential, as managers need to draw up the budget for their individual divisions within the financial indicators of their companies.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 6(c): Managers: Formally briefed about: Organisation of work

Table 5.6(c): Managers briefed about organisation of work

Managers briefed about organisation of work	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	16	13.3	13.3	13.3
Yes	104	86.7	86.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 5.6(c), it is indicated whether managers of the participating companies were formally briefed about the organisation of work within their companies. The results indicate that, in the case of 13.3% of the companies (16), managers were not briefed about the organisation of work within their companies, while 86.7% of the respondents (104) answered 'Yes'. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of participating companies formally briefed their managers about the organisation of work within their companies. This is essential, as the managers need to adapt and/or adjust their work structures to help achieve the overall business goals of the organisation where changes occur to the organisation of work within the organisation. Managers therefore need to be informed about what is going on in the rest of the organisation and how it operates.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 6(a): Professionals: Formally briefed about: Business strategy

Table 5.6(a): Professionals briefed about business strategy

Professionals briefed about business strategy	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	49	40.8	40.8	40.8
Yes	71	59.2	59.2	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 5.6(a), it is indicated whether participating companies briefed their professionals formally about the business strategy of the company. The results indicate that, in the case of 40.8% of the companies (49), this did not happen at the time of the research, while 59.2% of the respondents (71) answered 'Yes'. The findings indicate that the majority of companies formally briefed their professionals about the business strategy of the company. However, to function efficiently and effectively, all employees need to be informed of the direction in which the company will be moving. If this does not happen, the employees will be misdirecting their energy within the companies. From the findings it therefore appears that there might be a problem when it comes to this group of employees. This needs to be addressed as all employees need to be in agreement on the way forward within an organisation.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 6(b): Professionals: Formally briefed about: Financial performance

Table 5.6(b): Professionals briefed about financial performance

Professionals briefed about financial performance	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	54	45.0	45.0	45.0
Yes	66	55.0	55.0	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 5.6(b), it was indicated whether professionals in the participating companies were formally briefed about the financial performance of the organisation. The results show that in 45.0% of the companies (54), they were not informed in this regard, while 55.0% of the respondents (66) answered 'Yes'. The findings indicate that in the majority of companies, the professionals were formally brief about financial performance of the companies. However, it is important to note that, at the time of the research, nearly 45% of the employees were not briefed about the financial performance of the organisation. As indicated for the previous question, all employees need to be kept in the loop, and excluding some could only be detrimental to the organisation.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 6(c): Professionals: Formally briefed about: Organisation of work

Table 5.6(c): Professionals briefed about organisation of work

Professionals briefed about organisation of work	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	50	41.7	41.7	41.7
Yes	70	58.3	58.3	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 5.6(c), it is indicated whether professionals at the participating companies were formally briefed about the organisation of work. The results show that in 41.7% of the companies (50), this did not occur, while 53.8% of the respondents (70) answered 'Yes'. The findings show that the majority of participating companies formally briefed their professionals about the organisation of work at their companies. However, as has been the case with the previous two questions, it is important that all employees be involved in important aspects pertaining to the operation of the company. If this is not the case, the energy used within the organisation will not be focused, which will be detrimental to the organisation.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 6(a): Clerical/Manuals: Formally briefed about: Business strategy

Table 5.6(a): Clericals/manual employees briefed about business strategy

Clericals/manual employees briefed about business strategy	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	87	72.5	72.5	72.5
Yes	33	27.5	27.5	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 5.6(a), it is indicated whether clericals/manual employees at the participating companies were formally briefed about the business strategy of the companies at the time of the research. The results show that in 72.5% of the participating companies (87) clericals/manual employees were not informed about the business strategy, while 27.5% of the respondents (33) answered 'Yes;. The findings show that, at the time of the research, the majority of the participating companies generally did not brief their clericals/manual employees formally about the business strategy of the organisation. Although the organisations might think that it is not necessary to do so, it is important for all employees to know why they are operating in a specific manner. Informing clericals/manual employees of the business strategy of the company will help to clarify this aspect and also help them to buy into the strategy.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 6(b): Clericals/Manuals: Formally briefed about: Financial performance

Table 5.6(b): Clericals/manual employees briefed about financial performance

Clericals/manual employees briefed about financial performance	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	88	73.3	73.3	73.3
Yes	32	26.7	26.7	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 5.6(b), it is indicated whether clericals/manual employees at the participating companies were formally briefed about the financial performance of the company. The results show that in 73.3% of the companies (88), this did not happen at the time of the research, while 26.7% of the respondents (32) answered 'Yes'. The findings show that in the majority of the companies, clericals/manual employees were not formally briefed about the financial performance of the company. This might be regarded as unwise as briefing these workers about the financial performance of the company will help them to understand the financial position of the company when discussing salary increases as well as when causing financial losses through their actions.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 6(c): Clericals/Manuals: Formally briefed about: Organisation of work

Table 5.6(c): Clericals/manual employees briefed about organisation of work

Clericals/manual employees briefed about organisation of work	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Generally not used	65	54.2	54.2	54.2
Yes	55	45.8	45.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 5.6 (c), it is indicated whether the clericals/manual employees at the participating companies were formally briefed about the organisation of work within their company. The results show that in 54.2% of the companies (65), they were not informed about this aspect, while 45.8% of the respondents (55) answered 'Yes'. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of participating companies did not brief their clericals/manual employees formally about the organisation of work within the company. Again, as was the

case with the previous findings, this may be unwise as information pertaining to the aspect of the organisation of work is important to all employees irrespective of post level. They will thus better understand why certain activities take place within the organisation.

Section V (Employee relations and communication) – Question 7: What methods do employees use to communicate their views to management?

Table 5.7(a): Methods used by employees to communicate their views: Directly to management

Communicating directly with management	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	9	7.5	8.0	8.0
To a small extent	17	14.2	15.2	23.2
To some extent	28	23.3	25.0	48.2
To a great extent	23	19.2	20.5	68.8
To a very great extent	35	29.2	31.3	100.0
Total	112	93.3	100.0	
Missing	8	6.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.7(a), it is indicated which method employees in the participating companies were using at the time of the research to communicate their views to management. The results show that in 7.5% of the participating companies (9), the employees did not at all communicate their views directly to management, while in 14.2% of the companies (17), they communicated their views to a small extent directly to senior management. In 23.3% of the companies (28), they communicated their views to some extent directly to management, in 19.2% of the companies (23), they communicated their views to a great extent directly to senior management, and in 29.2% of the companies (35), they communicated their views to a very great extent directly to management. The findings indicate that the majority of employees (85.9%) communicated their views from a small extent to a very great extent directly to management. Eight companies did not answer the question. These findings are not surprising when considering the findings for question 5(a) (page 107) where 93.4% of the companies indicated that they communicated directly with their employees.

Table 5.7(b): Methods used by employees to communicate their views: Through immediate superior

Communicating through immediate superior	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	1	0.8	0.9	0.9
To a small extent	9	7.5	7.8	8.7
To some extent	26	21.7	22.6	31.3
To a great extent	35	29.2	30.4	61.7
To a very great extent	44	36.7	38.3	100.0
Total	115	95.8	100.0	
Missing	5	4.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.7(b), it is indicated whether employees of the participating companies communicated their views through their immediate superior directly to management. The

results show that in 0.8% of the companies (1), the employees did not communicate their views at all through their immediate superior, while in 7.5% of the companies (9), they communicated their views to a small extent, and in 21.7% of the companies (26), they communicated their views to some extent. In 29.2% of the companies (35), employees communicated their views to a great extent, and in 36.7% of the companies (44) they communicated their views to a very great extent through their immediate superior. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of employees (95.1%) communicated their views to management through their immediate superior. This finding is similar to the finding in question 5(b) where 90.8% of the companies indicated that they communicate with their employees through their immediate supervisors. However, as indicated in question 5(b) (page 107) earlier it would appear that the companies saw communication through the direct supervisor in the same light as communication directly to their employees irrespective of the presence of intermediary parties. Five companies did not answer the question.

Table 5.7(c): Methods used by employees to communicate their views: Through trade union representation

Communicating through trade union representative	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	8	6.7	7.0	7.0
To a small extent	15	12.5	13.2	20.2
To some extent	21	17.5	18.4	38.6
To a great extent	27	22.5	23.7	62.3
To a very great extent	43	35.8	37.7	100.0
Total	114	95.0	100.0	
Missing	6	5.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.7(c), it is indicated whether employees at the participating companies communicated their views through their trade union representative directly to management. The results show that in 6.7% of the companies (8), the employees do not communicate their views through the trade union representative at all, while in 12.5% of the companies (15), employees communicated their views to a small extent through the trade union representative. In 17.5% of the companies (21), employees communicated their views to some extent through the trade union representative, while in 22.5% of the companies (27), they communicated their views to a great extent through the trade union representative and in 35.8% of the companies (43), they communicated their views to a very great extent through the trade union representative.

The findings indicate that the majority of employees (88.3%) communicated their views through the trade union representatives in the companies. Again this finding is similar to the finding in question 5(c) (page 108), where 70.9% of the companies indicated that they communicate to their employees through their trade union representative. Six companies did not answer the question.

Table 5.7(d): Methods used by employees to communicate their views: Through works councils

Communicating through works councils	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	49	40.8	45.0	45.0
To a small extent	7	5.8	6.4	51.4
To some extent	14	11.7	12.8	64.2
To a great extent	16	13.3	14.7	68.9
To a very great extent	23	19.2	21.1	100.0
Total	109	90.8	100.0	
Missing	11	9.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.7(d), it is indicated whether employees at the participating companies communicated their views through works councils directly to management. The results show that in 40.8% of the companies (49), employees did not communicate their views through works council at all, while 5.8% of the companies (7) indicated that their employees communicated their views to a small extent through a works council. In 11.7% of the companies (14), employees communicated their views to some extent through works councils, in 13.3% of the companies (16), they communicated their views to a great extent through works councils, and in the case of 19.2% of the respondents (23), they communicated their views to a very great extent through works councils. The findings show that 49.8% of the employees communicated their views from a small extent to a very great extent through works councils to management. However, 40.8% of the employees did not follow this route. It would thus appear that, at the time of the research, the employees were divided on this matter. Eleven companies did not answer the question. It would thus appear that the use of this method to communicate to management is not very popular with the employees. This finding is similar to the finding in question 5(d) (page 109) where 54.2% of the companies indicated that they used works councils to communicate with their staff.

Table 5.7(e): Methods used by employees to communicate their views: Through regular workforce meetings

Communicating through regular workforce meetings	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	16	13.3	14.3	14.3
To a small extent	15	12.5	13.4	27.7
To some extent	27	22.5	24.1	51.8
To a great extent	22	18.3	19.6	71.4
To a very great extent	32	26.7	28.6	100.0
Total	112	93.3	100.0	
Missing	8	6.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.7(e), it is indicated whether employees at the participating companies communicated their views to management through regular workforce meetings. The results indicate that in 13.3% of the companies (16), employees did not communicate their views at all through regular workforce meetings to management, while in 12.5% of the companies (15), the employees communicated their views to a small extent through regular workforce

meetings. In 22.5% of the companies (27), the employees communicated their views to some extent through regular workforce meetings. In 18.3% of the companies (22), employees communicated their views to a great extent to management through regular workforce meetings, and in 26.7% of the companies (32), employees communicated their views to a very great extent to management through regular workforce meetings. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the majority of employees at participating companies (80%) communicated their views through regular workforce meetings to management. Thus, this appears a popular method to use by the employees to communicate their views. Eight companies did not answer this question. This finding is similar to the finding in question 5(e) (page 109) where 83.3% of the companies indicated that they communicated their views to their employees through regular workforce meetings.

Table 5.7 (f): Methods used by employees to communicate their views: Through team briefings

Communicating through team briefings	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	23	19.2	21.1	21.1
To a small extent	11	9.2	10.1	31.2
To some extent	26	21.7	23.9	55.0
To a great extent	22	18.3	20.2	75.2
To a very great extent	27	22.5	24.8	100.0
Total	109	90.8	100.0	
Missing	11	9.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.7(f), it is indicated whether employees at the participating companies communicated their views through team briefings. The results show that in 19.2% of the companies (23), employees did not communicate their views at all through team briefings, while in 9.2% of the companies (11), employees communicated their views to a small extent through team briefings. In 21.7% of the companies (26), the employees communicated their views to some extent through team briefings, while in 18.3% of the companies (22), they communicated their views to a great extent through team briefings, and in 22.5% of the companies (27), they communicated their views to a very great extent through team briefings. The findings show that the majority of employees (71.7%) communicated their views through team briefings to management. Eleven companies did not answer the question. As was the case with the previous question, this method appears to be very popular with the employees. This finding is very similar in line with the findings in question 5(f) (page 110) where 81,7% of the companies communicated to their employees through team briefings.

Table 5.7(g): Methods used by employees to communicate their views: Through suggestion schemes

Communicating through suggestion schemes	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	50	41.7	45.5	45.5
To a small extent	18	15.0	16.4	61.8
To some extent	19	15.8	17.3	79.1
To a great extent	4	3.3	3.6	82.7
To a very great extent	19	15.8	17.3	100.0

Communicating through suggestion schemes	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Total	110	91.7	100.0	
Missing	10	8.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.7(g), it is indicated whether employees at the participating companies communicated their views through suggestion schemes. The results show that in 41.7% of the companies (50), employees did not communicate their views through suggestion schemes at all, while in 15.0% of the companies (18), they communicated their views to a small extent through suggestion schemes. In 15.8% of the companies (19), they communicated their views to some extent through suggestion schemes while, in 3.3% of the companies (4), they communicated their views to a great extent through suggestion schemes, and in 15.8% of the companies (19), they communicated their views to a very great extent through suggestion schemes. The findings show that, at the time of the research 49.7% of employees at participating companies communicated their views through suggestion schemes to management. Ten companies did not answer the question. It would thus appear that, at the time of the research, only about 50% of the respondents made use of this method which does not seem to be a very popular method of communication.

Table 5.7(h): Methods used by employees to communicate their views: Through employee attitude surveys

Communicating through employee attitude surveys	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	47	39.2	42.7	42.7
To a small extent	19	15.8	17.3	60.0
To some extent	16	13.3	14.5	74.5
To a great extent	10	8.3	9.1	83.6
To a very great extent	18	15.0	16.4	100.0
Total	110	91.7	100.0	
Missing	10	8.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.7(h), it is indicated whether employees at the participating companies communicated their views through employee attitude surveys. The results show that in 39.2% of the companies (47), the employees did not communicate their views at all through employee attitude surveys, while in 15.8% of the companies (19), employees communicated their views to a small extent through employee attitude surveys. In the case 13.3% of the companies (16), employees communicated their views to some extent through employee attitude surveys, while in 8.3% of the companies (10), they communicated their views to a great extent through employee attitude surveys, and in 15.0% of participating companies (18), employees communicated their views to a very great extent through employee attitude surveys. The findings show that, at the time of the research, the majority of employees at the participating companies (52.3%) communicated their views through employee attitude surveys from a small to a very great extent to management. This is a very low percentage as employee surveys are popular methods used by organisations to gauge the employees' perception on various aspects. Perhaps employees are not happy to complete these surveys fearing possible

retribution from the company, although these surveys are normally done anonymously. Ten companies did not answer the question.

Table 5.7 (i): Methods used by employees to communicate their views: Through electronic communication

Communication through electronic means	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Not at all	24	20.0	21.2	21.2
To a small extent	6	5.0	5.3	26.5
To some extent	18	15.0	15.9	42.5
To a great extent	24	20.0	21.2	63.7
To a very great extent	41	34.2	36.3	100.0
Total	113	94.2	100.0	
Missing	7	5.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 5.7(i), it is indicated whether employees at participating companies communicated their views through electronic means. The results show that in 20.0% of the companies (24), employees did not communicate their views at all through electronic means, while in 5.0% of the companies (6), the employees communicated their views to a small extent through electronic means. In 15.0% of the companies (18), employees communicated their views to some extent through electronic means. In 20.0% of the companies (24), employees communicated their views to a great extent through electronic means, and in 34.2% of the respondents (41), the employees communicated their views to a very great extent through electronic means. The findings show that, at the time of the research, the majority of employees at participating companies (74.2%) communicated their views through electronic means to management. This finding makes sense as all employees nowadays have access to computers within the workplace and it would thus be easy for them to communicate with their managers or supervisors by using this technology. Seven companies did not answer the question. These findings are in line with the findings for question 5(g) (page 110) above.

SECTION VI – ORGANISATIONAL DETAIL

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 1: What is the main sector of industry you operate in?

Table 6.1: The main sector of industry you operate in

Main sector of industry you operate in	n	Per-cent	Valid per-cent	Cumu-lative percent age
A Agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining and quarrying	8	6.7	6.8	6.8
B Manufacture of food, beverages, textiles, wood and paper, coke and refined petroleum, and related products	8	6.7	6.8	13.7
C Manufacture of chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and medicinal chemical products	–	–	–	–
D Manufacture of basic metals and metal products, plastic and other non-metallic products	2	1.7	1.7	15.4
E Manufacture of computer, electronic products electrical equipment	1	0.8	0.9	16.2
F Manufacture of machinery and equipment	2	1.7	1.7	17.9
G Manufacture of transport equipment	2	1.7	1.7	19.7
H Other manufacturing	1	0.8	0.9	20.5
I Electricity, gas, steam, and water supply, waste management	5	4.2	4.3	24.8
J Construction	1	0.8	0.9	25.6
K Wholesale and retail trade	3	2.5	2.6	28.2
L Transportation and storage	1	0.8	0.9	29.1
M Accommodation and food service activities, publishing, broadcasting activities	1	0.8	0.9	29.9
N Telecommunications, IT and other information services	3	2.5	2.6	32.5
O Financial and insurance activities	1	0.8	0.9	33.3
P Accounting, management, architecture, engineering, scientific research, and other administrative and support service activities	5	4.2	4.3	37.6
Q Public administration and compulsory social security	34	28.3	29.1	66.7
R Education	4	3.3	3.4	70.1
S Human health services, residential care, and social work activities	3	2.5	2.6	72.6
T Other industry or services	32	26.7	27.4	100.0
Total	117	97.5	100.0	
Missing	3	2.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.1, it is indicated in which sector of the industry the participating companies operated in. The results show that the largest concentration of respondents (28.3%) can be found in the Public Administration and Compulsory Social Security group (34). The results further show that 26.7% of the respondents (32) – the second largest group – operated in Other Industries and Services. The third largest group consisted of two clusters of respondents (6.7% each). These groups can be found in Agricultural, Hunting, Forestry, Fishing, Mining, and Quarrying (8) and Manufacture of Food, Beverages, Textiles, Wood and Paper, Coke and Refined Petroleum, and Related Products (8). These respondents are followed by smaller groupings

(4.2% each) in areas such as Electricity, Gas, Steam and Water Supply, Waste Management and Accounting, Management, Architecture, Engineering, Scientific Research, and Other Administrative and Support Services Activities (5 companies each), Only 3.3% of the companies (4) can be found in Education, while 2.5% of the companies (3) can be found in Wholesale and Retail Trade, while a further 2.5% of the companies (3) can be found in Telecommunications, IT and Other Information Services and Human Health Services Residential Care and Social Work. Of the companies, 1.7% (2) can be found in the Manufacture of Basic Metals and Metal Products, Plastic and other Non-Metallic Products and Manufacture of Machinery and Other Equipments respectively. In the other instances, the findings indicate that 1.7% of the companies (2) can be found in the Manufacturing of Transport equipment and, lastly, one (0.8%) company each can be found in the following groups: manufacture of computers, electronic products, electrical equipment, other manufacturing, construction, transportation and storage, accommodation and food service activities, publishing, broadcasting activities, financial and insurance activities. The findings indicate that the companies were fairly well distributed over all the sectors of the economy.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 2(a): In which sector is your company?

Table 6.2: In which sector is your company?

In which sector is your company?	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Private	42	35	35.3	35.5
Public	77	64.2	64.7	100.0
Not for profit	–	–	–	–
Mixed	–	–	–	
Total	119	99.2	100.0	
Missing	1	0.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.2, it is indicated in which sector the participating companies operated in. The results show that 64.2% of the companies (77) operated in the public sector, while 35.3% of the companies (42) operated in the private sector. At the time of the research, no company indicated that it operated simultaneously in the private, public or non-profit sector. Thus, the majority of the companies participating in the survey operated in one sector, namely the public sector. One company did not answer this question.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 2(b): If private sector, are you a Public Limited Corporation (PLC) (on the stock market)?

Table 6.3: If private sector, are you a public limited corporation (plc)?

If private sector, are you a public limited corporation (plc)?	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	17	14.2	44.7	44.7
Yes	21	17.5	55.3	100.0
Total	38	31.7	100.0	–
Missing	82	68.3	–	
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 6.3, it is indicated whether the company was a public limited corporation (plc). The results show that 17.5% of the respondents (21) said 'Yes', while 14.2% of the respondents (17) said 'No'. As this question only focussed on the characteristics of private sector organisations, those in the Public Sector did not answer this question. The majority of companies in the private sector category thus operated as public limited corporations (plc) at the time of the research.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 2(c): If public sector, are you?

Table 6.4: If public sector, are you?

If public sector, are you?	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
National	11	9.2	14.3	14.3
Regional	19	15.8	24.7	39.0
Local	47	39.2	61.0	100.0
Total	77	64.2	100.0	
Missing	43	35.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.4, the participating companies in the public sector had to indicate at which level they operated. The results indicate that 39.2% of the companies (47) operated at local level, while 15.8% of the companies (19) operated at regional level and 9.2% of the companies (11) operated at national level. Since the question only related to the public sector, 43 companies did not answer the question as they are presumably found in the private sector.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 2(d): Is the business owned and/controlled by primarily one family?

Table 6.5: Business owned and/or controlled primarily by one family

Business owned and/controlled primarily by one family?	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	31	25.8	81.6	81.6
Yes	7	5.8	18.4	100.0
Total	38	31.7	100.0	
Not applicable	73	60.8		
Missing	9	7.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.5, it is indicated whether the business where the participants worked was owned and/or controlled primarily by one family. The results show that 25.8% of the respondents (31) answered 'No', while 5.8% of the respondents (7) answered 'Yes'. In the case of the private sector, only a minority of the companies participating in the survey were primarily controlled by one family. Nine companies did not answer this question.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 2(e): If yes, Is the family actively involved in the management?

Table 6.6: If yes, is the family actively involved in the management?

If yes, is the family actively involved in the management?	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	2	1.7	28.6	28.6
Yes	5	4.2	71.4	100.0
Total	7	5.8	100.0	
Missing	113	94.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.6, it is indicated whether the family was actively involved in the management of the business. The results show that 1.7% of the respondents (2) answered 'No', while 4.2% of the respondents (5) answered 'Yes'. In the case of family-owned businesses, the majority were actively involved in the management of their businesses. Of the participating companies, 113 did not answer the question as they presumably did not fall within this category.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 3: What percentage of the operating costs is accounted for by labour cost?

In this question, the companies had to indicate which percentage of their operating costs is for labour costs. The results show that in the case of 14 companies, these costs were between 1 and 16%; in 53 companies, between 20 and 50%, and in 29 companies, between 51 and 94%. A total of 96 companies did not answer this question, which is disappointing. The reason for this low response could well be that they did not have the information readily available. Thus the absence of a management information system (MIS). Therefore, in the majority of companies that answered this question, the labour costs were between 20 and 50%, which is in line with the international norm of between 40 and 50% (Cheshire & Hay, 2017).

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 4: if you are a private sector organisation, would you say the gross revenue over the past 3 years has been

Table 6.7: Gross revenue over the past three years

Gross revenue over the previous three years	n	Percentage	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
A Insufficient to cover costs	4	3.3	11.4	11.4
B Enough to break even	7	5.8	20.0	31.4
C Sufficient to make a small profit	19	15.8	54.3	85.7
D Well in excess of costs	5	4.2	14.3	100.0
E So low as to produce large losses	–	–	–	–
Total	35	29.2	100.0	
Missing	85	70.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.7, it is reflected how respondents indicated the movement of their gross revenue over the previous three years. According to 15.8% of the respondents (19), the gross revenue was sufficient to make a small profit, for 5.8% of the respondents (7), it was enough to break even, while for 4.2% of the respondents (5), it was well in excess of costs. However, for 3.3% of the companies (4), the gross revenue was insufficient to cover costs. A total of 85 companies did not answer this question as they did not fall within the private sector group. From the findings it is therefore clear that, at the time of the research, the majority of companies were able to make a profit in the previous three years.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 5: Compared to other organisations in your sector, how would you rate the performance of your organisation in relation to the following?

Table 6.8: Performance of the company compared with other companies in their sector

Performance of the company compared with other companies in their sector		Poor or at the low end of the indus-try	Below ave-rage	Ave-rage or equal to the compe-tition	Better than ave-rage	Supe-rior	Missing
A Service quality	%	2.5	3.3	21.7	35.8	25.8	1
Number of companies	N	3	4	26	43	31	
B Level of productivity	%	0.8	6.7	30.0	26.7	18.3	7
Number of companies	N	1	8	36	32	22	
C Profitability	%	0	5.8	18.3	21.7	9.2	41
Number of companies	N	0	7	22	26	11	
D Rate of innovation	%	0.8	7.5	26.7	23.3	10.8	21
Number of companies	N	1	9	32	28	13	
E Stock market performance	%	0.8	4.2	5.8	10.0	6.7	67
Number of companies	N	1	5	7	12	8	
F Environmental matters	%	1.7	4.2	33.3	24.2	14.2	11
Number of companies	N	2	5	40	29	17	

In Table 6.8, it is reflected how respondents compared their performance with that of other companies in their sector on a number of issues. It appeared that, for service quality, the majority of companies (74) rated themselves as better than average or superior. As far as the level of productivity is concerned, 54 companies rated themselves as better than average or superior while for the aspect of profitability, 37 companies rated themselves as better than average or superior. Regarding the innovation concept, 41 companies rated themselves as better than average or superior. In terms of the stock market, 20 companies rated themselves as better than average or superior. As far as the environmental matters were concerned, 46 companies rated themselves as better than average or superior. From the findings it would appear that the companies found themselves the strongest in the area of service quality, followed by-the level of productivity, environmental matters, rate of innovation, profitability and lastly, stock market performance.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 6: How would you describe the main market(s) for your organisation's products or services?

Table 6.9: Main market(s) for products or services

Main markets for products or services	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Local	51	42.5	44.7	44.7
Regional	17	14.2	14.9	59.6
National	25	20.8	21.9	81.6
Continent-wide	9	7.5	7.9	89.5
Worldwide	12	10.0	10.5	100.0
Total	114	95.0	100.0	
Missing	6	5.0		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.9, it is indicated where the main markets for the products or services of participating companies were. The results show that –

- for 42.5% of the respondents (51), their markets were local;
- for 14.2% of the respondents (17), markets were regional;
- for a further 20.8% of the respondents (25), markets were national;
- for 7.5% of the respondents (9), markets were continent-wide; and
- for 10.0% of the respondents (12), markets were worldwide.

The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the markets were fairly well distributed over the different regions. Six companies did not answer this question.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 7: Is the market you currently serve?

Table 6.10: Characteristics of the market you currently serve

Characteristics of the market you currently serve	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Declining to a great extent	4	3.3	4.0	4.0
Declining to an extent	5	4.2	5.1	9.1
Not changing	24	20.0	24.2	33.3
Growing to an extent	31	25.8	31.3	64.6
Growing to a great extent	35	29.2	35.4	100.0
Total	99	82.5	100.0	
Missing	21	17.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.10, the characteristics of the markets of the participating companies were serving at the time of the research, are indicated. The results show that –

- for 3.3% of the respondents (4), the markets were declining to a great extent;
- for 4.2% of the respondents (5), the markets were declining to an extent;
- for 20.0% of the respondents (24), the markets were not changing at all;
- for 25.8% of the respondents (31), the markets were growing to an extent; and
- for 29.2% of the respondents (35), the markets were growing to a great extent.

The findings therefore indicate that, at the time of the research, the companies were doing well, with 55% (66) experiencing growth to a great extent. A total of 21 companies did not answer this question which is understandable as they were probably mostly in the public sector.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 8: Has your organisation been involved in any of the following changes in the last 3 years?

Table 6.11: Changes in the company in the last three years

Changes in company in the last three years		Yes	No	Missing
		Valid percentage	Valid percentage	
A Acquisition of another organisation	%	17.5	65.8	20
Number of companies	N	21	79	
B Takeover by another organisation	%	11.7	70.8	21
Number of companies	N	14	85	
C Merger	%	13.3	70.0	20
Number of companies	N	16	84	
D Relocation	%	13.3	68.3	22
Number of companies	N	16	82	
E Demerger	%	12.5	66.7	25
Number of companies	N	15	80	

In Table 6.11, it is indicated which changes had taken place in the company over the preceding three years. The results show that the main activity was in the area of acquisitions, with 21 companies (17.5%) having gone through this process in the previous three years. This was followed by mergers (16 companies or 13.3%), relocations (16 companies or 13.3%), demergers (15 companies or 12.5%) and takeovers by other organisations (14 companies or 11.7%). An average of 20 companies did not answer the individual categories indicated in the question.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 9: If your answer was "yes" to any of the above (in Q8), when was the personnel/HR department involved in the process?

Table 6.12: Stage at which HR was involved in the changes in the organisation?

Stage at which HR was involved in the changes in the organisation	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumu-lative percentage
Not consulted	9	7.5	15.0	15.0
On implementation	6	5.0	10.0	25.0
Through subsequent consultation	10	8.3	16.7	41.7
From the outset	35	29.2	58.3	100.0
Total	60	50.0	100.0	
Missing	60	50		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.12, it is indicated at which stage HR was involved in the changes taking place within the organisation. The results show that –

- in 7.5% (9), HR was not consulted at all;
- in 5.0% (6), HR was consulted on implementation;
- in 8.3% (10), HR was involved through subsequent consultation, and
- in 29.2% (35), HR was involved from the outset.

When any changes, such as mergers, occur, it is of the utmost importance to have HR involved from the very outset as these kinds of changes have a direct effect as well as impact on the people of the organisation. From the findings, it is clear that, at the time of the research, this was taking place in the majority of companies. This is of vital importance as it can contribute to the smooth functioning of the organisation during the transition period, as well as thereafter. A total of 60 companies did not answer the question as they were most probably in the public sector.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 10(a): Annual staff turnover

Table 6.13: Annual staff turnover

Annual staff turnover	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
10 or fewer	75	39.1	49.0	49.0
11–20	53	27.6	34.6	83.7
21–50	23	12.0	15.0	98.7
51–75	2	1.0	1.3	100.0
Total	153	79.7	100.0	
Missing	39	20.3		
Total	192	100.0		

Table 6.13 indicates the annual staff turnover in the companies participating in the survey. From the data, it would appear that in the largest number of companies 39.1% (75), the turnover was less than 10%. This is an acceptable norm in major international countries such as the United Kingdom, US, China, India, Brazil and Germany where the turnover is between 8-10% (Elkyaer & Filmer, 2015). However, a more serious staff turnover is evident in 53 companies (27.6%), where the rate was between 11 and 20%, and in 23 companies (12%), the rate was between 21 and 50%, lastly, in two companies (1.0%) the rate was between 51 and 75%. Thirty-nine companies did not respond to this question. It would thus appear that in 50.9% of the companies, the turnover rate was unacceptably high – between 11 and 75%. A high turnover rate has a direct negative effect on the functioning of companies.

It is imperative that companies determine the underlying reasons for this considerable turnover, and address the matter as soon as possible. As indicated in question 2(a) above, the majority of companies participating in the survey were from the Public Sector. Thus this finding is worrying as the Public Sector is service driven and disruptions in service delivery can impact negatively on the economy. Perhaps this is the underlying reason for the service delivery strikes within South Africa over the last few years.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 10(b): Average days absent per employee per annum

Table 6.14: Average days absent per employee per annum

Days absent per annum	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
10 or fewer	103	53.6	85.1	85.1
11–20	13	6.8	10.7	95.9
21–35	5	2.6	4.1	100.0
Total	121	63.0	100.0	
Missing	71	37.0		
Total	192	100.0		

Table 6.14 indicated the number of days employees were absent per annum as reported by the participating companies. In the majority of companies 53.6% (103), the days absent per employee were fewer than 10 days per annum, while in 13 companies (6.8%), it was between 11 and 20 days, and in five companies (2.6%), this increased to between 21 and 35 days. What is worrisome, is that 71 companies refrained from answering the question. There could be numerous reasons for this, but it is generally known that many companies do not keep proper records of their employee absenteeism, especially when they do not have a proper HRIS (See Section I, question 10). Although absenteeism is not a serious issue at present, concerns have been expressed about the prevalence of Aids in South Africa and its impact on the work place productivity in the future. Many different statistics on Aids in the country are mentioned by numerous organisations, but according to the United Nations, the Aids figure for sub-Saharan Africa has not decreased, but actually increased (UNAIDS, 2016:8). It is currently estimated that 11% of the adult population in South Africa alone is infected by the virus (Avert, 2016). This situation could have a major effect on workforce productivity in the future.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 11: Percentage of employees 25 years old and under

Table 6.15: Percentage of employees of the age of 25 and under

Workforce of the age of 25 and under	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
0%	4	3.4	3.7	3.7
1–10%	33	27.5	30.6	34.3
11–25%	28	23.3	25.9	60.2
26–50%	27	22.5	25.0	85.2
51–75%	6	5.1	3.9	97.4
76–100%	2	1.7	1.9	100.0
Total	10	90.0	100.0	
Don't know	10	8.3		
Missing	2	1.7		
Total	112	100.0		

Table 6.15 indicates the percentage of companies who had a workforce under the age of 25. From the data it would appear that –

- 4 companies (3.4%) had no employees in this group;
- 33 companies (27.5%) had between 1 and 10% of their workforce in this group;
- 28 companies (23.3%) had between 11 and 25% of their workforce in this group;
- 27 companies (22.5%) had between 26 and 50 of their workforce in this group;
- 6 companies (5.1%) had between 51 and 75%) of their workforce in this group; and
- 2 companies (1.7%) had between 76 and 100% of their workforce in this group.

This is an interesting finding, with the majority of the companies (96 companies or 83.5%) all having various percentages (between 1–100%) of their employees under the age of 25. This is an important finding from a career management perspective where the company can assist these employees to build a career within the organisation and secure proper succession planning for the future. Two companies did not answer this question.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 12: What is the proportion of employees 50 years old and above?

Table 6.16: Percentage of the workforce 50 years old and above

Workforce 50 years old and above	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
0%	1	0.8	0.9	0.9
1–10%	30	25.0	27.0	27.9
11–25%	39	32.5	35.1	63.1
26–50%	32	26.7	26.8	91.9
51–75%	8	6.7	7.2	99.1
76–100%	1	0.8	0.9	100.0
Total	111	92.5	100.0	
Don't know	7	5.8		
Missing	2	1.7		
Total	120	100.0		

Table 6.16 indicates the percentage of the companies whose workforce was over the age of 50. From the data it would appear that –

- only one company (0.8%) had no employees who were 50 years and older;
- 30 companies (25.0%) had between 1 and 10% of their workforce in this age category;
- 39 companies (32.5%) had between 11 and 25% of their workforce in this group;
- 32 companies (26.7%) had between 26 and 50% of their workforce in this age group;
- 8 companies (6.7%) had between 51 and 75% of their workforce in this group, while
- only 1 company (0.8%) had between 76 and 100% of their workforce in this age group.

From the above it is clear that all participating companies had some percentage of their employees in this age group at the time of the research. This places a big responsibility on companies to do proper career planning with a view of replacing these employees when they retire. They (the employees) can play an important role in mentorship programmes to develop the skills of the younger employees before they retire from the organisation. In many organisations this is also a policy decision taken by the HR Department.

Section VI (Organisational details) Question 13: What is the proportion of the workforce with higher education/university qualifications?

Table 6.17: Workforce with higher education/university qualifications

Workforce with higher education/university qualifications	n	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
0%	1	0.8	1.0	1.0
1–10%	17	14.2	16.3	17.3
11–25%	25	20.8	24.0	41.3
26–50%	27	22.5	26.0	67.3
51–75%	21	17.5	20.2	87.5
76–100%	13	10.8	12.5	100.0
Total	104	86.7	100.0	
Don't know	12	10.0		
Missing	4	3.3		
Total	120	100.0		

Table 6.17 indicates the percentage of the workforce of the participating companies with higher education or university qualifications. From the findings it appears that –

- only 1 company (0.8%) had no employees with a university qualification;
- 17 companies (14.2%) had between 1 and 10% of their workforce with a university qualification;
- 25 companies (20.8%) had between 11 and 25% of their workforce with a university qualification;
- 27 companies (22.5%) had between 26 and 50% of their workforce with such a qualification;
- 21 companies (17.5%) had between 51 and 75% of their employees with such a qualification; and
- 13 companies (10.8%) had between 76 and 100% of their employees with such a qualification.

From the findings, it appears that the companies had a fairly well-qualified workforce, which should be their advantage as they can be seen as knowledgeable organisations.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 14: In which country is the corporate headquarters of your organisation based?

Table 6.18: Country where company headquarters is based

Company headquarters	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Other	13	10.8	10.8	10.8
Canada	2	1.7	1.7	12.5
France	1	0.8	0.8	13.3
Japan	1	0.8	0.8	14.2
Portugal	1	0.8	0.8	15.0
South Africa	99	82.5	82.5	97.5

Company headquarters	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Switzerland	2	1.7	1.7	99.2
USA	1	0.8	0.8	100.0
Total	120	100.0	100.0	

In Table 6.18, it is indicated where the companies headquarters were situated. The results show clearly that the majority of companies (82.5%) had their headquarters in South Africa (99), followed by with 13 companies (10.8%) indicating 'other'. Two of the companies (1.7%) indicated that their headquarters were in Canada and Switzerland respectively, while one each indicated that their headquarters were in France, Japan, Portugal and the USA (0.8% each). The findings are not surprising, seeing that the majority of companies who participated found themselves in the public sector group, and they were therefore locally based, while the remainder of the group was in the private sector, i.e. locally and internationally based companies. All 120 companies answered the question.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 15: When was your organisation established?

From the results, it is clear that 3 of the participating companies had been established before 1900, between 1900 and 1950 only 9 had been established, between 1951 and 1990 a further 11 had been established, and since 1991, 43 had been established. The findings thus indicate that the majority of companies were established after 1991 and are thus relatively young. It is important to remember that since 1994, many new public organisations were created to satisfy the needs of the community within South Africa and it is presumed that they are included here. Some of these organisations are well established and should have proper HR policies in place, but those that were established more recently might not have these HR practices in place. This tendency can perhaps be related to the democratisation of South Africa in 1994, which resulted in the dropping of sanctions resulting in more business opportunities that became available, and simultaneously changes to legislation pertaining to doing business in South Africa.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 16: Is your organisation (or part that you are answering for):

Table 6.19: Is your organisation (or part that you are answering for?)

Is your organisation (or part that you are answering for?)	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
A Corporate headquarters (HQ) of an international organisation	5	4.2	5.2	5.2
B Corporate HQ of a national organisation	29	24.2	29.9	35.1
C Subsidiary of an international organisation	6	5.0	6.2	41.2
D Subsidiary of a national organisation	23	19.2	23.7	64.9
E Independent organisation with more than one site	16	13.3	16.5	81.4

Is your organisation (or part that you are answering for?)	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
F Independent organisation with a single site	18	15.0	18.6	100.0
Total	97	80.8	100.0	
Missing	23	19.2		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.19, it is indicated whether the organisation was part of a national, international or a single-site independent organisation. The results show that –

- 5 companies (4.2%) were part of a corporate HQ of an international organisation;
- 29 companies (24.2%) were part of a corporate HQ of a national organisation;
- 6 companies (5.0%) were part of the subsidiary of an international organisation;
- 23 companies (19.2%) were part of the subsidiary of a national organisation'
- 16 companies (13.3%) were part of an independent organisation with more than one site; and
- 18 companies (15.0%) were part of an independent organisation with a single site.

A total of 97 organisations answered this question, while 23 did not respond. The results indicate an interesting mixture of companies participating in the survey with the focus being on "Corporate HQ of a national organisation" and being a subsidiary of a national organisation.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 17(a): If your organisation is part of a larger group of companies/divisions (including public sector), please indicate where policies on the following issues are mainly determined.

Table 6.20: Level of pay and benefits policies determined

Level of pay and benefits policies determined	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
International HQ	5	4.2	9.6	9.6
National HQ	35	29.2	67.3	76.9
Subsidiary/Dept.	12	10.0	23.1	100.0
Site/Establishment	–	–	–	–
Total	52	43.3	100.0	
Missing	68	56.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.20, it is indicated at which level the company's policies relating to pay and benefits were determined. The results show that in 5 companies (4.2%) this took place at the international HQ level; in 35 companies (29.2%), this happened at the national HQ level, while in 12 companies (10.0%), this happened at the subsidiary or department level. The findings indicate that in most of the companies (29.2%), policies were determined at national HQ level. This finding makes sense, as compensation policies are usually compiled by the HQ of companies. A total of 68 companies did not answer the question. One reason for this high figure could be the organisations classified as Public Organisations where the HRD policies are determined by a central body known as the Public Service Commission (PSC) which is an independent body which was not one of the options provided to the respondents.

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 17(b): If your organisation is part of a larger group of companies/divisions (including public sector), please indicate where policies on the following issues are mainly determined:

Table 6.21: Level at which recruitment and selection policies are determined

Level at which recruitment and selection policies are determined	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
International HQ	3	2.5	5.8	5.8
National HQ	22	18.3	42.3	48.1
Subsidiary/Dept.	25	20.8	48.1	96.2
Site/Establishment	2	1.7	3.8	100.0
Total	52	43.3	100.0	
Missing	68	56.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.21, it is indicated at which level participating companies' policies relating to recruitment and selection were determined. The results show that –

- in 3 companies (2.5%), this happened at the international HQ level;
- in 22 companies (18.3%), this happened at the national HQ level;
- in 25 companies (20.0%), this took place at the subsidiary or department level; and
- in only 2 companies (1.7%), the process took place at the site or establishment level.

The findings indicate that at the time of the research, policies relating to recruitment and selection were mostly determined at national HQ and subsidiary or department level. A total of 68 companies did not answer the question (see earlier remark in this regard).

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 17(c): If your organisation is part of a larger group of companies/divisions (including public sector), please indicate where policies on the following issues are mainly determined:

Table 6.22: Level at which training and development policies are determined

Level at which training and development policies are determined	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
International HQ	2	1.7	3.8	3.8
National HQ	26	21.7	50.0	53.8
Subsidiary/Dept.	21	17.5	40.4	94.2
Site/Establishment	3	2.5	5.8	100.0
Total	52	43.3	100.0	
Missing	68	56.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.22, it is indicated at which level the participating companies' policies relating to training and development were determined. The results show that in 2 companies (1.7%), the process took place at international HQ level; in 26 companies (21.7%), it took place at national HQ level; in 21 companies (17.5%), it happened at the subsidiary or department level; and in

only 3 companies (2.5%), it took place at the site or establishment level. This makes sense as the managers close to employees will know what is required at subsidiary or department level, while the overall policies for training and development are normally established at the national HQ. The findings indicate that, at the time of the research, the level of policies pertaining to training and development was mostly determined at the national HQ (21.7%) and subsidiary or department level (17.5%). A total of 68 companies did not answer the question (see earlier remark in this regard).

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 17(d): If your organisation is part of a larger group of companies/divisions (including public sector), please indicate where policies on the following issues are mainly determined:

Table 6.23: Level at which industrial relations policies are determined

Level at which industrial relations policies are determined	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
International HQ	2	1.7	3.8	3.8
National HQ	25	20.8	48.1	51.9
Subsidiary/Dept.	24	20.0	46.2	98.1
Site/Establishment	1	0.8	1.9	100.0
Total	52	43.3	100.0	
Missing	68	56.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.23, it is indicated at which level the participating companies' policies relating to industrial relations were determined. The results show that in 2 companies (1.7%), this took place at the international HQ level; in 25 companies (20.8%), this happened at the national HQ level; in 24 companies (20.0%), this happened at the subsidiary or department level, while in 1 company (0.8%), it happened at the site or establishment level. From the findings, it would appear that, at the time of the research, the establishment of industrial relations policies mainly took place at either the national HQ level (20.8%) or at the subsidiary or department level (20.0%). It is important that the national HQ has an overall policy in this regard, while the subsidiary or department has a more hands-on approach. A total of 68 companies did not answer this question (see earlier remark in this regard).

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 17(e): If your organisation is part of a larger group of companies/divisions (including public sector), please indicate where policies on the following issues are mainly determined:

Table 6.24: Level at which workforce expansion or reduction policies are determined

Level at which workforce expansion or reduction policies determined	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
International HQ	4	3.3	7.7	7.7
National HQ	22	18.3	42.3	50.0
Subsidiary/Dept.	23	19.2	44.2	94.2
Site/Establishment	3	2.5	5.8	100.0

Level at which workforce expansion or reduction policies determined	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Total	52	43.3	100.0	
Missing	68	56.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.24, it is indicated at which level the participating companies' policies relating to workforce expansion or reduction were determined. The results show that –

- in 4 companies (3.3%), it took place at the international HQ level;
- in 22 companies (18.3%), it happened at the national HQ level;
- in 23 companies (19.2%), it took place at the subsidiary or department level;
- in 3 companies (2.5%), it happened at the site or establishment level.

The findings indicate that, in terms of the level of workforce expansion or reduction, policy was mainly determined at the national HQ (18.3%) or at the subsidiary or department level (19.2%). A total of 68 companies did not answer the question (Please see earlier remark in this regard).

Section VI (Organisational details) – Question 17(f): If your organisation is part of a larger group of companies/divisions (including public sector), please indicate where policies on the following issues are mainly determined:

Table 6.25: Level at which management development policies are determined

Level at which management development policies are determined	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
International HQ	3	2.5	5.9	5.9
National HQ	26	21.7	51.0	56.9
Subsidiary/Dept.	21	17.5	41.2	98.0
Site/Establishment	1	0.8	2.0	100.0
Total	51	42.5	100.0	
Missing	69	57.5		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 6.25, it is indicated at which level participating companies' policies relating to management development were determined. The results show that –

- in 3 companies (2.5%), this took place at the international HQ level;
- in 26 companies (21.7%), this happened at the national HQ level.
- in 21 companies (17.5%), this took place at the subsidiary or department level; and
- in 1 company (0.8%), this took place at the site or establishment level.

As was the case with the previous two findings, the national HQ (21.7%) and the subsidiary or department (17.5%) were mainly involved with the development of policies relating to the management development in the organisation. This makes sense, as the national HQ would design the overall framework, while the subsidiary or department would develop the specific details needed in this regard. A total of 69 companies did not answer this question (please see earlier remark in this regard).

GENERAL – PERSONAL DETAILS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Section VII (Personal details) – Question 1: Do you work in the HR department of your organisation?

Table 7.1: Work in the HR department of the organisation

Work in the HR department	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	4	3.3	3.4	3.4
Yes	115	95.8	96.6	100.0
Total	119	99.2	100.0	
Missing	1	0.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In Table 7.1, it is indicated whether the respondents worked in the HR department of the organisation. The results indicate that the majority of the respondents (115) (95.8%) worked in the HR department of their organisation. Only a very small percentage (3.3%) (4 respondents) indicated that they did not work in the HR department of the organisation. The results thus indicate that the majority of the people who completed the questionnaire worked within the HR department. They should thus be well versed in the HR policies and practices and be in a good position to complete the questionnaire. Only one respondent did not answer the question.

Section VII (Personal details) – Question 2: If you are working in the HR department, how long have you been working as a specialist personnel/HR?

The results indicate that the average number of years the respondents have been working as a specialist personnel practitioner/HR manager are 12.5 years. The respondents can thus be seen as mature employees in the HR field, and can thus be in a position to successfully answer the questions in the survey.

Section VII (Personal details) – Question (3): Are you the most senior HR manager in the organisation?

Table 7.2: Most senior HR manager in the organisation

Most senior HR manager in the organisation	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	37	30.8	33.6	33.6
Yes	73	60.8	66.4	100.0
Total	110	91.7	100.0	
Missing	10	8.3		
Total	120	100.0		

In table 7.2, it is indicated whether the respondents were the most senior HR managers in their organisations. The results clearly show that in 30.8% (37 respondents) were not the most senior HR managers in their companies, while in 60.8% (73 respondents), they were. Thus, in the majority of cases, the most senior HR manager in the organisations completed the questionnaire, which would contribute to the reliability of the information provided. Ten respondents did not answer the question.

Section VII (Personal details) – Question (4): Are you male or female?

Table 7.3: Male or female

Male or female	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Male	44	36.7	37.0	37.0
Female	75	62.5	63	100.0
Total	119	99.2	100.0	
Missing	1	0.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In table 7.3, it is indicated whether the respondents were male or female. The results show that 36.7% were male (44), and 62.5% were female (75). Taking the results into account for the previous question, it would appear that the majority of the positions in the HR department are occupied by females. This finding is very interesting as the movement of the females to senior positions within organisations in South Africa are still problematic (Botha, 2017: 15).

Section VII (Personal details) – Question (5): How long have you been working in an HR specialist job?

It would appear from the results that the average number of years that the respondents have been working in an HR specialist job is 9.2 years. The respondents can thus be seen as fairly matured as far as their knowledge of HR matters in the organisation is concerned. They would thus be in a good position to complete the questionnaire.

Section VII (Personal details) – Question (6)(a): Do you have a university degree?

Table 7.4: University degree

University degree	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
No	29	24.2	24.6	24.6
Yes	89	74.2	75.4	100.0
Total	118	98.3	100.0	
Missing	2	1.7		
Total	120	100.0		

In table 7.4, it is indicated whether the respondents are in possession of a university degree. The results indicate that 29 respondents (24.2%) do not have a university degree, while 89 respondents (74.2%) do have a university degree. Hence, the majority of HR managers who completed the questionnaire have university degrees. Two respondents did not answer the question.

Section VII (Personal details) – Question (6)(b): What is your main academic field of study?

Table 7.5: Main academic field of study

Main academic field studied	n	Percentage	Valid percentage	Cumulative percentage
Business studies	38	31.7	42.7	42.7
Economics	1	0.8	1.1	43.8
Social or behavioural sciences	26	21.7	29.2	73.0
Humanities/art/languages	13	10.8	14.6	87.6
Law	4	3.3	4.5	92.1
Engineering	-	-	-	-
Natural sciences	1	0.8	1.1	93.3
Other	6	5.0	6.7	100.0
Total	89	74.2	100.0	
Missing	31	25.8		
Total	120	100.0		

In table 7.5, the main academic field of study in which the respondents obtained their qualifications are indicated. The results show that 31.7% (38 respondents) obtained a degree in Business Studies; 0.8% (1 respondent) in Economics; 21.7% (26 respondents) in Social/Behavioural Sciences; 10.8% (13 respondents) in Humanities/Languages; 3.3% (4 respondents) in Law; and 0.8% (1 respondent) in the Natural Sciences. While 5% (6 respondents) had degrees in other disciplines. The results clearly show that the most popular area of study for HR specialists is Business Studies followed by Social/Behaviour Sciences. This is understandable as it is related to the people component of organisations. Thirty one respondents did not answer the question.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no doubt that dramatic changes in both the external and internal environment of companies during the past few decades (i.e. 1994–present) in South Africa have resulted in HR managers being faced with new and important challenges. Externally, the pace of economic change continues to accelerate, while internally, there is a growing resistance among employees to the role of authority, and a desire on their part for more meaningful participation in the decision-making process. In this situation, increasing pressure is being exerted on HR managers in South Africa to make a more significant contribution to the success of their companies. Hence, a variety of attempts to achieve this objective have been made in recent times. Unfortunately, these efforts have had no more than marginal success (Word Economic Forum, 2017).

The question is, how can companies in South Africa deal with the complexity, speed and magnitude of these changes and still create and achieve a competitive advantage? The answer to this question lies in the HRM practices of companies and organisations. The purpose of the survey leading to this report was to establish to what extent HR practices are being applied in companies and organisations in South Africa. A summary of the findings relating to the individual sections of the questionnaire is discussed below.

Results of the findings in section I of the questionnaire (HRM activity in the organisation)

	SECTION I – Questions and findings
Question 1	**Question 1** ***Approximately, how many people are employed (on the payroll) by your organisation?*** **Findings** From the results, it would appear that the largest number of participating companies (61) had between 251 and 999 employees (50.8%), followed by 31 companies with 1 000+ (25.8%) employees and lastly, 26 companies had up to 250 employees (21.7%). **Question 1(a)** ***Total number of male employees*** **Findings** Fewer participating companies (46) had smaller numbers of males (up to 250) compared to females (61). However, where companies had between 251–999 males, these represented 36.7% of the companies, while in the case of females, these represented 26.7% of the companies. In the case of 1000 plus males, these represented 12.5% of the companies while in the case of females these represented 10% of these companies. **Question 1(b)** ***Total number of female employees*** **Findings** More companies who participated in the survey (61), compared to 46 companies in the case of males have up to 250 female employees. However, in the case of females between 251–999, more companies (44) have male employees than female employees (32). In the case of 1000 and more female employees less companies (12, 10%) have female employees, than companies with male employees (15, 12% of companies).
Question 2	**Question 2(a)** ***Percentage of managers in the workplace*** **Findings** From the findings, it seems that company structures are flatter (thus less levels of managers) as fewer people are appointed in managerial positions. **Question 2(b)** ***Percentage of professionals without managerial responsibility in the workplace*** **Findings** Professional staff without managerial responsibilities seemed to be limited amongst the participating companies. **Question 2(c)** ***Percentage of Clericals and/or Manuals*** **Findings** From the findings it is clear that the number of clericals/manual employees employed by the participating companies in this project differs widely. This can be attributed to perhaps the different nature of the organisations participating in the survey where some have a larger need for lower level employees than others.

SECTION I – Questions and findings	
Question 3 (a and b)	**Question 3(a)** ***Do you have an HR department?*** ***Yes*** ***No*** **Findings** The results indicate that 3.3% of participating companies (4) did not have an HR department, while 95.8% of the companies (115) had an HR department. **Question 3(b) Total number of staff employed by the HR department** **Findings** Most organisations (68.3%) employed 20 or fewer employees in HR. **Question 3b (1)** ***Total number of males employed in the HR department*** **Findings** Males were fairly well represented in the HR departments (96 companies had 20 or fewer). **Question 3b (2)** ***Total number of females employed in the HR department*** **Findings** The participating companies had slightly more females than males in their HR Departments.
Question 4	**Question 4** ***Does the person responsible for HR have a place on the board or equivalent top executive team?*** ***Yes*** ***No*** **Findings** The results indicate that in 46.7% of the companies (56), the person(s) responsible for HR issues did not have seat on the board of the company, while in the case of 50.8% of the companies (61), they did have a seat.
Question 5	**Question 5** ***Where was the person responsible for HR recruited?*** ***A From within the personnel/HR department*** ***B From non-personnel/HR specialists in your organisation*** ***C From personnel/HR specialists outside the organisation*** ***D From nonpersonnel/HR specialists outside the organisation*** **Findings** The results show that in 41.7% of the companies (50), the HR person was recruited from within the HR department, while in 30.0% of the companies (36), the recruitment occurred from HR specialists from outside the company. In only a small group of companies (11) or 9.2% of the companies, the recruitment occurred from non-HR specialists from outside the organisation, and in 12 companies (10.0%), the recruitment was from a non-HR specialist within the company.
Question 6	**Question 6(a)** ***Does your organisation have a:*** ***A Mission statement?*** ***B Business/service strategy?*** ***C Personnel/HRM strategy?*** ***D HR recruitment strategy?*** ***E HR training & development strategy?*** ***F Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) statement?*** ***G Diversity statement?*** **Findings** **6(A) Mission statement** The results indicate that, of the participating companies, 6.7% (8) did not have a mission statement, while 93.3% of the companies (112) did have a written mission statement. **6(B) Business/Service strategy** Of the participating companies, 20.0% (24) did not have a business or service strategy in place, while 80.0% of the companies (96) did have a written business or service strategy; **6(C) Personnel/HRM strategy** Of the participating companies, 15.8% (19) did not have a written personnel or HRM strategy, while 84.2% of the companies (101) did have a written statement. **6(D) HR recruitment strategy** Of the participating companies, 15.8% (19) did not have written HR recruitment strategy, while 84.2% of the companies (101) did have a written HR recruitment strategy. **6(E) HR training and development strategy** Of the participating companies, 20.0% (24) did not have a written HR training and development strategy, while 80.0% of the companies (96) did have one. **6(F) Corporate social responsibility (CSR) statement** Of the participating companies, 45.8% (55) had no written CSR statement, while 54.2% of the companies (65) did have a written CSR statement,

6(G) Diversity statement
Of the participating companies, 49.2% (59) they had no diversity statement in place, while 50.8% of the companies (61) had a written diversity statement.

Question 7

Question 7 ***If your organisation has a business/service strategy, at what stage is the person responsible for personnel/HR involved in its development?***

A From the outset
B Through subsequent consultation
C On implementation
D Not consulted
E Not applicable (do not have a business strategy)

Findings
The results indicate that, of the participating companies, 54.2% (65) were involved from the outset, while 18.3% of the companies (22) were involved through subsequent consultation, and 5.0% of the companies (6) were involved during the implementation stage. Only 4.2% of the companies (5) were not consulted at all, and lastly, 5.0% of the companies (6) indicated that this did not apply to them as they did not have a business strategy.

Question 8

Question 8 ***Who has primary responsibility for major policy decisions on the following issues?***

A payroll and benefits
B recruitment and selection
C training and development
D industrial relations
E workforce expansion/reduction

Findings
8(A) Payroll and benefits
The results indicate that in 43 of the participating companies (55.8%), the responsibility rested with the HR department, while in 29 companies (24.2%), it rested with line management. In 27 companies (22.5%), it rested with HR in consultation with line management, and in 13 companies (10.8%), the responsibility rested with line management in consultation with HR. This is a very important finding as the stakeholders are involved in the process, which will help implement the strategy.

8(B) Recruitment and selection
The results show that in 38 of the participating companies (31.7%), the responsibility rested with the HR department, while in 34 companies (28.3%), it rested with HR in consultation with line management. In 25.8% of the companies (31), the responsibility rested with line management in consultation with HR, while in 10.8% of the companies (13), it rested with line management only.

8(C) Training and development
In 42 of the participating companies (35.0%), the responsibility rested with HR in consultation with line management, while in 38 companies (31.7%), it rested with the HR department. In 22.5% of the companies (27), it rested with line management in consultation with HR, while in 8.3% of the companies (10), it rested with line management only. The fact that both line management and HR are responsible for policy decision regarding training and development will make buy-in of the programmes easier.

8(D) Industrial relations
In 43 of the participating companies (35.8%), the responsibility rested with the HR department only, while in 35 companies (29.2%), it rested with HR in consultation with line management. In 15.8% of the companies (19), the responsibility rested with line management in consultation with HR, while in 10.0% of the companies (12), it rested with line management only. The findings are positive as neither line management nor HR was responsible for major policy decisions, consultation appears to take place which will positive impact possible industrial action.

8(E) Workforce expansion/reduction
The results show that in 37 of the participating companies (30.8%), the responsibility rested with the HR department, while in 30 companies (25.0%), it rested with HR in consultation with line management. In 20.0% of the companies (24), the responsibility rested with line management in consultation with HR, while in 15.8% of the companies (19), it rested with line management only. This is positive as it will impact the effective functioning of the organisation.

Question 9

Question 9 ***To what extent do you outsource the following areas to external providers?***

A Payroll
B Pensions
C Benefits
D Training and development
E Workforce outplacement/reduction
F HR information systems
G Recruitment
H Selection
I Processing routine queries from managers/employees (e.g. HR call centre)

Findings
9(A) Payroll
The results show that in 82.5% of the participating companies (99), these activities were not outsourced, while in 8.3% of the companies (10), these activities were outsourced to a small extent, and in a further 1.7%

of the companies (2), they were outsourced to some extent. Only in 1.7% of the companies (2) were these activities outsourced to a great extent, while in 4.2% of the companies (5), they were outsourced completely.

9(B) Pensions
The results are fairly interesting when compared with the previous question on payroll. In the case of pensions, only 50.8% of participating companies (61) had not outsourced this function. In 7.5% of the companies (9), it was outsourced to a small extent, in a further 7.5% of the companies (9), it was outsourced to some extent, in 1.7% of the companies (2), it was outsourced to a great extent, and lastly, in 27.5% of the companies (33), it was outsourced completely.

9(C) Benefits
A pattern similar to that in payroll is evident here, namely with very low outsource active in this regard. This finding is not surprising because benefits are closely related to the payroll of a company. The results indicate that 68.3% of the participating companies (82) did not outsource their benefit activities at all, while 8.3% of the companies (10) outsourced benefits to a small extent; 5.8% of the companies (7) to some extent, 3.3% of the companies (4) to a great extent, and 10.8% of the companies (13) outsourced their benefits completely.

9(D) Training and development
The data indicates that 49% of the participating companies (50) did not at all outsource their training and development activities. However, 15.0% of the companies (18) did so to a small extent, 14.2% of the companies (17) did so to some extent, and 7.5% of the companies (9) did so to a great extent. In only 11.7% of the companies (14) were training and development activities outsourced completely.

9(E) Workforce outplacement/reduction
The results indicate that in 77.5% of the participating companies (93), this activity was not outsourced, while in 7.5% of the companies (9), it was outsourced to a small extent; in 5.0% of the companies (6), it was outsourced to some extent; in 5.0% of the companies (6) it was outsourced to a great extent; and in a further 1.7% of the companies (2), it was outsourced completely.

9(F) HR information systems
The results indicate that 68.3% of the participating companies (82) had not used external providers for this function. Hence, one may assume that they had purchased the system from an outside vendor and then ran it themselves internally. In 10.0% of the companies (12), external providers were used to a small extent, while in 6.7% of the companies (8), they were used to some extent. Only 5.8% of the companies (7) used external providers to a great extent, while 5.8% of the companies (7) used external providers only.

9(G) Recruitment
The results indicate that 75.8% of the participating companies (91) had not used external providers at all. However, 6.7% of the companies (8) used external recruiters to a small extent; 9.2% of the companies (11) used them to some extent, and 4.2% of the companies (5) used them to a great extent. Only 3.3% of the companies (4) used external providers only.

9(H) Selection
The results indicate that 83.3% of the participating companies (100) had not used external providers at all. A total of 5.8% of the companies (7) used external providers to a small extent; 2.5% of the companies (3) utilised them to some extent; and 4.2% of the companies (5) used them to a great extent. Only a further 2.5% of the companies (3) utilised external providers only.

9(I) Processing routine queries from managers/employees (e.g. HR call centre)
The results indicate that 78.3% of the participating companies (94) had not used external providers at all; only 5.8% of the companies (7) used external providers to a small extent; a further 3.3% of the companies (4) used external providers to some extent; and 2.5% of the companies (3) used them to a great extent. Furthermore, 3.3% of the companies (4) used them only.

Question 10

Question 10 ***Do you use the following to deliver HRM activities?***
A Human resource information system (HRIS) or electronic HRM system?
B Manager self-service
C Employee self-service

Findings
10(A) Human resource information system (HRIS) or electronic HRM system
The results show that 29.2% of the participating companies (35) did not use an HR information system to deliver HRM activities in their organisations, while 70.8% of the companies (85) did use an HR information system to deliver HRM activities in their organisation.

10(B) Manager self-service
The results show that 68.3% of the participating companies (82) did not use manager self-service to deliver HRM activities, while 31.7% of the companies (38) did make use of manager self-service to deliver HRM activities.

10(C) Employee self-service
The results show that 66.7% of the participating companies (80) did not use an employee self-service system to deliver HRM activities in their organisation, while 33.3% of the companies (40) did use such system.

SECTION I – Questions and findings	
Question 11	**Question 11** ***To what extent is the performance of the personnel/human resources function/department evaluated?*** ***Not at all*** ***To a small extent*** ***To some extent*** ***To a great extent*** ***To a very great extent*** **Findings** The results indicate that in 2.5% of the participating companies (3) this did not happen at all, while in 3.3% of the companies (4), it took place to a small extent; in 27.5% of the companies (33) it took place to some extent, and in 26.7% of the companies (32) it took place to a great extent. Only in 39.2% of the companies (47) did it happen to a very great extent.

Results of the findings in section II of the questionnaire (Resourcing practices)

SECTION II – Questions and findings	
Question 1	**Question 1** ***How has the total number of employees (full-time equivalents) in your organisation changed in the last three years?*** ***Decreased to a great extent*** ***Decreased to some extent*** ***Not changed*** ***Increased to some extent*** ***Increased to a great extent*** **Findings** The results indicate that in 12.5% of the participating companies (15), employees decreased to a great extent, while in 13.3% of the companies (16) they decreased to some extent. In 13.3% of the companies (16), they did not change at all, while in 26.7% of the companies (32), employees increased to some extent over the preceding three years, and in 31.7% of the companies (38) they increased to a great extent. The findings therefore indicate that in the case of the majority of the companies (58.4%), their staff increased from some to a very great extent over the preceding three years.
Question 2	**Question 2** ***Have you used any of the following methods to downsize the organisation (through reducing the number of people employed or other means to decreased cost?*** ***A Recruitment freeze*** ***B Early retirement*** ***C Internal transfer (redeployment)*** ***D Voluntary redundancies/Attrition*** ***E No renewal of fixed-term/temporary contracts*** ***F Unpaid study leave/vacations*** ***G Outsourcing*** ***H Management pay-cut*** ***I Ban on overtime*** ***J Wage Freeze*** ***K Reduced job proportions*** ***L Job sharing*** ***M Reduced benefits*** ***N Employee cut*** ***O Individual layoffs (1-4% of workforce laid off in 12 months period)*** ***P Concentrated layoffs (5-9 laid off in 12 months)*** ***Q Mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in 1-3 months period)*** **Findings** **Managers** **2(A) Recruitment freeze** The results show that 81.7% of the participating companies (98) had not used recruitment freeze as a method to reduce managers, while 18.3% of the companies (22) indicated that they had used recruitment freeze to reduce the managers in the organisation. **2(B) Early retirement** The results indicate that 80.0% of the participating companies (96) had not used early retirement to reduce managers to downsize the organisation, while 20.0% of the companies (24) indicated that they had used early retirement to reduce managers in the organisation. **2(C) Internal transfer (redeployment)** The results show that 80.0% of the participating companies (96) had not used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce managers in the organisation, while 20.0% of the companies (24) indicated that they had used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(D) Voluntary redundancies/Attrition
The results show that 87.5% of the companies (105) had not used voluntary redundancies and/or attrition to reduce managers in the organisation, while 12.5% of the companies (15) indicated that they had used voluntary redundancies and/or attrition to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(E) No renewal of fixed-term/temporary contracts
The results show that 80.8% of the participating companies (97) had not used no renewal of fixed-term and/or temporary contracts to reduce managers in the organisation, while 19.2% of the companies (23) indicated that they had used no renewal of fixed-term and/or temporary contracts to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(F) Unpaid study leave/vacations
The results indicate that 92.5% of the participating companies (111) had not used unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce managers in the organisation, while 7.5% of the companies (9) indicated that they had used unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(G) Outsourcing
The results show that 94.2% of the participating companies (113) had not used outsourcing to reduce managers in the organisation, while 5.8% of the companies (7) indicated that they had used outsourcing to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(H) Management pay-cut
The results show that 96.0% of the companies (114) had not used management pay-cuts to reduce managers in the organisation, while 5.0% of the companies (6) indicated that they had used management pay-cuts to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(I) Ban on overtime
The results indicate that 90.8% of the companies (109) had not used a ban on overtime to reduce managers in the organisation, while 9.2% of the companies (11) indicated that they had used a ban on overtime to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(J) Wage Freeze
The results indicate that 99.2% of the companies (119) had not used wage freeze to reduce managers in the organisation, while 0.8% of the companies (1) indicated that they had used wage freeze to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(K) Reduced job proportions
The results indicate that 98.3% of the companies (118) had not used reduced job propositions to reduce managers in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they had used reduced job propositions to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(L) Job sharing
The results indicate that 95.8% of the participating companies (118) had not used job sharing to reduce managers in the organisation, while 4.2% of the companies (5) indicated that they used job sharing to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(M) Reduced benefits
The results indicate that 96.7% of the participating companies (116) had not used reduced benefits to reduce managers in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they had used reduced benefits to reduce managers in the organisation.

2(N) Employee cut
The results indicate that 99.2% of the participating companies (119) had not used employee pay cuts to reduce managers in the organisation, while 0.8% of the companies (1) indicated that they had done so.

2(O) Individual layoffs (1–4% of workforce laid off in a 12-month period)
The results indicate that 95.0% of the participating companies (114) had not used individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce managers in the organisation, while 5.0% of the companies (6) indicated that they had done so.

2(P) Concentrated layoffs (5–9 laid off in 12 months)
The results indicate that 97.5% of the participating companies (117) had not used concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in 12 months) to reduce managers in the organisation, while 2.5% of the companies (3) indicated that they had done so.

2(Q) Mass layoffs and/or compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3-month period)
The results indicate that 96.7% of the participating companies (116) had not used mass layoffs and/or compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce managers in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they had done so.

Professionals

2(A) Recruitment freeze
The results show that 85.8% of the participating companies (103) had not used recruitment freeze as a method to reduce professionals, while 14.2% of the companies (17) indicated that they had used recruitment freeze to reduce professionals in the organisation.

2(B) Early retirement
The results indicate that 83.3% of the participating companies (100) had not used early retirement as a method to reduce professionals in their organisation, while 16.7% of the companies (20) indicated that they had used early retirement to reduce professionals in the organisation.

2(C) Internal transfer (redeployment)
The results show that 80.0% of the participating companies (96) had not used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 20.0% of the companies (24) indicated that they had used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce professionals in the organisation.

2(D) Voluntary redundancies/Attrition
The results show that 88.3% of the participating companies (106) had not used voluntary redundancies and/or attrition to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 11.7% of the companies (14) indicated that they had used this method.

2(E) No renewal of fixed term/temporary contracts
The results show that 83.3% of the participating companies (100) had not used no renewal of fixed-term and/or temporary contracts to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 16.7% of the companies (20) indicated that they had done so.

2(F) Unpaid study leave/vacations
The results indicate that 93.3% of the participating companies (112) had not used unpaid study leave/vacations to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 6.7% of the companies (8) had done so.

2(G) Outsourcing
The results show that 93.3% of the participating companies (112) had not used outsourcing to reduce the professionals in the organisation, while 6.7% of the companies (8) indicated that they had done so.

2(H) Management pay-cut
The results show that 96.7% of the participating companies (116) had not used management pay cuts to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they had done so.

2(I) Ban on overtime
The results indicate that 90.8% of the participating companies (109) had not used a ban on overtime to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 9.2% of the companies (11) indicated that they had done so.

2(J) Wage freeze
The results indicate that none of the participating companies had used wage freeze to reduce professionals in the organisation.

2(K) Reduced job proportions
The results indicate that 97.5% of the participating companies (117) had not used reduced job propositions to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 2.5% of the companies (3) indicated that they had done so.

2(L) Job sharing
The results indicate that 95.8% of the participating companies (118) had not used job sharing to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 4.2% of the companies (5) indicated that they had done so.

2(M) Reduced benefits
The results indicate that 98.3% of the participating companies (118) had not used reduced benefits to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they had done so.

2(N) Employee cuts
The results indicate that 99.2% of the participating companies (119) had not used employee pay cuts to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 0.8% of the companies (1) indicated that they had done so.

2(O) Individual layoffs (1–4% of workforce laid off in a 12-month period)
The results indicate that 95.0% of the participating companies (114) had not used individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 5.0% of the companies (6) indicated that they had done so.

2(P) Concentrated layoffs (5–9 laid off in 12 months)
The results indicate that 97.5% of the participating companies (117) had not used concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in 12 months) to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 2.5% of the companies (3) indicated that they had done so.

2(Q) Mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3-month period)
The results indicate that 96.7% of the participating companies (116) had not used mass layoffs and/or compulsory redundancies (10% or more of the workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce professionals in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they had done so.

Clericals/Manual employees

2(A) Recruitment freeze
The results show that 81.7% of the participating companies (98) had not used recruitment freeze as a method to reduce clericals/manual employees, while 18.3% of the companies (22) indicated that they had done so.

2(B) Early retirement
The results indicate that 85.8% of the participating companies (103) had not used early retirement to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 14.2% of the companies (17) indicated that they had done so.

2(C) Internal transfer (redeployment)
The results show that 78.3% of the participating companies (94) had not used internal transfer (redeployment) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 21.7% of the companies (26) indicated that they had done so.

2(D) Voluntary redundancies and/or attrition
The results show that 88.3% of the participating companies (106) had not used voluntary redundancies and/or attrition to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 11.7% of the companies (14) indicated that they had done so.

2(E) No renewal of fixed-term/temporary contracts
The results show that 72.5% of the participating companies (87) had not used no renewal of fixed-term and/or temporary contracts to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 27.5% of the companies (33) indicated that they had done so.

2(F) Unpaid study leave/vacations
The results indicate that 93.3% of the participating companies (112) had not used unpaid study leave/ vacations to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 6.7% of the companies (8) indicated that they had done so.

2(G) Outsourcing
The results show that 95.2% of the participating companies (115) had not used outsourcing to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while in 4.2% of the companies (5) they had done so.

2(H) Management pay cut
The results show that 98.3% of the participating companies (118) had not used management pay cuts to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they had done so.

2(I) Ban on overtime
The results indicate that 85.3% of the participating companies (103) had not used a ban on overtime to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 14.2% of the companies (17) indicated that they had done so.

2(J) Wage freeze
The results indicate that none of the participating companies had used wage freeze to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation.

2(K) Reduced job proportions
The results indicate that 98.3% of the companies (118) had not used reduced job propositions to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they had done so.

2(L) Job sharing
The results indicate that 96.7% of the companies (116) had not used job sharing to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they had done so.

2(M) Reduced benefits
The results indicate that 98.3% of the companies (118) had not used reduced benefits to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they had done so.

2(N) Employee cut
The results indicate that 98.3% of the companies (118) had not used employee pay cuts to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they had done so.

2(O) Individual layoffs (1–4% of workforce laid off in a 12-month period)
The results indicate that 95.0% of the companies (114) had not used individual layoffs (1–4% workforce laid off in a 12-month period) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 5.0% of the companies (6) indicated that they had done so.

2(P) Concentrated layoffs (5–9 laid off in 12 months)
The results indicate that 96.7% of the companies (117) had not used concentrated layoffs (5–9% laid off in 12 months) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they had done so.

2(Q) Mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3-month period)
The results indicate that 96.7% of the companies (116) had not used mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in a 1–3-month period) to reduce clericals/manual employees in the organisation, while 3.3% of the companies (4) indicated that they had done so.

Question 3

Question 3 ***Please indicate which of the following recruitment methods are used in your organisation?***

A Internally
B Word of Mouth/employees referrals
C Vacancies in newspapers
D Vacancy page on company website
E Vacancies on commercial job websites
F Social Media (e.g. Facebook)
G Speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institution)
H Career Fairs
I Recruitment agencies/consultancies/executive search
J Job centres
K Trainee program

Findings
Managers

3(A) Internally
The results show that 39.2% of the participating companies (47) had not used internal recruitment as a method to recruit managers, while 60.8% of the companies (73) indicated that they had done so.

3(B) Word of mouth or employee referrals
The results indicate that 70.0% of the participating companies (84) had not used word of mouth or employee referrals as a method to recruit managers, while 30.0% (36) indicated that they had done so.

3(C) Vacancies in newspapers
The results show that 18.3% of the participating companies (22) had not used newspapers as a method to recruit managers, while 81.7% of the companies (98) indicated that they had done so.

3(D) Vacancy page on company website
The results show that 29.2% of the participating companies (35) had not used a company website as a method to recruit managers, while 70.3% of the companies (85) indicated that they had done so.

3(E) Vacancies on commercial job websites
The results show that 56.7% of the participating companies (68) had not used commercial job websites as a method to recruit managers, while 43.3% of the companies (52) indicated that they had done so.

3(F) Social Media (e.g. Facebook)
The results indicate that 84.2% of the participating companies (101) had not used social media as a method to recruit managers, while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they had done so.

3(G) Speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institutions)
The results show that 90.0% of the participating companies (108) had not used speculative applications or walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit managers, while 10.0% of the companies (12) indicated that they had done so.

3(H) Career Fairs
The results show that 91.7% of the participating companies (110) had not used career fairs to recruit managers, while 8.3% of the companies (10) indicated that they had done so.

3(I) Recruitment agencies, consultancies/executive search
The results indicate that 73.3% of the participating companies (88) had not used recruitment agencies, consultancies or executive search to recruit managers, while 26.7% of the companies (32) indicated that they had done so.

3(J) Job centres
The results indicate that 93.3% of the participating companies (112) had not used job centres (public) to recruit managers, while 6.7% of the companies (8) indicated that they had done so.

3(K) Trainee program
The results indicate that 84.2% of the participating companies (101) had not used a trainee programme to recruit managers, while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they had done so.

Professionals

3(A) Internally
The results show that 40.0% of the participating companies (48) had not used this method to recruit professionals, while 60.0% of the companies (72) indicated that they had done so.

3(B) Word of mouth/employees referrals
The results indicate that 70.8% of the participating companies (85) had not used word of mouth or employee referrals to recruit professionals, while 29.0% of the companies (35) indicated that they had done so.

3(C) Vacancies in newspapers
The results show that 94.2% of the participating companies (113) had not used newspapers to recruit professionals, while 5.8% of the companies (7) indicated that they had done so.

3(D) Vacancy page on company website
The results show that 32.5% of the participating companies (39) had not used a vacancy page on the company website to recruit professionals, while 67.5% of the companies (81) indicated that they had done so.

3(E) Vacancies on commercial job websites
The results show that 57.5% of the participating companies (69) had not used this method, while 42.5% of the companies (51) indicated that they had done so.

3(F) Social Media (e.g. Facebook)
The results indicate that 84.2% of the participating companies (101) had not used social media to recruit professionals, while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they had done so.

3(G) Speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institutions)
The results show that 84.2% of the participating companies (101) had not used speculative applications or walk-ins (directly through educational institutions) to recruit professionals, while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they had done so.

3(H) Career Fairs
The results show that 88.3% of the participating companies (106) had not used career fairs to recruit professionals, while 11.7% of the companies (14) indicated that they had done so.

3(I) Recruitment agencies/consultancies/executive search
The results indicate that 76.7% of the participating companies (92) had not used recruitment agencies, consultancies or executive search to recruit professionals, while 23.3% of the companies (28) indicated that they had done so.

3(J) Job centres
The results indicate that 70.0% of the participating companies (84) had not used job centres (public) to recruit professionals, while 30.0% of the companies (56) indicated that they had done so.

3(K) Trainee program
From the findings, it would appear that none of the companies had used this method to recruit professional employees, which probably makes sense as these employees are already trained in a specific disciplinary field.

Clericals/Manual employees

3(A) Internally
The results show that 30.0% of the participating companies (36) had not used internal recruitment as a method to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 70% (84) indicated that they had done so.

3(B) Word of Mouth/employees referrals
The results indicate that 68.3% of the participating companies (82) had not used this method, while 31.7% of the companies (38) indicated that they had done so.

3(C) Vacancies in newspapers
The results show that 39.2% of the participating companies (47) had not used vacancies in newspapers to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 60.8% of the companies (73) indicated that they had done so.

3(D) Vacancy page on company website
The results show that 40.0% of the participating companies (48) had not used a vacancy page on the company website to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 60.0% of the companies (72) indicated that they had done so.

3(E) Vacancies on commercial job websites
The results show that 71.7% of the participating companies (86) had not used the vacancies on commercial job websites to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 28.3% of the companies (34) indicated that they had done so.

3(F) Social Media (e.g. Facebook)
The results indicate that 83.3% of the participating companies (100) had not used this method, while no companies indicated that they used the method.

3(G) Speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institutions)
The results show that 82.5% of the participating companies (99) had not used speculative applications or walk-ins (directly from educational institutions) to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 17.5% of the companies (21) indicated that they had done so.

3(H) Career Fairs
The results show that 91.7% of the participating companies (110) had not used career fairs to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 8.3% of the companies (10) indicated that they had done so.

3(I) Recruitment agencies/consultancies/executive search
The results indicate that 85.0% of the participating companies (102) had not used this method, while 15.0% of the companies (18) indicated that they had done so.

3(J) Job centres
The results indicate that 92.5% of the participating companies (111) had not used job centres (public) to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 7.5% of the companies (9) indicated that they had done so.

3(K) Trainee program
The results indicate that 62.5% of the participating companies (75) had not used a training programme to recruit clericals/manual employees, while 37.5% of the companies (45) indicated that they had done so.

Question 4

Question 4 ***Please indicate which of the following selection methods are used in your organisation?***

A Interview panel
B One-to-one interviews
C Application forms
D Psychometric test
E Assessment centre
F Social media profiles
G References
H Ability tests/Work sample
I Technical tests
J Numeracy test
K Online selection tests

Findings
Managers

4(A) Interview panel
The results show that 12.5% of the participating companies (15) had not used interview panels to select managers, while 87.5% of the companies (105) indicated that they had done so.

4(B) One-to-one interviews
The results show that 63.3% of the participating companies (76) had not used one-on-one interviews to select managers, while 36.7% of the companies (44) indicated that they had done so.

4(C) Application forms
The results show that 28.3% of the participating companies (34) had not used application forms to select managers, while 71.7% of the companies (86) indicated that they had done so.

4(D) Psychometric test
The results show that 55.0% of the participating companies (66) had not used psychometric tests to select managers, while 45.0% of the companies (54) indicated that they had done so.

4(E) Assessment centre
The results show that 69.2% of the participating companies (83) had not used this method to select managers, while 30.8% of the companies (37) indicated that they had done so.

4(F) Social media profiles
The results show that 89.2% of the participating companies (107) had not used this method to select managers, while 10.8% of the companies (13) indicated that they had done so.

4(G) References
The results show that 14.2% of the participating companies (17) had not used references to select managers, while 85.8% of the companies (103) indicated that they had done so.

4(H) Ability tests/Work sample
The results show that 61.7% of the participating companies (74) had not used this method to select managers, while 38.3% of the companies (46) indicated that they had done so.

4(I) Technical tests
The results show that 68.3% of the participating companies (82) had not used this method to select managers, while 31.7% of the companies (38) indicated that they had done so.

4(J) Numeracy test
The results show that 83.3% of the participating companies (100) had not used this method to select managers, while 16.7% of the companies (20) indicated that they had done so.

4(K) Online selection tests
The results show that 90.8% of the participating companies (109) had not used this method to select managers, while 9.2% of the companies (11) indicated that they had done so.

Professionals

4(A) Interview panel
The results show that 16.7% of the participating companies (20) had not used this method to select professionals, while 83.3% of the companies (100) indicated that they had done so.

4(B) One-to-one interviews
The results show that 67.5% of the companies (81) had not used this method to select professionals, while 32.5% of the companies (39) indicated that they had done so.

4(C) Application forms
The results show that 30.8% of the participating companies (37) had not used this method to select professionals, while 69.2% of the companies (83) indicated that they had done so.

4(D) Psychometric tests
The results show that 73.3% of the participating companies (88) had not used psychometric tests to select professionals, while 26.7% of the companies (32) indicated that they had done so.

4(E) Assessment centre
The results show that 79.2% of the participating companies (95) had not used this method to select professionals, while 20.8% of the companies (25) indicated that they had done so.

4(F) Social media profiles
The results show that 90.0% of the participating companies (108) had not used this method to select professionals, while 10.0% of the companies (12) indicated that they had done so.

4(G) References
The results show that 17.5% of the participating companies (21) had not used references to select professionals, while 82.5% of the companies (99) indicated that they had done so.

4(H) Ability tests/Work sample
The results show that 61.7% of the participating companies (74) had not used this method to select professionals, while 38.3% of the companies (46) indicated that they had done so.

4(I) Technical tests
The results show that 55.8% of the participating companies (67) had not used this method to select professionals, while 44.2% of the companies (53) indicated that they had done so.

4(J) Numeracy test
The results show that 77.5% of the participating companies (93) had not used this method to select professionals, while 22.5% of the companies (27) indicated that they had done so.

4(K) Online selection tests
The results show that 91.7% of the companies (110) had not used this method to select professionals, while 8.3% of the companies (10) indicated that they had done so.

Clericals/Manual employees

4(A) Interview panel
The results show that 27.2% of the companies (35) had not used this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 70.8% of the companies (85) indicated that they had done so.

4(B) One-to-one interviews
The results show that 71.7% of the companies (86) had not used this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 28.3% of the companies (34) indicated that they had done so.

4(C) Application forms
The results show that 35.0% of the companies (42) had not used this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 65.0% of the companies (78) indicated that they had done so.

4(D) Psychometric test
The results show that 90.0% of the companies (108) had not used psychometric tests to select clericals/manual employees, while 10.0% of the companies (12) indicated that they had done so.

4(E) Assessment centre
The results show that 87.5% of the companies (105) had not used this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 12.5% of the companies (15) indicated that they had done so.

4(F) Social media profiles
The results show that 98.3% of the companies (118) had not used this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 1.7% of the companies (2) indicated that they had done so.

4(G) References
The results show that 31.7% of the companies (38) had not used references to select clericals/manual employees, while 68.3% of the companies (82) indicated that they had done so.

4(H) Ability tests and/or work sample
The results show that 66.7% of the companies (80) had not used this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 33.3% of the companies (40) indicated that they had done so.

4(I) Technical tests
The results show that 70.0% of the companies (84) had not used this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 30.0% of the companies (36) indicated that they had done so.

4(J) Numeracy test
The results show that 77.5% of the companies (93) had not used this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 22.5% of the companies (27) indicated that they had done so.

4(K) Online selection tests
The results show that 95.8% of the companies (115) had not used this method to select clericals/manual employees, while 4.2% of the companies (5) indicated that they had done so.

Question 5

Question 5 ***Does your organisation have action programmes covering any of the following groups to improve their participation in the workforce?***
For the following groups of people:
A Minority ethnics
B Older workers (aged 50 plus)
C People with disabilities
D Women
E Women returners
F Low skilled labour
G Younger workers (aged under 25)

Findings
For Recruitment

5(A) Minority ethnics
The results show that 70.0% of the participating companies (84) did not have any action programmes in place for minority ethnics, while 30.0% of the companies (36) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(B) Older workers (aged 50 plus)
The results show that 84.2% of the participating companies (101) did not have any such programmes in place for older workers (aged 50 plus), while 15.8% of the companies (19) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(C) People with disabilities
The results indicate that 45.8% of the participating companies (55) did not have any programmes in place for people with disabilities, while 54.2% of the companies (65) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(D) Women
The results show that 48.3% of the participating companies (58) did not have any programmes in place for women, while 51.7% of the companies (62) indicated that they had programmes for women available.

5(E) Women returners
The results show that 78.3% of the participating companies (94) did not have any programmes in place for women returners, while 21.7% of the companies (26) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(F) Low skilled labour
The results show that 72.5% of the participating companies (87) did not have any programmes in place for skilled labour, while 27.5% of the companies (33) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(G) Younger workers (aged under 25)
The results show that 58.3% of the participating companies (70) did not have any programmes in place for younger workers (aged under 25), while 41.7% of the companies (50) indicated that they had such programmes available.

For training

5(A) Minority ethnics
The results show that 73.3% of the participating companies (88) did not have any action programmes in place for minority ethnics, while 26.7% of the companies (32) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(B) Older workers (aged 50 plus)
The results show that 78.3% of the participating companies (94) did not have any programmes in place for older workers (aged 50 plus), while 21.7% of the companies (26) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(C) People with disabilities
The results show that 60.0% of the participating companies (72) did not have any programmes in place for people with disabilities, while 40.0% of the companies (48) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(D) Women
The results show that 55.8% of the participating companies (67) did not have any programmes in place for women, while 44.2% of the companies (53) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(E) Women returners
The results show that 75.8% of the participating companies (91) did not have any programmes in place for women returners, while 24.2% of the companies (29) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(F) Low skilled labour
The results show that 49.2% of the participating companies (59) did not have any programmes in place for skilled labour, while 50.8% of the companies (61) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(G) Younger workers (aged under 25)
The results show that 47.5% of the participating companies (57) did not have any programmes in place for younger workers (aged under 25), while 52.5% of the companies (63) indicated that they had such programmes available.

For career progression

5(A) Minority ethnics
The results show that 78.3% of the participating companies (94) did not have any action programmes in place for minority ethnics, while 21.1% of the companies (26) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(B) Older workers (aged 50 plus)
The results show that 89.2% of the participating companies (107) did not have any programmes in place for older workers (aged 50 plus), while 10.8% of the companies (13) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(C) People with disabilities
The results show that 75.8% of the participating companies (91) did not have any action programmes in place for people with disabilities, while 24.2% of the companies (29) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(D) Women
The results show that 66.7% of the participating companies (80) did not have any action programmes in place for women, while 33.3% of the companies (40) indicated that they had such programmes available.

5(E) Women returners
The results show the 85.0% of the participating companies (102) did not have any action programmes in place for women returners, while 15.0% of the companies (18) indicated that they had such programmes available.

SECTION II – Questions and findings	
	5(F) Low skilled labour The results show that 73.3% of the participating companies (88) did not have any action programmes in place for skilled labour, while 26.7% of the companies (32) indicated that they had such programmes available. **5(G) Younger workers (aged under 25)** The results show that 68.3% of the participating companies (82) did not have any action programmes in place for younger workers (aged under 25), while 31.7% of the companies (38) indicated that they had such programmes available.
Question 6	**Question 6** ***Please indicate the approximate proportion of those employed by your organisation who are on the following working arrangements:*** ***A Weekend work*** ***B Shift work*** ***C Overtime*** ***D Annual hour contract*** ***E Part-time work*** ***F Job sharing*** ***G Flexi-time*** ***H Temporary/casual*** ***I Flexi-term contracts*** ***J Home-based work (workers who do not have permanent electronic links to a fixed workplace)*** ***K Teleworking (workers who can link electronically to a fixed workplace)*** ***L Compressed working week*** **Findings** The working arrangement implemented in order of popularity (i.e. number of companies using them): annual hours contract (104); overtime (101); shift work (94); temporary or casual work (76); flexitime (76); weekend work (73); compressed working week (30); telework (21); job sharing (19); teleworking (14) and home-based work (10).

Results of the findings in section III of the questionnaire (employee development)

SECTION III – Questions and findings	
Question 1	**Question 1** ***Do you have a formal appraisal system for the following categories of the workforce?*** ***Yes No*** ***A Management*** ***B Professional without managerial responsibility*** ***C Clericals/Manuals*** **Findings** **1(A) Management** The results show that 13.3% of the participating companies (16) did not have such a system in place for their management staff, while 86.7% of the companies (104) indicated that they had such a system in place. **1(B) Professionals without managerial responsibility** The results show 34.2% of the participating companies (41) did not have such a system in place for professionals without managerial responsibility, while 61.7% of the companies (74) indicated that they had such a system in place. **1(C) Clericals/Manuals** The results show that 35.8% of the participating companies (43) did not have such a system in place for their clericals/manual employees, while 59.2% of the companies (71) indicated that they did have such a system in place for them.
Question 2	**Question 2** ***If you have an appraisal system, who is formally expected to make an input/provide data for the appraisal process?*** ***A Immediate supervisor*** ***B Supervisor's supervisor*** ***C The employee himself/herself*** ***D Subordinates*** ***E Peers*** **Findings** **Managers** **2(A) Immediate supervisor** The results show that in 27.5% of the participating companies (33), the immediate supervisor did not play a role in the performance appraisal of the management staff, while in 72.5% of the companies (87) he or she did play a role.

2(B) Supervisor's supervisor
The results indicate that in 51.7% of the participating companies (62), the supervisor's supervisor did not play a role in the appraisal of the management staff, while in 48.3% of the companies (58) he or she did play a role in the appraisal of the management staff.

2(C) The employee him- or herself
The results show that in 51.7% of the participating companies (62), the employees did not contribute to the performance appraisal of the management staff, while in 48.3% of the companies (58), these employees did contribute to the performance appraisals of the management staff.

2(D) Subordinates
The results indicate that in 81.7% of the participating companies (98), the subordinates did not contribute to the performance appraisal of the management staff, while in 18.3% of the companies (22), they did contribute.

2(E) Peers
The results show that in 89.2% of the participating companies (107), peers did not contribute to the performance appraisal of management staff, while in 10.8% of the companies (13), they did contribute to the performance appraisal of the management staff.

Professionals without managerial responsibility

2(A) Immediate supervisor
The results show that in 46.7% of the participating companies (56), the immediate supervisor did not play a role in the appraisal of the professional staff, while in 53.3% of the companies (64) he or she did play a role in the appraisal of the professional staff.

2(B) Supervisor's supervisor
The results show that in 60.8% of the participating companies (73), the supervisor's supervisor did not play a role in this regard, while in 39.2% of the companies (47), he or she did play a role in the appraisal of professional staff without managerial responsibility.

2(C) The employee him- or herself
The results show that in 65.0% of the participating companies (78), the employee him- or herself did not contribute to the performance appraisal of the professional group, while in 35.0% of the companies (42); the employee him- or herself did contribute to the performance appraisal of the group.

2(D) Subordinates
The results show that in 82.5% of the participating companies (99), their subordinates did not contribute to the performance appraisal of the professional staff, while in 17.5% of the companies (21), they did contribute to the performance appraisal of professional staff.

2(E) Peers
The results show that in 93.3% of the participating companies (112), peers did not contribute to the performance appraisal of professional staff, while in 6.7% of the companies (8), they did contribute to the performance appraisal of professional staff.

Clericals/manual employees

2(A) Immediate supervisor
The results show that in 64.2% of the participating companies (77), the immediate supervisor did not play a role in the appraisal of the manual or clerical staff, while in 35.8% of the companies (43), the immediate supervisor did play a role in the appraisal of the manual/clerical staff.

2(B) Supervisor's supervisor
The results show that in 71.7% of the participating companies (86), the supervisor's supervisor did not play a role in the appraisal of the manual or clerical staff, while in 28.3% of the companies (34), he or she did play a role in the appraisal of this group.

2(C) The employee him- or herself
The results show that in 70.0% of the participating companies (84), the employee him- or herself did not contribute to the performance appraisal of the manual or clerical group, while in 30.0% of the companies (36), they did contribute to the performance appraisal of this group.

2(D) Subordinates
The results indicate that in 89.2% of the participating companies (107), the subordinates did not contribute to the performance appraisal of the manual or clerical staff, while in 10.8% of the companies (13), the subordinates indicated that they had contributed to the process.

2(E) Peers
The results show that in 92.5% of the participating companies (111), peers did not contribute to the performance appraisal of manual or clerical staff, while in 7.5% of the companies (9), they had done so.

SECTION III – Questions and findings	
Question 3	**Question 3** ***Are the appraisal data used to inform decisions in the following areas?*** ***Yes*** ***No*** ***A Pay*** ***B Training and development*** ***C Career moves*** ***D Workforce planning*** **Findings** **3(A) Pay** The results show that in 33.3% of the participating companies (40), the appraisal data obtained was not used to inform pay decisions, while in 66.7% of the companies (80), appraisal data was used to inform pay decisions. **3(B) Training and development** The results show that in 27.5% of the participating companies (33), the appraisal data obtained was not used to inform training and development decisions, while in 72.5% of the companies (87), the appraisal data obtained was used to inform training and development decisions. **3(C) Career moves** The results show that in 55.0% of the participating companies (66), the appraisal data obtained was not used to inform the career moves, while in 45.0% of the companies (54), the data obtained was used to inform career moves. **3(D) Workforce planning** The results show that in 52.5% of the participating companies (63), the appraisal data obtained was not used to inform workforce planning, while in 47.5% of the companies (57), the appraisal data obtained was used to inform workforce planning.
Question 4	**Question 4** ***Do you systematically evaluate the effectiveness of your training?*** ***Yes*** ***No*** **Findings** The results show that in 13.3% of the companies (16), they did not systematically evaluate the effectiveness of training of their personnel, while in 84.2% of the companies (101), this happened.
Question 5	**Question 5** ***Approximately what proportion of the annual payroll costs is currently spent on training?*** **Findings** The results show that a great difference was found between the companies in terms of this aspect. Areas of concentration are: at 1% of the budget, 45 companies were involved (37.5%). This was followed by 17 companies at 3% of the budget (14.2% of the companies); 16 companies at more than 11% (13.3% of the companies); at 2% of the budget, 12 companies (10% of the companies); at 5%, 9 companies (7.5% of the companies) and at 10%, 6 companies (5.0% of the companies).
Question 6	**Question 6** ***Approximately, how many days' training per year do employees in each staff category below receive on average?)*** ***A Management*** ***days per year per employee*** ***B Professional/technical*** ***days per year per employee*** ***C Clericals/Manuals*** ***days per year per employee*** **Findings** Employees in all three categories were reported to receive training each year. Managerial and professional staff received more training than lower-level (clerical) employees). This can be attributed to the nature of their jobs. The skills levies that organisations can claim back also seem to have a positive influence on the number of days training that staff members receive.
Question 7a	**Question 7a** ***Do you systematically evaluate the effectiveness of the training of personnel in your organisation?*** ***Yes*** ***No*** **Findings** The results show that 40.0% of the companies (48) did not evaluate the effectiveness of the training of their personnel systematically, while 54.2% of the participating companies (65) evaluated the effectiveness of the training of their personnel.

Question 7b

Question 7b ***If "yes", which of the following techniques does your organisation use to evaluate the effectiveness of training?***

A Total number of days' training undertaken per employee per annum
B Meeting the objectives formulated in the training and development plan
C Reaction evaluation immediately after training
D Measuring job performance before and immediately after training
E Measuring job performance before and some months after training
F Informed feedback from line managers
G Informed feedback from employees
H Return on investment (ROI)

Findings

7(A) Total number of days' training undertaken per employee per annum
The results show that 11.7% of the companies (14) did not use the total number of days' training provided per employee per year to evaluate their training effort, while 37.5% of the companies (45) used the total number of days' training provided to evaluate their training effort.

7(B) Meeting the objectives formulated in the training and development plan
The results show that 5.0% of the companies (6) did not use the objectives formulated in the training plan to evaluate their training effort, while 45.8% of the companies (55) used the objectives formulated in the training plan to evaluate their training effort.

7(C) Reaction evaluation immediately after training
The results show that 15.8% of the companies (19) did not use the reaction evaluation method to evaluate their training efforts, while 35.0% of the companies (42) used the reaction evaluation method immediately after training in order to evaluate their training efforts.

7(D) Measuring job performance before and immediately after training
The results show that in 23.3% of the participating companies (28), they did not measure job performance before and immediately after training, while in 26.7% of the companies (32), this method was used.

7(E) Measuring job performance before and some months after training
The results show that in 10.8% of the participating companies (13), they did not measure job performance before and some months after training to evaluate their training efforts, while in 40.8% of the companies (49) this method was used.

7(F) Informed feedback from line managers
The results show that in 14.2% of the participating companies (7), they did not use the informal feedback from line managers to evaluate their training efforts, while in 38.3% of the companies (46) they used the informal feedback from line managers to evaluate their training efforts.

7(G) Informed feedback from employees
The results show that in 15.0% of the participating companies (18), they did not use informal feedback from employees to evaluate their training efforts, while in 37.5% of the companies (45), they used this method.

7(H) Return on investment (ROI)
The respondents had to indicate whether they used the return on investment (ROI) method to evaluate the training efforts. The results show that in 23.3% of the participating companies (28), they did not use the return on investment (ROI) method to evaluate their training efforts, while in 26.7% of the companies (32), they used this method to evaluate the training efforts.

Question 8

Question 8 ***To what extent do you use the following methods for career management?***

A Special tasks/projects to stimulate learning/on-the-job training
B Projects to stimulate learning
C Training om-the-job
D Participation in project team work
E Formal networking schemes
F Formal career plans
G Development centres
H Succession plans
I Planned job rotation
J "High flier" schemes/High potentials
K International work assignments
L Coaching
M Mentoring
N Computer-based packages/E-learning

SECTION III – Questions and findings
Findings The participating companies had to indicate to which extent they used the different career development methods within their organisations. The findings, which are placed in order from the highest to the lowest percentages, are: • training on-the job (89.2%–107 companies); • mentoring (78.3%–94 companies); • coaching (76.6%–92 companies); • participation in project team work (75.8%–91 companies); • formal career plans (60%–72 companies), succession plans (60%–72 companies); • planned job rotation (52.5%–61 companies), and special tasks (52.5%–61 companies).

Results of the findings in section IV of the questionnaire (Compensation and benefits)

SECTION IV – Questions and findings	
Question 1	**Question 1** ***At what level(s) is the basic pay determined?*** ***A National/industry-wide collective bargaining*** ***B Regional collective bargaining*** ***C Company/division, etc.*** ***D Establishment/site*** ***E Individual*** **Findings** **For Managers** **1(A) National or industry-wide collective bargaining** The results show that in 36.7% of the participating companies (44), this did not happen at this level for managers, while in 63.3% of the companies (76) it did. **1(B) Regional collective bargaining** The results show that in 69.2% of the participating companies (83), this did not happen at this level for managers, while in 30.8% of the companies (37), it did. **1(C) Company/division, etc.** The results show that in 74.2% of the participating companies (89), this did not happen at this level for managers, while in 25.8% of the companies (31), it did. **1(D) Establishment or site** The results show that in 84.2% of the participating companies (101), this did not happen at this level for managers, while in 15.8% of the companies (19), it did. **1(E) Individual level** The results show that in 78.3% of the participating companies (94), this did not happen at this level for managers, while in 21.7% of the companies (26) it did. **For professionals** **1(A) National or industry-wide collective bargaining** The results indicate that in 40.0% of the participating companies (48), this did not happen at this level for professionals, while in 60.0% of the companies (72), it did. **1(B) Regional collective bargaining** The results show that in 69.2% of the participating companies (83), this did not happen at this level for professionals, while in 30.8% of the companies (37), it did. **1(C) Company/division, etc.** The results show that in 79.2% of the participating companies (95), this did not happen at this level for professionals, while it did in 20.8% of the companies (25). **1(D) Establishment/site** The results show that in 86.7% of the participating companies (104), this did not happen at this level for professionals, while it did in 13.3% of the companies (16). **1(E) Individual level** The results show that in 84.2% of the participating companies (101), this did not happen at this level for professionals, while it did in 15.8% of the companies (19).

SECTION IV – Questions and findings	
Question 1	**For clericals/manual employees** **1(A) National/industry-wide collective bargaining** The results show that in 32.5% of the participating companies (39), this was not the case for clericals/manual employees at this level, while in 67.5% of the companies (81), respondents answered 'Yes'. **1(B) Regional collective bargaining** The results show that in 68.3% of the participating companies (82), this did not happen at this level for clericals/manual employees, while it did in 31.7% of the companies (38). **1(C) Company or division, etc.** The results show that in 86.7% of the participating companies (104), this did not happen at this level for clericals/manual employees, while in 13.3% of the companies (16) it did. **1(D) Establishment/site** The results show that in 90.8% of the participating companies (109), this did not happen at this level for clericals/manual employees, while in 9.2% of the companies (11), it did. **1(E) Individual** The results show that in 93.3% of the participating companies (112), this did not happen at this level for clericals/manual employees, while in 6.7% of the companies (8) it did.
Question 2	**Question 2** ***Do you offer any of the following?*** ***A Employee share schemes*** ***B Profit sharing*** ***C Stock options*** ***D Flexible benefits*** ***E Individual performance-related pay*** ***F Bonus based on individual goals/performance*** ***G Bonus based on team goals/performance*** ***H Bonus based on organisational goals/performance*** ***I Non-monetary incentives*** **Findings** **For managers** **2(A) Employee share schemes** The results indicate that in 82.5% of the participating companies (99), these schemes were not offered to managers, while they were offered in 17.5% of the companies (21). **2(B) Profit sharing** The results show that 86.7% of the participating companies (104) did not offer any profit sharing to managers, while 13.3% of the companies (16) did. **2(C) Stock options** The results show that in 93.3% of the participating companies (112), they did not offer stock options to managers, while 6.7% of the companies (8) did. **2(D) Flexible benefits** The results show that 75.8% of the participating companies (91) did not offer flexible benefits to managers, while 24.2% of the companies (29) did. **2(E) Individual performance-related pay** The results show that 55.0% of the participating companies (66) did not offer individual performance-related pay to managers, while 45.0% of the companies (54) did. **2(F) Bonus based on individual goals/performance** The results show that in 45.0% of the participating companies (54), this did not happen, while it applied in 55.0% of the companies (66). **2(G) Bonus based on team goals/performance** The results show that in 74.2% of the participating companies (89), this did not happen, while it applied in 25.8% of the companies (31). **2(H) Bonus based on organisational goals or performance** The results show that in 58.3% of the participating companies (70), this did not happen, while it did apply in 41.7% of the companies (50). **2(I) Non-monetary incentives** The results show that in 75.8% of the participating companies (91), this did not happen, while it did apply in 24.2% of the companies (20).

For professionals

2(A) Employee share schemes
The results show that in 86.7% of the participating companies (104), they did not offer such schemes to professionals, while 13.3% of the companies (16) did.

2(B) Profit sharing
The results show that in 91.7% of the participating companies (110) they did not offer any profit sharing to their professional staff, while 8.3% of the companies (10) did.

2(C) Stock options
The results show that in 93.3% of the participating companies (112), this did not happen, while in 6.7% of the companies (8) it did.

2(D) Flexible benefits
The results show that in 85.0% of the participating companies (102), this did not happen, while in 15.0% of the companies (18) it did.

2(E) Individual performance-related pay
The results show that in 69.2% of the participating companies (83), this did not happen, while in 30.8% of the companies (37), it did.

2(F) Bonus based on individual goals/performance
The results show that in 62.5% of the participating companies (75), this did not happen, while in 37.5% of the companies (45) it happened.

2(G) Bonus based on team goals/performance
The results indicate that in 80.0% of the participating companies (96), they did not, while 20.0% of the companies (24) did.

2(H) Bonus based on organisational goals/performance
The results show that in 72.5% of the participating companies (87), this did not happen, while it did apply in 27.5% of the companies (33).

2(I) Non-monetary incentives
The results show that in the case of 76.7% of the participating companies (92), this did not happen, while it did apply in 23.3% of the companies (28).

For clericals/manual employees

2(A) Employee share schemes
The results indicate that in 94.2% of the participating companies (113), this did not happen, while in 5.8% of the companies (7), it did happen.

2(B) Profit sharing
The results show that in 97.5% of the participating companies (117), it did not happen, while in 2.5% of the companies (3), it did.

2(C) Stock options
The results show that in 99.2% of the participating companies (119), this did not happen, while in 0.8% of the companies (1), it did.

2(D) Flexible benefits
The results show that in 92.5% of the participating companies (111), this did not happen, while in 7.5% of the companies (9), it did.

2(E) Individual performance-related pay
The results show that in 77.5% of the participating companies (93), this did not happen, while in 22.5% of the companies (27), it did.

2(F) Bonus based on individual goals/performance
The results show that in 69.2% of the participating companies (83) this did not happen, while in 30.8% of the companies (37) it did.

2(G) Bonus based on team goals/performance
The results show that in 82.5% of the participating companies (99), this did not happen, while in 17.5% of the companies (21), it did.

2(H) Bonus based on organisational goals/performance
The results show that in 76.7% of the participating companies (92), this did not happen, while it did apply in 23.3% of the companies (28).

2(I) Non-monetary incentives
The results show that in 78.3% of the participating companies (94), this did not happen, while it did apply in 21.7% of the companies (26).

SECTION IV – Questions and findings	
Question 3	**Question 3** ***Do you offer any of the following schemes in excess of statutory requirements?*** ***Yes*** ***No*** ***A Workplace childcare (subsidized or not)*** ***B Childcare allowances*** ***C Career break schemes*** ***D Maternity leave*** ***E Paternity leave*** ***F Parental leave*** ***G Pension schemes*** ***H Education/training break*** ***I Private health care schemes*** ***J Flexible/cafeteria benefits*** **Findings** The results show that the participating companies offered quite a few 'other' benefits to varying degrees. For example, in order of importance, the following are offered in excess of statutory requirements. Maternity leave (91.7% or 110 of the companies); pension schemes (84.2% or 101 of the companies); education and/or training break (76.7% or 92 of the companies); paternity leave (74.2% or 89 of the companies); private health care schemes (66.7% or 80 of the companies); parental leave (65.8% or 79 of the companies) and flexible cafeteria benefits (12.5% or 15 of the companies).

Results of the findings in Section V of the questionnaire (employee relations and communication)

SECTION V – Questions and findings	
Question 1	**Question 1** ***What proportion of the total number of employees in your organisation are members of a trade union? (Please round up to the nearest full percentage)*** ***0%*** ***1%-10%*** ***11%-25%*** ***26%-50%*** ***51%-75%*** ***76%-100%*** ***Don't know*** **Findings** In only 10% of companies who participated no employees were members of a trade union. In 11 companies who participated, trade union membership ranges between 1-10%, while the membership in 5 companies ranges between 11 and 25% in a further 5 companies membership ranges between 26-50%. Trade union membership in 22 participating companies ranged between 51 and 75% and for 61 companies who participated in the survey the trade union membership of their employees ranged between 76 and 100%. From the findings, it would appear that, at the time of the research, the majority of the employees of the participating companies were members of a trade union. Thus, in South Africa, as in other developing countries, employees feel the need for protection from their employers despite the fact that South Africa has sophisticated labour legislation. Two companies did not answer the question.
Question 2	**Question 2** ***To what extent do trade unions influence your organisation?*** ***Not at all*** ***To a small extent*** ***To some extent*** ***To a great extent*** ***To a very great extent*** **Findings** The results indicate that, in 13.3% of the participating companies (16), trade unions did not influence the companies at all, while in 8.3% of the respondents (10), they did so to a small extent. In 21.7% of the participating companies (26), they influenced the companies to some extent, while in 18.3% of the participating companies (22) they influenced the companies to a great extent, and in 35.0% of the participating companies (42) they influenced the companies to a very great extent
Question 3	**Question 3** ***Do you recognise trade unions for the purpose of collective bargaining?*** ***Yes*** ***No*** **Findings** The results show that in 12.5% of the respondents (15), the answer is "no", while in 85.0% of the respondents (102), the answer is "yes".

SECTION V – Questions and findings	
Question 4	**Question 4** ***Do you have a joint consultative committee or works council?*** ***Yes*** ***No*** **Findings** The results show that for 23.3% of the participating companies (28), the answer was 'No', while for 72.5% of the participating companies (87), it was 'Yes'.
Question 5	**Question 5** ***To what extent do you use the following methods to communicate major issues to your employees?*** ***A Direct to employees*** ***B Through immediate superior*** ***C Through trade union representative*** ***D Through works council*** ***E Team briefings*** ***F Electronic communication*** ***Not at all*** ***To a small extent*** ***To some extent*** ***To a great extent*** ***To a very great extent*** **Findings** **5(A) Direct to employees** The findings indicate that in the majority of participating companies (93.4%), they communicated directly to their employees from a small to a very great extent. **5(B) Through immediate superior** The findings indicate that in the majority of the participating companies (90.8%), they communicated with the employees from a small to a very great extent through the immediate superior. **5(C) Through trade union representative** The findings indicate that the majority of participating companies (70.9%), communicated from a small to a very great extent with their employees through a trade union representative. **5(D) Through works council** The findings indicate that in 54.2% of the participating companies, they communicated from a small extent to a very great extent with their employees through works councils. **5(E) Through team briefings** The findings indicate that the majority of participating companies (81.7%) communicated from a small to a very great extent through team briefings with their staff. **5(F) Electronic communication** The findings indicate that the majority of participating companies (85.9%) communicated from a small to a very great extent with their staff through electronic means.
Question 6	**Question 6** ***Which employee categories are formally briefed about the following issues?*** ***A Business strategy*** ***B Financial performance*** ***C Organisation of work*** **Findings** **<u>For managers</u>** **6(A) Business strategy** The results indicate that in 8.3% of the participating companies (10), they were not generally briefed about the business strategy, while in 91.7% of the companies (110), this happened. **6(B) Financial performance** The results indicate that in 9.2% of the participating companies (11), this did not happen. while for 90.8% of the companies (109), the answered was 'Yes'. **6(C) Organisation of work** The results indicate that in 13.3% of the participating companies (16), they were not briefed about the organisation of work within their companies, while in 86.7% of the companies (104) the answered was 'Yes'.

For professionals

6(A) Business strategy
The results indicate that in 40.8% of the participating companies (49), this did not happen, while for 59.2% of the companies (71), the answered was 'Yes'.

6(B) Financial performance
The results indicate that in 45.0% of the participating companies (54), they were not informed in this regard, while in 55.0% of the companies (66) the answer was 'Yes'.

6(C) Organisation of work
The results indicate that in 41.7% of the participating companies (50), this did not occur, while in 58.3% of the companies (70), the answer was 'Yes'.

For Clericals/Manual employees

6(A) Business strategy
The results indicate that in 72.5% of the participating companies (87), they were not informed about the business strategy, while for 27.5% of the companies (33) the answer was 'Yes'.

6(B) Financial performance
The results indicate that in 73.3% of the companies (88), this did not happen, while in 26.7% of the companies (32) the answer was 'Yes'.

6(C) Organisation of work
The results indicate that in 54.2% of the participating companies (65), they were not informed about this aspect, while for 45.8% of the companies (55), the answer was 'Yes'.

Question 7

Question 7 ***To what extent do you use the following methods for employees to communicate their views to management?***

A Direct to senior managers
B Through immediate superior
C Through trade union representatives
D Through works council
E Through regular workforce meetings
F Team briefings
G Suggestion schemes
H Employee/Attitude surveys
I Electronic communication

Not at all
To a small extent
To some extent
To a great extent
To a very great extent

Findings

7(A) Directly to senior managers
The findings indicate that the majority of employees (85.9%) communicated their views from a small extent to a very great extent directly to senior management.

7(B) Through immediate superior
The findings indicate that the majority of employees (95.1%) communicated their views to management from a small to a very great extent through the immediate superior.

7(C) Through trade union representatives
The findings indicate that the majority of employees (88.3%) communicated their views from a small to a very great extent through the trade union representatives in the companies.

7(D) Through works councils
The findings indicate that 49.8% of the employees communicated their views to management from a small extent to a very great extent through works councils, while 40.8% of the employees did not use this method.

7(E) Through regular workforce meetings
The findings indicate that the majority of employees (80%) communicated their views to management from a small to a very great extent through regular workforce meetings.

SECTION V – Questions and findings
7(F) Team briefings The findings indicate that the majority of employees (71.7%) communicated their views to management from a small to a very great extent through team briefings, while 19.2% did not use this method at all. **7(G) Suggestion schemes** The findings indicate that 49.7% of employees communicated their views to management from a small to a very great extent through suggestion schemes, while 41.7% did not use this method at all. **7(H) Employee/Attitude surveys** The findings indicate that the majority of employees (52.3%) communicated their views to management from a small to a very great extent through employee attitude surveys, while 39.2% of the companies did not use this method at all. **7(I) Electronic communication** The findings indicate that the majority of the employees (74.2%) communicated their views to management from a small to a very great extent through electronic communication, while 20.0% did not use this method at all.

Results of the findings in section VI of the questionnaire (organisational details)

SECTION VI – Questions and findings
Question 1: ***Please indicate the main sector of industry or services in which you operate.*** ***A Agricultural, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining and quarrying*** ***B Manufacture of food, beverages, textiles, wood and paper, coke and refined petroleum, and related products*** ***C Manufacture of chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and medicinal chemical products*** ***D Manufacture of basic metals and metal products, plastic and other non-metallic products*** ***E Manufacture of computer, electronic products, electrical equipment*** ***F Manufacture of machinery and equipment*** ***G Manufacture of transport equipment*** ***H Other manufacturing*** ***I Electricity, gas, steam, and water supply, waste management*** ***J Construction*** ***K Wholesale and retail trade*** ***L Transportation and storage*** ***M Accommodation and food service activities, publishing, broadcasting activities*** ***N Telecommunications, IT and other information services*** ***O Financial and instrument activities*** ***P Accounting, management, architecture, engineering, scientific research, and other administrative and support service activities*** ***Q Public administration and compulsory social security*** ***R Education*** ***S Human health services, residential care and social work activities*** ***T Other industry or services*** **Findings** The results show that the largest concentration of respondents (28.3%) can be found in the Public Administration and Compulsory Social Security group (34). The results further indicate that in 26.7% of the participating companies (32) – the second largest group – operated in Other Industries and Services. The third largest group comprised two clusters of respondents (6.7% each). These groups can be found in Agricultural, Hunting, Forestry, Fishing, Mining and Quarrying (8) and Manufacture of Food, Beverages, Textiles, Wood and Paper, Coke and Refined Petroleum, and Related Products (8 companies each). These respondents were followed by smaller groupings (4.2% each) in areas such as Electricity, Gas, Steam and Water Supply, Waste Management and Accounting, Management, Architecture, Engineering, Scientific Research, and Other Administrative and Support Service Activities (5 companies each), Of the participating companies, 3.3% (4) could be found in Education while 2.5% of the participating companies (3) could be found in Wholesale and Retail Trade, while a further 2.5% of the participating companies (3) could be found in Telecommunications, IT and Other Information Services and Human Health Services Residential Care and Social Work. A further 1.7% of participating companies (2) could be found in the Manufacture of Basic Metals and Metal Products, Plastic and Other Non Metallic Products and Manufacture of Machinery and Other Equipments respectively. In the other instances, the findings indicate that 1.7% of the participating companies (2) could be found in the manufacturing of transport equipment and, lastly, one (0.8%) company each could be found in the following groups: manufacturing of computers, electronic products, electrical equipment, other manufacturing, construction, transportation and storage, accommodation and food service activities, publishing, broadcasting activities, financial and insurance activities.

Question 1

SECTION VI – Questions and findings	
Question 2	**Question 2** ***Is your organisation in?*** ***A Private Sector*** ***B If private sector, are you a Public Limited Company (on the stock market: Yes No*** ***C Public sector*** ***D If public sector are you: National/Regional/Local*** ***E Business owned and/or controlled by primarily one family*** ***F Family actively involved in its management*** **Findings** **2(A) Private sector** The results indicate that 64.2% of the respondents (77) operated in the public sector, while 35.3% of the respondents (42) operated in the private sector. **2(B) If private sector, are you a public limited lompany (on the stock market)** The results indicate that in 17.5% of the participating companies (21), they operated as a public limited corporation, while 14.2% of the respondents (17) said 'No'. **2(C) If public sector are you: National / Regional / Local** The results indicate that 39.2% of the participating companies (47) operated at local level, while 15.8% of the companies (19) operated at regional level, and 9.2% of the companies (11) operated at national level. **2(D) Business owned and/or controlled by primarily one family** The results show that 25.8% of the participating companies (31) were not family controlled, while 5.8% of the respondents (7) answered 'Yes'. **2(E) Family actively involved in its management** The results show that 1.7% of the participating companies (2) indicated that the family was not actively involved in the management of the company, while 4.2% of the respondents (5) answered 'Yes'.
Question 3	**Question 3** ***What percentage of the operating costs is accounted for by labour costs?*** **Findings** The results indicate that in 14 participating companies, these costs were between 1 and 16%; in 53 companies, between 20 and 50%, and in 29 companies, between 51 and 94%.
Question 4	**Question 4** ***If you are a private sector organisation would you say the gross revenue over the past three years has been?*** ***A Well in excess of costs*** ***B Sufficient to make small profit*** ***C Enough to break even*** ***D Insufficient to cover costs*** ***E So low as to produce large losses*** **Findings** According to 15.8% of the respondents (19), the gross revenue was sufficient to make a small profit, for 5.8% of the participating companies (7), it was enough to break even, while for 4.2% of the companies (5), it was well in excess of costs. However, for 3.3% of the companies (4), the gross revenue was insufficient to cover costs.
Question 5	**Question 5** ***Compared with other organisations in your sector, how would you rate your organisation's performance in relation to the following?*** ***A Service quality*** ***D Rate of innovation*** ***B Level of productivity*** ***E Stock market performance*** ***C Profitability*** ***F Environmental matters*** **Findings** From the findings it would appear that the companies found themselves the strongest in the area of service quality, followed by: the level of productivity, environmental matters, rate of innovation, profitability and lastly stock market performance.
Question 6	**Question 6** ***How would you describe the main market(s) for your organisation's products or services?*** ***A Local*** ***D Continent-wide*** ***B Regional*** ***E Worldwide*** ***C National*** **Findings** The results show that – • for 42.5% of the participating companies (51), markets were local; • for 14.2% of the respondents (17), markets were regional; • for a further 20.8% of the respondents (25), markets were national; • for 7.5% of the participating companies (9), markets were continent-wide, and • for 10.0% of the participating companies (12), markets were worldwide.

SECTION VI – Questions and findings	
Question 7	**Question 7** ***Is the market you currently serve:*** ***Decline to a great extent*** ***Declining to an extent*** ***Not changing*** ***Growing to an extent*** ***Growing to a great extent*** **Findings** The results show that – • for 3.3% of the participating companies (4), markets were declining to a great extent; • for 4.2% of the companies (5), markets were declining to an extent; • for 20.0% of the companies (24), markets were not changing at all, • for 25.8% of the companies (31), markets were growing to an extent, and • for 29.2% of the companies (35), the markets were growing to a great extent.
Question 8	**Question 8** ***Has your organisation been involved in any of the following changes in the last three years?*** ***A Acquisition of another organisation*** ***B Takeover by another organisation*** ***C Merger*** ***D Relocation*** ***E Demerger*** **Findings** The results show that the main activity was in the area of acquisitions, with 21 companies (17.5%) having gone through this process over the preceding three years. This was followed by mergers (16 companies or 13.3%), relocations (16 companies or 13.3%), demergers (15 companies or 12.5%), and takeover by another organisation (14 companies or 11.7%).
Question 9	**Question 9** ***If your answer was "yes" to any of the above (in Q8), when was the personnel/HR department involved in the process?*** • ***From the outset*** • ***Through subsequent consultation*** • ***On implementation*** • ***Not consulted*** **Findings** The results show that in 7.5% of the participating companies (9), HR was not consulted at all, while in 5.0% of the companies (6), HR was consulted on implementation; in 8.3% of the companies (10), HR was involved through subsequent consultation, and in 29.2% of the companies (35), HR was involved from the outset.
Question 10	**Question 10** ***Approximately, please provide the following information about your workforce:*** ***A Annual staff turnover*** ***B Average days absent per employee per annum*** **Findings** **10(A) Annual staff turnover** From the data, it would appear that in the largest number of companies (75), the turnover was less than 10%. This is an acceptable norm in the majority of countries (Elkyaer & Filmer, 2015). However, a more serious staff turnover was evident in 53 companies, where the rate was between 11 and 20%; in 23 companies, the rate was between 21 and 50%; and, lastly, in two companies, the rate was between 51 and 75%. Thirty-nine companies did not respond to this question. It would thus appear that in 50.9% of the companies, the turnover rate was unacceptably high – between 11 and 75%. **10(B) Average days absent per employee per annum** In the majority of participating companies (103), the days absent were less than 10 days per annum per employee, while in 13 companies, it was between 11 and 20 days, and in five companies, this increased to between 21 and 35 days.
Question 11	**Question 11** ***What is the proportion of employees 25 years old and under?*** **Findings** It would appear that – • 33 participating companies (27.5%) had between 1 and 10% of their workforce in this group; • 28 companies (23.3%) had between 11 and 25% of their workforce in this group; • 27 companies (22.5%) had between 26 and 50% of their workforce in this group; • 4 companies (3.3%) had no workers in this group; • 6 companies (3.1%) had between 51 and 75%) of their workforce in this group; and • 2 companies (1.7%) had between 76 and 100% of their workforce in this group. This is an interesting finding, with the majority of the companies (96 companies or 78.1% of the companies) all having some of their employees under the age of 25.

SECTION VI – Questions and findings	
Question 12	**Question 12** ***What is the proportion of employees 50 years old and above?*** **Findings** It would appear that only one participating company (0.8%) had employees who were 50 and older, 30 companies (25.0%) had between 1 and 10% of their workforce in this age category, 39 companies (32.5%) had between 11 and 25% of their workforce in this group, 32 companies (26.7%) had between 26 and 50% of their workforce in this age group, 8 companies (6.7%) had between 51 and 75% of their workforce in this group while one company (0.8%) had between 76 and 100%) of their workforce in this age group.
Question 13	**Question 13** ***What is the proportion of workforce with a higher education/university qualification?*** **Findings** Of the participating companies, 17 companies (14.2%) had between 1 and 10% of their workforce with a university qualification, while only one company (0.8%) had no employees with a university qualification. As far as the other results are concerned, the situation was as follows: • 25 companies (20.8%) had between 11 and 25% of their workforce with a university qualification; • 27 companies (22.5%) had between 26 and 50% of their workforce with such a qualification; • 21 companies (17.5%) had between 51 and 75% of their employees with such a qualification; and • 13 companies (10.8%) had between 76 and 100% of their employees with such a qualification.
Question 14	**Question 14** ***In which country is the corporate headquarters of your organisation based?*** **Findings** The majority of participating companies (82.5%) had their headquarters in South Africa (99) followed by 13 companies (10.8%) indicating 'other'. Two of the companies (1.7%) indicated that their headquarters were in Canada and Switzerland respectively while one each indicated that their headquarters were in France, Japan, Portugal and the USA (0.8% each).
Question 15	**Question 15** ***In what year was your organisation established?*** **Findings** The findings indicate that the majority of companies were established after 1991. Some of these companies were well established in their markets, and should also have had proper HR policies in place, but those that were established more recently might not have had these in place. This tendency can perhaps be related to the democratisation of South Africa in 1994, which resulted in the dropping of sanctions, more business opportunities that became available, and changes to legislation pertaining to doing business in South Africa.
Question 16	**Question 16** ***Is your organisation (or part that you are answering for):*** ***A Corporate HQ of an international organisation*** ***B Corporate HQ of a national organisation*** ***C Subsidiary of an international organisation*** ***D Subsidiary of a national organisation*** ***E Independent organisation with more than one side*** ***F Independent organisation with single site*** **Findings** **16(A) Corporate HQ of an international organisation** Five of the participating companies (4.2%) were part of the corporate HQ of an international organisation. **16(B) Corporate HQ of a national organisation** Of the participating companies, 29 (24.2%) were part of the corporate HQ of a national organisation. **16(C) Subsidiary of an international organisation** Six participating companies (5.0%) were part of a subsidiary of an international organisation. **16(D) Subsidiary of a national organisation** Of the participating companies, 23 (19.2%) were part of a subsidiary of a national organisation. **16(E) Independent organisation with more than one side** Of the participating companies, 16 (13.3%) were part of independent organisation with more than one site. **16(F) Independent organisation with single site** Of the participating companies, 18 (15.0%) were part of an independent organisation with a single site.
Question 17	**Question 17** ***If your organisation is part of a larger group of companies/divisions (including public sector), please indicate where policies on the following issues are mainly determined:*** ***A Pay and benefits*** ***D Industrial relations*** ***B Recruitment and selection*** ***E Workplace expansion/reduction*** ***C Training and development*** ***F Management development*** ***International HQ*** ***National HQ*** ***Subsidiary/Dept.*** ***Site/Establishment***

SECTION VI – Questions and findings

17(A) Pay and benefits

Findings
The findings indicate that, in the current study, the level at which the policies for pay and benefits were determined in the case of most of the companies (29.2%) was national HQ level.

17(B) Recruitment and selection

Findings
The findings indicate that the policies relating for recruitment and selection were mostly determined at subsidiary or department level (20.8%) followed by national HQ level (18.3%).

17(C) Training and development

Findings
The findings indicate that the level at which policies pertaining to training and development were mostly determined was national HQ level (21.7%) and subsidiary or department level (17.5%).

17(D) Industrial relations

Findings
It would appear that the level at which the policies pertaining to individual relations were determined was split between national HQ (20.8%) and subsidiary or department level (20.0%).

17(E) Workplace expansion/reduction

Findings
The findings indicate that the level at which the policies for work expansion or reduction are determined was mostly subsidiary or department level (19.2%) followed by national HQ level (18.3%).

17(F) Management development

Findings
The findings indicate that the level at which the policies relating to Management development are determined was mostly national HQ (21.7%) followed by subsidiary or department level (17.5%).

Personal details about person completing the questionnaire

Question 1 ***Do you work in the HR department of your organisation?***
Yes ***No***

Findings
The results indicate that the majority of the respondents (95.8%) worked in the HR department of their organisation. Only a very small percentage (3.3%) indicated that they did not work in the HR department of the organisation.

Question 2 ***If you are a personnel/HR specialist, how long have you been working in a specialist personnel/HR or training job?***
Years ***Not applicable***

Findings
The results indicate that the average number of years the respondents had been working as a specialist personnel/HR was 12.5 years.

Question 3 ***Are you the most senior personnel/HR manager in the organisation?***
Yes ***No***

Findings
The results clearly show that in 30.8% (37), the respondents were not the most senior HR managers in their companies, while in 60.8% (73), they were.

Question 4 ***Are you:***
Male ***Female***

Findings
The results show that 36.7% were male, and 62.5% were female.

Question 5 ***How long have you been working in the organisation?***
Years ***Not applicable***

Findings
It would appear from the results, that the average number of years the respondents had been working in the organisation was 9.2 years.

SECTION VI – Questions and findings	
Personal details about person completing the questionnaire	**Question 6a** ***Do you have a university degree?*** ***Yes*** ***No*** **Findings** The results indicate that 29 respondents (24.2%) did not have a university degree, while 89 respondents (74.2%) did have a university degree. Hence, the majority of HR managers had university degrees. **Question 6b** ***If yes, in what main academic field did you study for your most advanced degree?*** ***A Business studies*** ***B Economics*** ***C Social or behavioural sciences*** ***D Humanities/Art/Languages*** ***E Law*** ***F Engineering*** ***G Natural Sciences*** ***H Other*** **Findings** The results show that – • 31.7% (38 respondents) had a degree in Business Studies; • 0.8%, in Economics; • 21.7%, in Social/Behavioural Sciences; • 10.8%, in Humanities/Languages; • 3.3%, in Law; • 0.8%, in the Natural Sciences; and • 5% had degrees in other disciplines. The results clearly show that the most popular area of study for the HR specialist participating in this research was Business Studies followed by Social or Behavioural Sciences.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this report, the following recommendations can be made in terms of the management of employees in companies or organisations in South Africa:

1) better formal involvement of the HR function in the development of the company strategy is needed;
2) better evaluation of the performance of the HR function is needed;
3) flexible work practices should become an integral part of the business strategy;
4) management of staff turnover needs to be addressed;
5) better use of 360 degree appraisals is required;
6) attitude surveys among workers should be used on a regular basis;
7) better cooperation between HR and line managers regarding the formulation of policies across HR activities is needed;
8) Better evaluation of the effectiveness of training provided;
9) flexible benefits should be made available to all staff members;
10) companies should pursue the use of company and commercial websites more actively to recruit employees;
11) the use of assessment centres to appoint staff to management level should be encouraged more;
12) the involvement of HR from the outset in mergers, acquisitions, etc. should be encouraged more actively;
13) the matter of very few HRISs currently being used in companies should be investigated; and
14) companies need to address the use of mentoring and coaching in the area of career development, as this is currently extremely low.

Summary

There is no doubt that the world of work has changed dramatically and continues to do so. This has an effect not only on employees' working lives, but also on their future survival. For HRM to address these challenges successfully, the traditional role HR has fulfilled thus far will fall short; hence, the need to redesign the HRM role. One method to achieve this is through the re-engineering of the HR processes, namely the development of high-performance work practices (HPWPs). However, although re-engineering will reduce waste and result in more satisfied internal clients, it will not change the fundamental role that HR professionals play in the company or the value they add to shareholders. Research suggests that, if HR professionals are to succeed, they must first work with top management to contract for a new or realigned role before pursuing the re-engineering route. This should take place after the contract process. Three tactics can be followed to achieve success:

1) contracting with line management for a new role for HR;
2) identifying and developing new HR competencies; and
3) redesigning HR work systems and the organisation.

Each tactic on its own cannot effect change; there is therefore a need for the three tactics to be implemented together.

APPENDIX A – QUESTIONNAIRE

HOW TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to make completion as easy and fast as possible. Most questions can be answered by simply ticking boxes. Very little information will need to be looked up.

This questionnaire asks you about the Personnel/Human Resource (HR) policies and practices in the organisation or part of the organisation (Division, Business Unit) for which you have Human Resource Management responsibility.

Please indicate below the organisational unit to which the answers in the questionnaire refer:

a. Is your organisation part of a larger Group of companies/institutions? **Yes** □ 1 **No** □ 0

b. If yes, are you answering for the whole Group in your country? **Yes** □ 1 **No** □ 0

The questionnaire has been created for simultaneous use by private and public sector employers in 40 countries; some questions may therefore be phrased in a slightly unfamiliar way.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION

© CRANET, 2014

SECTION I: HRM ACTIVITY IN THE ORGANISATION

1. Approximately how many people are employed (on the payroll) by your organisation?

In total _____ Male _____ Female _____

2. Please give proportions for the following:

A. Managers ____% of workforce
B. Professionals (without managerial responsibility ____% of workforce
C. Clerical and/Manuals ____% of workforce

TOTAL = 100%

3a. Do you have an HR department?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

3b. If yes, approximately how many people are employed in the personnel/human resources (HR) department by your organisation?

In total _____ Male _____ Female _____

4. Does the person responsible for HR have a place on the Board or equivalent top executive team?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

5. From where was the person responsible for HR recruited (Please tick only one).

A. From within the personnel/HR department □ 1
B. From non-personnel/HR specialists in your organisation □ 2
C. From personnel/HR specialists outside of the organisation □ 3
D. From non-personnel/HR specialists outside of the organisation □ 4

6. Does your organisation have a written:

		Yes	No
A.	Mission statement	□ 1	□ 0
B.	Business/service strategy	□ 1	□ 0
C.	Personnel/HRM strategy	□ 1	□ 0
D.	HR recruitment strategy	□ 1	□ 0
E.	HR training & development strategy	□ 1	□ 0
F.	Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)* statement	□ 1	□ 0
G.	Diversity statement	□ 1	□ 0

*CSR generally refers to the practice of operating a business in a manner that goes beyond what is normally required by law to meet broader ethical and public expectations.

7. If your organisation has a business/service strategy, at what stage is the person responsible for personnel/HR involved in its development? (Please tick only one)

A. From the outset □ 3
B. Through subsequent consultation □ 2
C. On implementation □ 1
D. Not consulted □ 0
E. Not applicable (do not have a business strategy) □ 9

8. Who has primary responsibility for major policy decisions on the following issues?
(Please tick one per row)

	Line Management	Line Mgt. in consultation with HR dept.	HR dept in consultation with line Mgt.	HR Department
A. Pay and benefits	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
B. Recruitment and selection	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
C. Training and development	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
D. Industrial relations	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
E. Workforce expansion/reduction	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4

9. To what extent do you outsource the following areas to external providers?

	Not outsourced	Outsourced to a small extent	Outsourced to some extent	Outsourced to a great extent	Completely outsourced
A. Payroll	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
B. Pensions	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
C. Benefits	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
D. Training and development	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
E. Workforce outplacement/reduction	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
F. HR Information systems	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
G. Recruitment	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
H. Selection	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
I. Processing routine queries from Managers/employees (e.g. HR call centre)	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4

10. Do you use the following to deliver HRM activities?

A. Human resource information system (HRIS) or electronic HRM system **Yes** □ 1 **No** □ **0**

B. Manager self-service * **Yes** □ **1** **No** □ **0**
*Functionality of an electronic HR system that allows managers to handle many HR-related tasks for their employees directly, rather than relying on the HR department to do these

C. Employee self-service* **Yes** □ **1** **No** □ **0**
*Functionality of an electronic HR system that allows an employee to handle many HR-related tasks for themselves e.g, changing personal details, booking holiday, claiming expenses

11. To what extent is the performance of the personnel/human resources function/department evaluated? (Please tick one of the following)

Not at all				**To a very great extent**
□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4

SECTION II: RESOURCE PRACTICES

1. How has the total number of employees (full time equivalents) in your organisation changed since three years ago? (Please tick one box only)

Decreased to a great extent		**Not changed**		**Increased to a great extent**
□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5

2. Have you used any of the following methods to downsize the organisation (through reducing the number of people employed or other means to decrease cost)?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
A. Recruitment freeze	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
B. Early retirement	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
C. Internal transfer (redeployment)	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
D. Voluntary redundancies/Attrition	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
E. No renewal of fixed term/temporary contracts	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
F. Unpaid study leaves/vacations	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
G. Outsourcing	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
H. Management pay-cut	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
I. Ban on overtime	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
J. Wage freeze	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
K. Reduced job proportions	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
L. Job sharing	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
M. Reduced benefits	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
N. Employee pay-cut	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
O. Individual layoffs (1-4% of workforce laid in 12 months period)	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
P. Concentrated layoffs (5-9 laid off in 12 months period)	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
Q. Mass layoffs/compulsory redundancies (10% or more of workforce in 1-3 months period)	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4

3. Please indicate which of the following recruitment methods are used for each staff category.

	Managers		Profes-sionals		Clerical/ Manuals		Generally not used	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
A. Internally	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
B. Word of Mouth/employee referrals	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
C. Vacancies in newspapers	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
D. Vacancy page on company website	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
E. Vacancies on commercial job websites	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
F. Social Media (e.g. Facebook)	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
G. Speculative applications/walk-ins (directly from educational institution)	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
H. Career Fairs	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
I. Recruitment agencies/consultancies/executive search	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
J. Job centres (public)	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
K. Trainee program	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0

4. Please indicate which of the following selection methods are used in your organisation?

	Managers		Profes-sionals		Clerical/ Manuals		Generally not used	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
A. Interview panel	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
B. One-to-one interviews	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
C. Application forms	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
D. Psychometric test	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
E. Assessment centre	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
F. Social media profiles	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
G. References	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
H. Ability tests/Work sample	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
I. Technical tests	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
J. Numerical test	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
K. Online selection tests	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0

5. **Does your organisation have action programmes covering any of the following groups to improve their participation in the workforce:**

For the following groups of people:	Recruitment		Training		Career progression		Group not addressed	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
A. Minority ethics	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
B. Older workers (aged 50 plus)	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
C. People with disabilities	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
D. Women	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
E. Women returners	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
F. Low skilled labour	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
G. Younger workers (aged under 25)	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0

6. **Please indicate the approximate proportion of those employed by your organisation who are on the following working arrangements. (list continues on next page)**

	Not used	5% or less	6-10%	11-20%	21-50%	>50%
A. Weekend Work	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
B. Shift work	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
C. Overtime	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
D. Annual hours contract	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
E. Part-time work	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
F. Job sharing	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
G. Flexi-time	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
H. Temporary/casual	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
I. Fixed-term contracts	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
J. Homebased work (workers whose normal workplace is home but who do not have permanent electronic links to a fixed workplace)	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
K. Teleworking (technology-based) (workers who can link electronically to a fixed workplace)	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5
L. Compressed working week	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5

SECTION III: EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT

1. **Do you have a formal appraisal system for the following categories of the workforce?**

A. Management No □ 0 Yes □ 1
B. Professionals without managerial responsibility No □ 0 Yes □ 1
C. Clericals/Manuals No □ 0 Yes □ 1

2. **If you have an appraisal system, who formally is expected to make an input/provide data for the appraisal process?**

	Management		Professionals		Clericals/Manuals		Generally not used	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
A. Immediate supervisor	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
B. Supervisor's superior	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
C. The employee himself/herself	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
D. Subordinates	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
E. Peers	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0

3. Is the appraisal data used to inform decisions in the following areas:

		Yes	No
A.	Pay	□ 1	□ 0
B.	Training and development	□ 1	□ 0
C.	Career moves	□ 1	□ 0
D.	Workforce planning	□ 1	□ 0

4. Do you <u>systematically</u> estimate the need for training of personnel in your organisation?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

5. Approximately what proportion of the annual payroll costs is currently spent on training?

0%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	8%	9%	10%	>10%	Don't know
□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ 6	□ 7	□ 8	□ 9	□ 10	□ 11	□ .9

6. Approximately, how many days training per year do employees in each staff category below receive on average?

A. Management ____ days per year per employee
B. Professionals ____ days per year per employee
C. Clerical/Manuals ____ days per year per employee

7a. Do you <u>systematically</u> evaluate the effectiveness of training of personnel in your organisation?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

7b. If <u>yes</u>, which of the following techniques does your organisation use to evaluate training effectiveness?

		Used	Not Used
A.	Total number of days training undertaken per employee per year	□ 1	□ 0
B.	Meeting the objectives set out in the training and development plan	□ 1	□ 0
C.	Reaction evaluation immediately after training	□ 1	□ 0
D.	Measured job performance before and immediately after training	□ 1	□ 0
E.	Measured job performance before and some months after training	□ 1	□ 0
F.	Informal feedback from line managers	□ 1	□ 0
G.	Informal feedback from employees	□ 1	□ 0
H.	Return on investment	□ 1	□ 0

8. To what extent do you use the following methods for career development:

		Not at all				To a very great extent
A.	Special tasks	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
B.	Projects to stimulate learning	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
C.	Training on-the-job	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
D.	Participation in project team work	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
E.	Formal networking schemes	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
F.	Formal career plans	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
G.	Development centres	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
H.	Succession plans	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
I.	Planned job rotation	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
J.	"High flier" schemes	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
K.	International work assignments (experience)	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
L.	Coaching	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
M.	Mentoring	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
N.	Computer based packages/ e-learning	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4

SECTION IV: COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

1. At what level(s) is basic pay determined for the following staff categories?

	Managers		Professionals		Clericals/ Manuals		Generally not used	
	Yes	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
A. National/industry-wide (collective bargaining)	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
B. Regional collective bargaining	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
C. Company/division, etc.	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
D. Establishment/site	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
E. Individual	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0

2. Do you offer any of the following:

	Managers	Professionals	Clericals/ Manuals	Generally not used
A. Employee share schemes	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 0
B. Profit sharing	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 0
C. Stock options	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 0
D. Flexible benefits	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 0
E. Individual performance related pay	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 0
F. Bonus based on individual goals/ performance	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 0
G. Bonus based on team goals/performance	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 0
H. Bonus based on organisational goals/performance	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 0
I. Non-monetary incentives	□ 1	□ 1	□ 1	□ 0

3. Do you offer any of the following schemes in <u>excess of statutory requirements</u>?

	Yes	No
A. Workplace childcare (subsidized or not)	□ 1	□ 0
B. Childcare allowances	□ 1	□ 0
C. Career break schemes	□ 1	□ 0
D. Maternity leave	□ 1	□ 0
E. Paternity leave	□ 1	□ 0
F. Parental leave*	□ 1	□ 0
G. Pension schemes	□ 1	□ 0
H. Education/training break	□ 1	□ 0
I. Private health care schemes	□ 1	□ 0
J. Flexible/cafeteria benefits		

* **Parental leave refers to leave given to a parent to look after a child outside of maternity/paternity leave, for instance, to care for a sick child.**

SECTION V: EMPLOYEE RELATIONS AND COMMUNICATION

1. What proportion of the total number of employees in your organisation are members of a trade union? (Please round up to the nearest full percentage)

0%	1%-10%	11%-25%	26%-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Don't know
□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ 6	□ .9

2. To what extent do trade unions influence your organisation?

Not at all				**To a very great extent**
□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4

3. Do you recognise trade unions for the purpose of collective bargaining?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

4. Do you have a joint consultative committee or works council?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

5. To what extent do you use the following methods to communicate major issues to your employees?

		Not at all				To a very great extent
A.	Direct to employees	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
B.	Through immediate superior	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
C.	Through trade union representative	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
D.	Through works council	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
E.	Through regular workforce meetings	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
F.	Team briefings	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
G.	Electronic communication	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4

6. Which employee categories are formally briefed about the following issues?
(Please tick as many as applicable).

		Managers		Professionals		Clericals/Manuals		Generally not used	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
A.	Business strategy	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
B.	Financial performance	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0
C.	Organisation of work	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0	□ 1	□ 0

7. To what extent are the following methods used by employees to communicate their views to management?

		Not at all				To a very great Extent
A.	Direct to senior managers	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
B.	Through immediate superior	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
C.	Through trade union representatives	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
D.	Through works council	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
E.	Through regular workforce meetings	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
F.	Team briefings	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
G.	Suggestion schemes	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
H.	Employee/ Attitude surveys	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
I.	Electronic communication	□ 0	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4

SECTION VI: ORGANISATIONAL DETAILS

1. Please indicate the main sector of industry or services in which you operate

A. Agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining and quarrying □ 1
B. Manufacture of food, beverages, textiles, wood and paper, coke and refined petroleum, and related products. □ 2
C. Manufacture of chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and medicinal chemical products. □ 3
D. Manufacture of basic metals and metal products, plastic and other non-metallic products □ 4
E. Manufacture of computer, electronic products electrical equipment. □ 5
F. Manufacture of machinery and equipment. □ 6
G. Manufacture of transport equipment. □ 7
H. Other manufacturing. □ 8
I. Electricity, gas, steam, and water supply, waste management. □ 9
J. Construction □ 10
K. Wholesale and retail trade □ 11
L. Transportation and storage. □ 12
M. Accommodation and food service activities, publishing, broadcasting activities. □ 13

N. Telecommunications, IT and other information services. □ 14
O. Financial and insurance activities. □ 15
P. Accounting, management, architecture, engineering, scientific research, and other administrative and support service activities. □ 16
Q. Public administration and compulsory social security. □ 17
R. Education. □ 18
S. Human health services, residential care, and social work activities. □ 19
T. Other industry or services □ 20

2a. Is your organisation:

Private sector □ 1

If private sector, are you a Public Limited Company (on the stock market) Yes □ 1 No □ 0

Public sector □ 2

If public sector, are you: National □ 1 Regional □ 2 Local □ 3

Not for profit □ 3

Mixed (public and private sector) □ 4

2b. Is the business owned and/or controlled by primarily one family?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

3. What percentage of the operating costs is accounted for by labour costs?

_____ % of operating costs Don't know □ .9

4. <u>If you are a private sector organisation</u>, would you say the gross revenue over the past 3 years has been:

A. Well in excess of cost □ 5
B. Sufficient to make a small profit □ 4
C. Enough to break even □ 3
D. Insufficient to cover costs □ 2
E. So low as to produce large losses □ 1

5. Compared to other organisations in your sector, how would you rate the performance of your organisation in relation to the following:

	Poor or at the low end of the industry	Below average	Average or equal to the competition	Better than average	Superior	Not applicable
A. Service quality	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ .9
B. Level of productivity	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ .9
C. Profitability	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ .9
D. Rate of innovation	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ .9
E. Stock market performance	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ .9
F. Environmental matters	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ .9

6. How would you describe the main market(s) for your organisation's products or services? (please tick only one)

A. Local □ 1
B. Regional □ 2
C. National □ 3
D. Continent-wide □ 4
E. World-wide □ 5

7. Is the market you currently serve:

Declining to a great extent	Declining to an extent	Not changing	Growing to an extent	Growing to a great extent
□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5

8. Has your organisation been involved in any of the following changes in the last 3 years?
(Tick all that apply)

		Yes	No
A.	Acquisition of another organisation	□ 1	□ 0
B.	Takeover by another organisation	□ 1	□ 0
C.	Merger	□ 1	□ 0
D.	Relocation	□ 1	□ 0
E.	Demerger	□ 1	□ 0

9. If your answer was yes to any of the above (in Q8), when was the personnel/HR department involved in the process? (Tick only one)

A. From the outset □ 3
B. Through subsequent consultation □ 2
C. On implementation □ 1
D. Not consulted □ 0

10. Approximately, please provide the following information about your workforce:

A. Annual staff turnover ____% turnover per year Don't know □ .9
(Turnover is calculated as the % of the total workforce that have left the organisation in the past year)

B. Absenteeism/sick leave ____ average days per employee per year Don't know □ .9.

11. What is the proportion of employees 25 years old and under?

0%	1%-10%	11%-25%	26%-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Don't know
□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ 6	□ .9

12. What is the proportion of employees 50 years old and above?

0%	1%-10%	11%-25%	26%-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Don't know
□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ 6	□ .9

13. What is the proportion of the workforce with a higher education/university qualification?

0%	1%-10%	11%-25%	26%-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Don't know
□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4	□ 5	□ 6	□ .9

14. In which country is the corporate headquarters of your organisation based?
(Please refer to ultimate parent company if your organisation is part of a larger group).

_____

15. In what year was your organisation established (YYYY)?

_____ Don't know □ .9

16. Is your organisation (or part that you are answering for):

A. Corporate HQ of an international organisation □ 1
B. Corporate HQ of a national organisation □ 2
C. Subsidiary of an international organisation □ 3
D. Subsidiary of a national organisation □ 4
E. Independent organisation with more than one side □ 5
F. Independent organisation with single site □ 6

17. If your organisation is part of a larger group of companies/divisions, etc. (including public sector), please indicate where policies on the following issues are mainly determined.

	International HQ	National HQ/ Headquarters	Subsidiary/ Dept./ division	Site/ establish-ment Local offices
A. Pay and benefits	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
B. Recruitment and selection	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
C. Training and development	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
D. Industrial relations	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
E. Workforce expansion/reduction	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4
F. Management development	□ 1	□ 2	□ 3	□ 4

PERSONAL DETAILS

1. Do you work in the HR department of your organisation?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

2. If you are working in the HR department, how long have you been working as a specialist personnel/HR or training job?

_____ Years Not applicable □ .9

3. Are you the most senior personnel/HR manager in the organisation?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

4. Are you: Male □ 1 Female □ 2

5. How long have you been working in the organisation?

_____ Years Not applicable □ .9

6a. Do you have a university degree?

Yes □ 1 No □ 0

6b. If yes, in what main academic field did you study for your most advanced degree?

A.	Business studies	□ 1	E.	Law	□ 5
B.	Economics	□ 2	F.	Engineering	□ 6
C.	Social or behavioural sciences	□ 3	G.	Natural Sciences	□ 7
D.	Humanisties/Art/Languages	□ 4	H.	Other	□ 8

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

APPENDIX B – DATABASES USED

Databases used in the survey

A **Foreign companies**

Foreign companies in South Africa Yearbook (2007). Published by the Commercial intelligence Service, a division of Business Monitor International, Blackfriars, London (http://www.businesmonitor.com).

B **Companies listed on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange**

Profile's Stock Exchange Handbook, June–September 2012. Published by Profile Media, Houghton, Johannesburg.

C **Government departments, provincial government departments and municipalities**

- ***A*** South African Government Directory, dated 12 September 2012
- ***B*** Government Communication System (http://www.gcis.gov.za) accessed on 6 December 2012
- ***C*** The Department of Provincial and Local Government, 14 November 2012

D **Non-listed companies**

Bureau van Dyk Orbis Financial Information System (SA) 2012.

Regarding the size of companies, the following guidelines were followed for this research project:

100–499 employees	Small
500–999 employees	Medium
1 000 and more employees	Large

APPENDIX C – REFERENCES

American Psychological Association. 2004. *Assessment centres help companies identify future managers*. Available at: http://www.apa.org/research/action/managers.aspx [accessed on: 28 June 2018].

Arvidson, M, Lyon, F, McKay, S & Mro, D. 2013. "Valuing the social? The nature and controversies of measuring social return on investment (SROI)", *Voluntary Sector Review*, 4(1):3–18.

Avert. 2018. *HIV fact sheets.* Available from: https://www.avert.org/learn-share/hiv-fact-sheets [accessed on: 28 June 2018].

Belcourt, M, Bohlander, G & Snell, S. 2011. *Managing Human Resources*. 6th ed. Torronto: Nelson Education.

Bloomberg. 2015. *HR Department Benchmarks and Analysis 2015–2015*. Available from: https://www.bna.com/uploadedFiles/BNA_V2/HR/Products/Surveys_and_Reports/HR%20Department%20Benchmark%20and%20Analysis%202015-16_Executive%20Summary.pdf [accessed 29 June 2017].

Botha, D. 2017. "Barriers to career advancement of women in mining: A qualitative analysis", *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 41:15–32.

Brewster, C & Hegeswisch, A (eds). 2017. *Policy and practice in European human resource management: The Price Waterhouse Cranfield Survey*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Burke, RJ & Cooper, CL. 2009. *The peak performing organisation*. London: Routledge.

Cascio, WF. 2003. *Managing human resources*. 6th ed. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Choudhary, V. 2015. *Why is the human resource profession dominated by women? Department Benchmarks and Analysis 2015–2015*. Available from: https://www.quora.com/Why-is-the-human-resource-profession-dominated-by-women-Statistics-of-various-surveys-depict-that-70-of-the-human-resources-profession-is-dominated-by-women-It-is-just-because-women-are-empathetic-and-have-a-better-emotional-intelligence-EQ [accessed 20 June 2018].

Edmonds, I. 2013. *Urbanisation in South Africa*, 9 September 2013. Vanderbuilt University. Available from: https://my.vanderbilt.edu/f13afdevfilm/2013/09/urbanization-in-south-africa/ [accessed 21 June 2018].

Elkyaer, D and Filmer, S. 2015. *Trends and drivers of workforce turnover*. Available at: https://www.mercer.com/content/dam/mercer/attachments/global/webcasts/trends-and-drivers-of-workforce-turnover-results-from-mercers-2014-turnover-survey.pdf [accessed on: 28 June 2018].

Evans, S. 2015. "A permanent job is hard to find", *Mail & Guardian,* 2 October 2015. Available from: https://mg.co.za/article/2015-10-01-a-permanent-job-is-hard-to-find [accessed 21 June 2018].

Grobler, PA & Wärnich, S. 2016. “Human Resource Development (HRD) practices in local vs foreign companies in South Africa: is there a difference?” *Journal of Contemporary Management* 13:702–724.

Israelstam, I. 2013. “Is reference checking legal?“, *HR Pulse.* Available from: http://www.hrpulse.co.za/recruitment/screening/229284-is-reference-checking-legal [accessed 21 June 2018].

Lepak, D & Gowan, M. 2017. *Human resource management: managing employees for competitive advantage*. 3rd ed. Chicago, IL: Chicago Business Press.

Marchington, M & Wilkinson, A. 2012. *Human resource management at work*. 5th ed. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.

Meyer, T. 2016. *Shaping Africa’s talent*. Randburg: KR Publishing.

Moffat-Bruce, SD, Hefner, JL, Mekhjian, H, McAlearney, JS, Latimer, T, Ellison, C and McAlearney, AS. 2017. What is the return on investment for implementation of a crew resource management program at an academic medical centre? *American Journal of Medical Quality* 32(1):5-11.

Mullar, R & Hall, K. 2013. “Social return on investment (SROI) and performance measurement: the opportunities and barriers for social enterprises in health and social care”, *Public Management Review*, 15(6):23–41.

Noe, RA, Hollenbeck, JR, Gerhart, B & Wright, PM. 2017. *Human resource management*. 10th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Ono, T, Lafortune, G & Schoenstein, M. 2013. *Health workforce planning in OECD countries: A review of 26 projection models from 18 countries*. OECD Health Working Papers, 62. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Paterson, H & Uys, K. 2005. “Critical issues in psychological test use in the South African workplace”, *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology,* 31(3):12-22.

Paton, C. 2018. “Government in move to trim public service“, *BusinessDay.* Available from: https://www.businesslive.co.za/bd/national/2018-06-14-government-in-move-to-trim-public-service/ [accessed 27 June 2018].

Republic of South Africa. Health Professions Act amended 1974, amended 2008. *Government Gazette*, 31433. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 1995. Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995. *Government Gazette*, 16861. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. 1998. Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998. *Government Gazette*, 19370. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Republic of South Africa. Skills Development Levies Act 9 of 1999. *Government Gazette*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Saridakis, G & Cooper, CL. 2013. *How can HR drive growth?* Cheltenham: Edgar Elgar.

Smith, J. 2014. "Four reasons why fairs aren't a total waste for companies", *Business Insider*, March 7. Available from: http://www.businessinsider.com/how-employers-can-benefit-from-job-fairs-2014-3?IR=T [accessed 21 June 2018].

Snell, S, Morris, SS & Bohlander, GW. 2016. *Managing human resources*. 17th ed. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Society for Human Resource Management. 2015. *How organizational staff size influences HR metrics*. Available from: https://www.shrm.org/ResourcesAndTools/business-solutions/Documents/Organizational%20Staff%20Size.pdf [accessed 26 May 2017].

Sparrow, P, Hird, M, Hesketh, A & Cooper, CL. 2010. *Leading HR*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Staff. 2017. "2017 Training industry report". Available from: https://trainingmag.com/trgmag-article/2017-training-industry-report/ [accessed 26 June 2018].

Statistics South Africa. 2017. "Quarterly labour force survey – QLFS: Q4:2017". Available from: http://www.statssa.gov.za/?p=10884 [accessed 19 June 2018].

UNAIDS. 2016. *Global AIDS update 2016*. Available from: http://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/global-AIDS-update-2016_en.pdf [accessed on: 28 June 2018].

Wärnich, S, Carrell, MR, Elbert, NF & Hatfield, RD. 2018. *Human resource management in South Africa*. 6th ed. Andover: Cengage Learning.

World Economic Forum. 2017. "Global competitiveness report 2017-2018". Available from: https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2017-2018 [accessed 14 June 2018].

Zeuch, M. 2016. *Handbook of Human Resources Management Vol 2*. Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg Germany.

APPENDIX D – LANGUAGE EDITING CERTIFICATE

Jackie Viljoen
Language Editor and Translator
16 Bergzicht Gardens
Fijnbos Close
STRAND 7140

Accredited member of the South African Translators' Institute
No APSTrans 1000017
Member of the Professional Editors' Group (PEG)

☎ +27+21-854 5095 082 783 0263 086 585 3740
Postal address: 16 Bergzicht Gardens, Fijnbos Close, STRAND 7140 South Africa

DECLARATION

I hereby certify that the report by **PROF. PA GROBLER, MS S WÄRNICH & MR G MOKOBANE** was properly language edited but without viewing the final version.

The track changes function was used and the author was responsible for accepting the editor's changes and for finalising the reference list.

Title of report:
CRANET – UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA SURVEY:
HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN SOUTH AFRICA
Report on the South African findings

The editor did not write or rewrite any part of the report on behalf of the client, including passages that may have been plagiarised. The academic content is the sole responsibility of the client as author of the work. The editor could not and did not test definitively for plagiarism, nor is there any explicit or implicit guarantee that the content that was edited contained no material used without consent. The editor accepts no responsibility for any failure regarding acceptance of this report.

JACKIE VILJOEN
Strand
South Africa
02 July 2018