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A questionnaire survey was conducted into 93 large South African organisations, mostly public companies based in the PWV region but with some national representation. The questionnaire comprised open and closed ended questions aimed at soliciting information on the de facto practices with regard to human resource policy formulation and implementation.

Three human resource policy issues were selected for the study; Industrial Relations policy, as many large South African companies are unionised and because there are well established legal prescriptions governing practices in this area. The other policies selected were AIDS and Affirmative Action, as they are both more recent developments requiring policy statements and as there are currently no legal prescriptions in these areas.

The major findings of this exploratory research are both interesting and significant. The more salient of which include the following: the process, steps and factors involved in policy formulation and implementation are the same across the three policies; and there is a broad
spectrum of stakeholders involved with varying degrees of influence and interest. Although not dealt with in the literature, a major finding was the myriad of complex competencies required by human resource practitioners involved in this process, including policy conceptualisation, consensus building and implementation skills.

In conclusion, the method used proved to be highly successful in identifying the wide variety of factors involved in policy formulation and implementation, and led to the development of an empirically based generic model aimed at assisting human resource practitioners and organisations in the complex process of human resource policy formulation and implementation.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 1, some background to the research and the rationale for embarking on this exploratory research is discussed. Chapter 2 is a detailed literature review into the area of policy formulation, implementation and stakeholder theory. Significant prior research into these areas is examined within the context of the formulation and implementation of policy. This Chapter concludes with the research questions. The research methodology used in this research as well as limitations and key assumptions are detailed in Chapter Three. The findings of the research are presented in Chapter Four, followed with an analysis and interpretation of the results in Chapter Five. Finally the research report is concluded in Chapter Six with the conclusions and recommendations for possible future research.

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

There can be little doubt that South Africa is moving towards a new, different and in many ways a more challenging business environment. The stability and predictability of the 1950’s and 1960’s has been replaced by ambiguity, paradox and an increasing rate of change (Human and Berhan, 1990).

As stated by Post (1978), organisations of all sizes and types face the challenge of operating in a social setting that is increasingly complex and inherently political. He states that the manner in which organisations respond to this commercial and social complexity is fundamental to their institutional legitimacy and their business survival. He further states that the most challenging frontiers
of professional management today are probably those in which change is occurring most rapidly, where the least is known, where the most speculation occurs, and where the opportunities for imaginative executive leadership are greatest (Post, 1978).

Today, organisations are recognised to be "open", inextricably interwoven and thus interdependent with the complex fabric of their environment (Emery, 1969). Business in South Africa has increasingly been called upon to become involved in activities and issues that transcend the boundaries of the traditional management of the firm and take part in the social restructuring of society (Bernstein, 1988; Burgess, 1989; Godsell, 1987). Tromp (1990) emphasises the rate at which the environment is changing and points out that not only the rate of change but also the complexity of change poses specific threats to organisations should they not be able to adapt and adjust proactively.

According to Freeman (1984), the environmental shifts that have occurred place a need for a radical re-thinking of our model of the firm (be it a production or a managerial viewpoint). He further states that we need a theory or set of concepts which can turn external change into internal change, thereby reducing uncertainty and discomfort. Such an "intellectual" or "conceptual" move serves as a legitimising force so that changes can be positively managed. Freeman (1984) thus suggests that one possible approach to this conceptual problem of dealing with the external environment of the firm is to redraw the picture of the firm. This must take into account all of those groups and individuals that can affect, or are affected by the accomplishment of the organisational purpose. Furthermore, each of these groups play a vital role in the success of the business organisation, and each of these groups have a "stake" in the modern corporation.

1.2 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Thus, a key problem facing South African organisations today is how to best respond to the fast changing socio-political environment. The formulation and
Implementation of policy is a critically important function of human resource management and is an expression of the organisation's interface with its environment. Beach (1980) states that policy is a statement of intention committing management to a general course of action. He further points out that certain personnel policy statements may contain elements of philosophy. Where these policy commitments or philosophies are found to be in conflict with the environment, difficulties are inevitable.

Famularo (1972) thus points out that policy formulation and implementation is a job that is never finished, as conditions inevitably and continuously change. The question is whether the socio-political and other environmental changes are being taken into account in the process of human resource policy formulation and implementation.

As research into human resource policy formulation and implementation has not been widely published, particularly in a South African context, the following aims were decided on for this research:

1. To identify what are the factors involved in the process of human resource policy formulation and implementation.

2. To determine who the stakeholders are in the formulation and implementation of selected human resources policies.

3. To establish whether the formulation and implementation process is different for different types of policies.

The research approach was designed to establish who are considered to be the stakeholders in the formulation and implementation of selected human resource policies. Having identified who these stakeholders are, the research examines whether these "perceived" stakeholders are actually involved in the policy formulation and implementation process.
Thereafter, the research aimed to evaluate the implementation approach used by various companies against Foster's (1989) pre-forms recommendation on how an employment or social policy may be formulated, adopted and implemented. The research also examined the methods used to communicate the selected human resource policies.

Finally, the research aimed to bring all the factors and processes identified as playing a role in policy formulation and implementation into a common framework. An overall framework to human resource policy formulation and implementation is offered.

1.3 Importance of the Research

That an espouse move towards developing a more participative working environment is currently uppermost on many organisational and managerial plans cannot be doubted. For example, Hofmeyr (1993) comments that a participative approach to affirmative action would suggest that all the individuals and groups who have a stake in the decisions taken and the programmes implemented, should participate in the process.

In contrast to what Hofmeyr (1993) is suggesting, human resource policies have tended to remain unchanged for fairly long periods of time and in certain cases appear to have evolved from a strong "legal" base. In other words, companies have tended to only develop human resource and industrial relations policies in response to a legal or other prescriptive requirement. Douwes-Dekker (1990) points out how one of South Africa's corporate giants rely heavily on the legal system in managing their industrial relations. "The emphasis is not on Industrial Relations, but on how to exercise legal control over any union's actions which are seen to move towards centralised bargaining", Douwes-Dekker (1990, p232).

In view of the above contradictions and the fact that human resource policy formulation and implementation has not enjoyed wide coverage, a need exists to
know what the current situation is on human resource policy in South Africa. There is a distinct paucity of literature, both locally and internationally, on the subject. The lack of empirical data on the subject further emphasises the importance of the research.

1.4 LIMITATIONS AND KEY ASSUMPTIONS

The following limitations are detailed:

The research sample has been broadly categorised into two groups. Group one being the companies where the 1993 Post Graduate Diploma in Management (PDM) students from the Wits Business School carried out their two month practical internship.

The second category of the sample was identified as those companies where the researcher was able to gain reasonable access to data. All companies in this sample employ in excess of 250 people. These convenience and judgemental methods of sampling have limitations with regard to the generalizability of the findings.

A number of the respondents in the second category of the population are generally known to the researcher. This could have influenced the responses of these participants in completing the questionnaire in a manner that would make their companies appear more favourable than they actually are.

The research is limited to identifying those factors that influence the formulation and implementation of a selected number of human resource policies. The factors covered cannot be considered exhaustive or all embracing.

Data was collected using a questionnaire. Although data collection via this method is extensively used in social sciences research, it may be argued that there is a large element of bias in the use of questionnaires. The researcher also brings
into the research his own interpretations and personal bias.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The research report is structured in the following manner:

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

This Chapter deals with the literature review and commences with deconstructing the often misunderstood and misused notion of policy. The three human resources policies that formed the basis of the research, namely Industrial Relations, Aids and Affirmative Action are examined and contextualised.

An integral part of ensuring the success of any policy issues, is the involvement of the critical and often less obvious parties who have an interest in the policies. The notion of stakeholders is therefore analysed. This all provides the rationale and framework within which the factors influencing the formulation and implementation of certain human resource policies are considered.

Chapter 3 - Research Methodology

The research process is discussed in detail in this Chapter. Specifically the survey population, sample structure and design of the questionnaire are expanded on. The process of validating the questionnaire and method of collecting data are detailed. The survey method of data collection is also examined in detail.

Chapter 4 - Research Results

This research has essentially been exploratory and descriptive in nature. The limited statistical analysis, sample demographics and sample composition are described. The analysis of the findings is dealt with in this chapter including a discussion of the analytical techniques employed and the corresponding findings.
Chapter 5 - Discussion and Interpretation of the Results

This Chapter begins with an analysis of the relevance of the findings and the relevance in terms of the reviewed literature. The findings with regard to the research questions are detailed and discussed. A suggested framework to be followed in the process of policy formulation and implementation is developed.

Chapter 6 - Conclusion and Recommendations

In this Chapter, the final conclusions are drawn. The scope and limitations of the research are discussed. The major findings made with regard to the identification of the key stakeholders and processes involved in human resources policy formulation and implementation are presented. The contribution which this report may make to the existing body of knowledge is detailed and suggestions and recommendations for future research are made.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Human Resource policy formulation and implementation has not enjoyed wide coverage in academic literature. As a result there is a distinct dearth of literature both locally and internationally on the subject.

In this Chapter the often misunderstood and misused notion of policy is explored in detail. The relationship between policy and strategy is examined. Policy is defined for the purpose of this report after which the various forms that policy takes is examined. This is followed by an overview of the three human resource policy issues that have been selected for this study, namely Industrial Relations, Aids and Affirmative Action.

A detailed examination of the processes of policy formulation and implementation follows. As policies are essentially designed to regulate and influence the behaviours of the people and the organisations, an examination of the concept of "stakeholders" follows. Finally, these concepts and principles are integrated and the research questions introduced.

2.1 POLICY VERSUS STRATEGY

The terms Policy and Strategy are often used interchangeably. It is therefore necessary to, for the purposes of this research, distinguish between these terms after which policy can be defined. Torrington and Hall (1991) point out that the word "Policy" causes more confusion than clarity among managers, as it means so many different things to different people. They emphasise that any discussion of
the issues lying behind policy requires careful definition of terms.

Allen (1983, p10-11) defines policy as "a standing decision that applies to recurring questions and problems of concern to the organisation as a whole. Strategy on the other hand, is defined as the general approach to be followed in achieving an objective".

Policy is defined by Torrington and Hall (1991) as a declared mode of action for the future. They say the objective of policy is to set a framework within which action can be taken. It is not to analyse what has gone wrong in the past - though that may be a preliminary step to the policy formulation stage.

The distinction, as previously mentioned, between strategy and policy is seldom clear. Strategy is usually related to planning what is to be achieved, while policy is the framework within which the plans to implement the strategy will be put into operation.

Stoner and Wankel (1986) provide contrasted definitions:

"Strategy is the broad programme for defining and achieving an organisation's objectives, the organisation's response to its environment over time" (Stoner and Wankel 1986, p695).

"A policy is a general guideline for decision-making. It sets up boundaries around decisions, including those that can be made and shutting out those that cannot. In this way it channels thinking of the organisation members so that it is consistent with organisational objectives" (Stoner and Wankel 1986, p91).

Fombrun, Tichy and Devanna (1984) suggest that strategic management involves consideration of the following:
1. Mission and Strategy
2. Formal Structure
3. Human Resource Systems

Fombrun, et al, (1984) state that the organisation needs a sense of being. This they refer to as the mission. A sense of how to display materials, information, and people to carry out the mission is referred to as the strategy. Figure 1 presents the basic elements of mission and strategy, formal structure, and human resource management as interrelated systems that are embedded in a turbulent environment.

"This framework elaborates the traditional view of how a firm should think about strategic management by including human resource management as an integral tool that managers can use in the strategic arena of their organisations" (Fombrun et al, 1984, p35).

FIGURE 1: STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL PRESSURES (Fombrun, Tichy, Devanna 1984, p35)
For the purposes of this study, it is not deemed pertinent to elaborate further on the concept of strategy. However, strategy must be defined in the context of this research. Stoner and Wankel's (1986) definition of strategy is considered most appropriate. Hence strategy is defined as "the broad programme for defining and achieving an organisation's objectives, the organisation's response to its environment over time".

2.2 POLICY DEFINED

INTRODUCTION

Torrington and Hall (1991) state that when coming to consider personnel policy as part of the total policy framework, there is again a problem about definition. The following phrases have been found and all seem to be used to mean the same thing: Personnel policy, Manpower policy, Employment policy, Human Resource policy, Employee Relations policy and Industrial Relations policy.

A number of definitions of policy are given in the literature:

"A policy is a plan of action. It is a statement of intention committing management to a general course of action. When management drafts a policy statement to cover some future of its personnel programme, that statement may often contain an expression of philosophy as well" (Beach 1980, p35).

A policy has been defined as a statement of objectives and a strategy for their achievement (Salamon, 1987). A policy is a set or system of principles by appeal to which we can consider the question as to what should be done in a certain set of circumstances (Horwitz, 1987). It reflects a system of principles which guides managerial interaction with employees and which communicates the following to
employees at all levels:

(a) The organisation's philosophy or core values about its employees;
(b) Acceptable and unacceptable behavioural standards; and
(c) Reference points for establishing the organisation's approach to employees, for example, the freedom of association.

According to Brewster and Richbell (1982), the first issue that needed to be determined was what constituted an organisation's personnel policy. Their research led to the definition of personnel policy as: "A set of proposals and actions that act as a reference point for managers in their dealings with employees" (Brewster et al 1982, p35). This definition of policy is, for the purposes of this study, considered most relevant and appropriate.

2.2.1 FORMS OF POLICY

Beach (1980) contends that policies should be in writing. Although this proposition may seem self-evident, countless companies have never bothered to reduce their practices, customs and traditions to writing. Beach (1980) states that many executives are actually opposed to writing the personnel policies on paper and disseminating them to all employees. They contend that such action would tie their hands and limit their freedom of action.

Policies, according to Beach (1980) are usually stated in broad terms. Written policies should not tie the hands of management so that it cannot use some discretion and flexibility in handling particular cases. They are designed to aid the operation of the business, not impede it.

Beach (1980) is of the view that only when policies are reduced to writing can they be communicated to employees. He believes that in large organisations containing many dispersed plants, it is almost a necessity to have written policies.
Brewster and Richbell (1982) state that there appears to be two forms of personnel policy within an organisation. The more obvious form they have termed the "espoused" policy. This refers to the collection of proposals, objectives and standards that top management hold and/or state they hold for establishing the organisation's approach to its employees. It includes the more formal written aspects of policy contained in various documents, statements and agreements and also verbal statements of intent made by top management.

The other form of policy is referred to as "operational" policy. This refers to the action or behaviour of managers and supervisors according to a set of defined principles. Espoused and operational policies may conflict with each other. When seen in the context of Industrial Relations, Horwitz (1987), has added that the espoused policy reflects good intent, whereas the operational policy reflects a pre-occupation with goal achievement such as optimisation of production output. The operational policy may more accurately signal the de facto organisational climate and practices.

Finnemore and Van der Merwe (1989) have noted that industrial relations policy statements may be brief and general or detailed and much longer in the form of in-company manuals or booklets. Cohen (1990) states that booklets and longer policy documents are directed primarily within the company whereas brief and general policy statements are aimed both inside and outside the organisation.

One of the principle aims of this research is to determine what forms the human resource policies selected take in South Africa.

2.2.2 AREAS OF POLICY RESEARCH

As it is not possible to research all of the areas of human resource policy, it was necessary to identify a cross section of suitable policies for the
purpose of this study. Three policy areas were included:

Industrial Relations policy essentially because most large South African organisations have some form of unionisation as well as the fact that there is a fair amount of legislation prescribing minimum practices in this area. A further factor being that many organisations have had policies in this area for a number of years.

Aids and Affirmative Action were the other policy issues identified primarily because they are more recent issues to have emerged and many organisations are in the process of grappling with how to address them. They also have a very different emphasis to Industrial Relations, as there is no current legislation prescribing minimum practices. These policies would seem to be more inclined to facilitate a participative process of formulation and implementation.

2.2.2.1 INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY

According to Brewster, Gill and Richbell (1981) the concept of an "Industrial Relations Policy", when discussed, is rarely defined. Their analysis indicates that an industrial relations policy is seen as a set of proposals and actions. These establish the organisation's approach to its employees and act as a reference point for management.

As referred to above, they have distinguished between what they have defined as espoused policy and operational policy. When policies are formalised it is the espoused policy which management commits to paper. The operational policy in contrast, is the way senior management are seen to order industrial
relations priorities vis-a-vis those of other policies. This is done through the mechanisms of restrictions, control and direction that they impose on line management.

Salamon (1987) has noted that a clearly defined industrial relations policy is fundamental to the development and maintenance of an orderly industrial relations system within the organisation. He further states that a company's industrial relations policy expresses the organisation's overall philosophy towards its employees and its conduct of industrial relations affairs.

In determining the role of an industrial relations policy, Prinsloo (1990), has noted that its primary function is to: remove uncertainty from the minds of the managers; promote consistency in management approaches and decisions while still allowing differing approaches and decisions on versus sets of facts or circumstances; promote the continuity of industrial relations principles; and to serve as a standard of performance in the monitoring of industrial relations.

Cohen (1990) believes that the industrial relations policy should be communicated to all employees so that they are aware of and able to assess management's intention. He suggests that it is therefore advantageous that it should be set out in a "formal written document". Cohen (1990) further supports this view for the following reasons:

(a) The discipline and precision required in
producing such a document helps management to clarify its thoughts and intentions.

(b) A written document ensures that managers, supervisors, shop stewards and employees receive the same information.

c) A written policy may be easier to change in the light of changed circumstances than one based solely on custom and practice.

Industrial relations and human resources policies constitute two distinct categories. While a relationship exists between them, the human resource management policies address the individual employee within the company. The industrial relations policies, on the other hand, are intended to regulate the relationship between management and employees, management and organised labour and management and external agencies that play a role in industrial relations. It is clear, however, that both categories of policy influence the industrial relations climate within the company and vice versa (Prinsloo, 1990).

Cuthbert (1973) suggests that underlying the expression of a policy are certain values and constraints. He further suggests that industrial relations policies should be designed in terms of the following variables: Objectives, Framework, Standards and Principles. Various guidelines for the presentation of an industrial relations policy are suggested. Cohen (1990) emphasises the importance, in this regard, of drawing a distinction between
policies and procedures. Mixing them up may easily give a false impression of, for example, rigidity. Salamon (1987) has also drawn a distinction between policies, procedures and practices. Policy reflects the organisation's overall philosophy while procedure is the operational mechanism which details and regulates the manner in which a specified issue is to be handled. Practice, on the other hand has been defined as a set of decisions or actions which are made in response to a given problem or situation.

The industrial relations policy should be integrated with and supportive of the organisation's corporate business strategy, as well as reflect the interaction of industrial relations with policies in other areas such as production, marketing or finance (Brewster and Richbell, 1982).

The wide meaning and interpretation of the concept of industrial relations policy is in itself confusing. For the purpose of this research, it is not possible to distinguish between the various forms of industrial relations policy. The focus is more on the espoused policy and its form as opposed to the operational policy.

2.2.2.2 AIDS POLICY

Kerrigan (1991) points out that whilst the subject of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) has enjoyed much publicity, very few of the authors agree as to the extent of the future problem for South African employers.
This highlights what is currently the main problem facing employers and that is the uncertainty of the likely effect of Aids in the workplace.

The intention is not to cover the history or background to Aids, but rather to introduce some of the policy issues that arise out of this situation for employers.

Whiteside (1992) points out that employers face the problem of Human Immuno-Deficiency Virus (HIV) infection among workers as a result of which they will have to address the following issues:

- Dealing compassionately with the employee during the period of asymptomatic infection and eventual illness.
- Other workers may need education on Aids before they are willing to work with an infected colleague.
- The effect on certain employee benefits such as medical aid, pensions, death benefits and insurance.
- The potential for a decline in production and efficiency.

The whole question of dismissing an employee with HIV/Aids is a highly controversial and emotionally explosive one, requiring very careful consideration for policy purposes. Gon and Pellinat (1992) state that the employer only has an obligation to inform other employees that someone has Aids when that employee presents a health risk to fellow employees. They contend that dismissal for HIV/Aids may
only be a consideration where the employee's incapacity is of a permanent nature or for a prolonged period and where the employer cannot fairly be expected to continue the employment relationship.

The intention is not to go into a lengthy review of HIV/AIDS but rather to introduce some of the policy implications as relevant to this research. What is abundantly clear from the above is that organisations will have to give very careful consideration to the significant future impact Aids could have on the organisation. The formulation and implementation of a policy on such a sensitive and emotional issue will not only require very careful planning but will of necessity have to enjoy wide support for effective implementation. This will require extensive consultation and education.

2.2.2.3 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

Niel-Boss (1993) believes that there can be little doubt that affirmative action will soon become a powerful instrument of policy. Properly applied as a mechanism for eradicating racial prejudice and creating equality of opportunity, he believes, it is unquestionably a force for good. Niel-Boss (1993) is of the view that apartheid was the first great experiment in affirmative action; it failed because it was morally indefensible, politically untenable and economically destructive.

The South African Chamber of Business (SACOB) suggests that the basic policy principle on which affirmative action is based is that the removal of formal or obvious
discrimination against members of a target group is not sufficient to eliminate the effects of past discrimination nor to eradicate all the informal barriers to advancement which may have taken root in a climate of discrimination. Affirmative action, therefore, implies comprehensive measures to nullify the complex legacy of systems of privileged access to occupational and business opportunity, SACOB (1993).

Affirmative Action policy, according to Alpersoh (1992), should have its emphasis on empowerment and training.

Pinaar (1992) states that the basis of the affirmative action programme in Barlows Equipment Company is that there cannot be any discrimination based on race, gender or disability.

Eskom adopted its first affirmative action policy in 1986, but according to Dawn Mokobo, Senior Manager, Human Resources, "I don't think much happened then - the political climate was not supportive", Alpersoh (1992, p54). The company had in 1991 formalised its commitment to adopt an official equal opportunity policy, which Eskom call "harmonisation". Eskom has a two-pronged approach to affirmative action. Its external focus examines how "harmonisation" can lead to a more equalised society while the internal focus is on changing the organisation from the inside to adapt to current social needs.

Innes (1993) states that the aim of the African National Congress' affirmative action policy is to ensure that people who are discriminated against in the work situation, are empowered to enable them to gain access to and compete
for all posts, including those at high level.

Innes (1993) sets out the African National Congress' affirmative action strategy as to: improve the life circumstances of the oppressed; develop children; flexible access to tertiary education; flexible entry requirements into occupations; career development planning; and introduction of a mentorship system. Innes (1993) further points out that the International Labour Organisation (ILO) are in the process of investigating the legal possibilities for affirmative action in South Africa. It is anticipated that, together with local lawyers, the ILO is likely to propose an affirmative action legal code for South Africa. In this regard it is believed that the code is likely to follow the Namibia model: declaring designated groups; forcing disclosure of information; and stipulating that companies should set targets.

If the above serves as a reasonable base on what is to be expected for the future in the area of affirmative action, then there can be little doubt that organisations will sooner or later be faced with having to formulate and implement policies to address this issue.

2.2.2.4 CONCLUSION

The diversity of issues that arise out of the literature review of the three policies selected, namely Industrial Relations, Aids and Affirmative Action, confirms they are ideally suited as a basis against which to examine the process of policy formulation and implementation.
The process of policy formulation varies greatly depending on the nature of the policy being formulated and the organisational climate and culture, (Cohen 1990). According to Foster (1989), germane to the formulation of any policy is the employer/employee relationship. Policy formulation, according to Cohen (1990), is the process of determining the boundaries of limits within which the company will allow management to exercise power.

According to Hofmeyr (1993), the process of policy formulation in South Africa is based on a "top - down" philosophy. Hofmeyr (1993) further states that management takes decisions, formulates and implements policy in a somewhat autocratic way. Management feels comfortable with this approach in that a top-down approach generally fits the "culture" of many South African organisations.

In this section, the process of policy formulation is examined firstly by reviewing the objectives of policy formulation. A framework within which policy formulation takes place is examined as are the standards and principles that can be applied in this process. The nature of policy formulation and the difference between the actual policy applied versus the stated policies are considered from an industrial relations perspective.

2.3.1 OBJECTIVES

In the formulation of any policy, the objective and purpose of the policy is the most important starting point.

As Cuthbert (1973) points out there are certain values and constraints underlying the expression of a policy. When dealing with the design of an industrial relations policy, he points out that these variables should be taken into consideration. The objectives that any industrial relations policy should cover, according to Cuthbert (1993), include: the development of
mutual trust and co-operation; prevention of problems and disputes through agreed procedures; reduction of labour costs; strengthening of managerial control; development of manpower skills and management of productivity.

Where policies are formulated without having given careful prior consideration to the underlying objectives, the very essence of the policy becomes questionable.

3.2 FRAMEWORK

Policy formulation is influenced by a wide variety of factors. McGregor (1991) has classified policy formulation into two main areas. The first is termed the "synoptic approach" in which managers are described as being more ambitious and confident of their ability to treat problems comprehensively and analytically. There is essentially one decision maker namely the "autocratic manager". The second approach is termed the "strategic planning approach". In this approach, policy requirements are determined from strategic goals. This approach attempts to link policy statements to strategic goals and objectives in a more structured framework.

Torrington and Hall (1991) have said that the two most common methods of devising personnel policies are both inadequate. One is to use the policy of another organisation as a model; the other is to start with a blank piece of paper to produce something that sounds good. Copying from elsewhere usually means that the policy will be at best very vague and at worst inappropriate through having first been devised for a different situation. The inadequacy of starting with a blank piece of paper is that the writing is likely to reflect the values and prejudices of the author rather than the needs of the organisation and its employees.
According to Cohen (1990), the framework for an industrial relations policy has four features:

(i) Management accountability
(ii) Management initiative
(iii) Acceptance of both the legitimate functions of management as well as the trade union
(iv) Distinction between policy and practice

The literature outlines the various methods adopted in policy formulation and emphasises the necessity to develop policies that are appropriate to the situation having followed a particular process.

2.3.3 STANDARDS

Torrington and Hall (1991) point out that policy is only as good as the practice it produces. They offer a three-part rule for policy formulation:

(i) Policy does not translate into effective practice without a commitment to both the policy and the measures needed to make it work.

(ii) Commitment is more likely when the policy develops out of issues in the organisation itself, and

(iii) Where the policy is devised and later sustained, by the involvement of all those affected by it.

In dealing with industrial relations policy formulation Cohen (1990) states that the initial formulation of the policy may rest with the Human Resources Department. The integration of such a policy with other functional areas may be achieved through senior management as a group
accepting responsibility for authorising the industrial relations policy, as well as ensuring its implementation by managers. Cohen (1990) continues to say that the acceptance of such responsibilities is a demonstration to both unions and employees of senior management's commitment to the policy.

2.3.4 PRINCIPLES

The formulation of an acceptable joint industrial relations policy is a lengthy process, requiring the recognition, acceptance and reconciliation of different attitudes, beliefs and philosophy. Ignoring such differences would result in a policy statement which would be ambiguous and lead to mutual recriminations and claims of breach of faith.

Cohen (1990) emphasises that there are a number of principles that industrial relations policy must conform to. Some of the more important include any legal requirements as well as issues such as the freedom of association. Hofmeyr (1993) points out that South Africa is moving away from a society based on exclusion to one based on inclusion. He further states that for any important issues requiring policy decisions, "legitimacy" of these decisions will only be possible where there has been meaningful participation.

Hofmeyr (1993) further states that studies of individual and organisational behaviour asserts powerfully that there are many advantages to participation. These include: people understand more about something they have contributed to; people are more committed to something they have been involved in formulating; if participation leads to the empowerment of people, it releases the potential of individuals to perform effectively; and the knowledge, experience and insights of the people at whom the process is directed can be tapped.
A fundamental principle for successful policy formulation in the future must therefore be one of inclusion and participation.

### 2.3.5 NATURE OF POLICY

When dealing with the nature of industrial relations policy, Salamon (1987), proposes a grouping of the major issues for inclusion in the policy. He suggests that these may be conveniently grouped under the following five headings: managerial principles, the relationship between management and employees, the determination of terms and conditions of employment, the approach to employment and finally the role of procedures in resolving problems.

### 2.3.6 ESPoused Verses Operational Policy

Brewster et al (1981), note that Personnel Managers are very aware that espoused policies are not always carried out in practice. They suggest that the reason for this is that because of the very nature of personnel policies, their implementation does not lie with the personnel department but rather with the general or line managers in their day-to-day relationship with the workforce.

Horwitz (1987) has noted that the main strategic objective regarding industrial relations policy is for the espoused policies to become operationally legitimate.

The realisation that personnel managers are often not directly involved in the implementation of many personnel policies is a fundamental first step to the understanding of why espoused policies are not always operationalised (Brewster et al, 1981).
In posing the question, why is there more need for participation, Hofmeyr (1993) states that the reason has to do partly with the changes taking place in our society. However haltingly, we are moving away from a society based on exclusion to one based on inclusion. There is a realisation that negotiation, talking and listening are vital (Hofmeyr, 1993). There is an increasing importance being attached to the "legitimacy" of decisions taken and programmes implemented. Put simply, decisions taken without the meaningful participation of those involved are not accepted.

It is Cohen's (1990) contention that policy should be formulated with the involvement of line management and supervision, who will be required to interpret and apply the policy within their day-to-day operational decisions. He further states that line management should understand, implement and communicate the policy once it has been formulated by senior management. They should therefore be afforded the opportunity to influence the policy.

Cohen (1990), in dealing with joint determination in industrial relations issues points out that grievance, discipline and retrenchment procedures may be negotiated with a union, drafted by management in consultation with the union or other employee representatives or unilaterally instituted by management. Bendix (1989), points out that the unilateral implementation of such policies where there is active employee representation is not recommended.

Consultation and participation at the formulation stage may assist in ensuring understanding between senior management and lower levels of the management hierarchy, between line management and industrial relations specialists and also assist in generating commitment to the final policy amongst all levels of management (Salamon, 1987).
Salamon (1987) has noted that the extent to which employee or union representatives should be involved in determining the industrial relations policy depends on whether management regard it solely as an expression of management objectives for the guidance of management.

2.3.8 CONCLUSION

The literature review emphasises the inadequacy of what is described as current practice in respect to policy formulation whilst also pointing out the many pitfalls to be avoided. However, there is clearly no empirical evidence on the question of human resource policy formulation. The need for further research in this area will unquestionably be of value to a future body of knowledge on the subject.

2.4 POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

The process of implementation of policy is a critical one which often does not enjoy proper attention. Brewster and Richbell (1982) point out that if other functions are to be convinced of the vital role personnel has to play, then personnel specialists must devote more attention to strategies which will secure implementation of their policies.

In this section the policy implementation process is examined firstly by considering the presentation and format of policy followed by a look at the policy implementation process. Finally, a review of the responsibility for implementation follows.

2.4.1 PRESENTATION AND FORMAT OF POLICY

Policies take on many forms with the presentation being viewed as an
important factor depending on the type of policy. In dealing with industrial relations policy, Cohen (1990) offers a set of guidelines for presentation. These include: type of language which should be clear and simple; policy statement must be unambiguous; policy statement must not need interpretation and the rationale behind the policy must be explained.

The format of policies may vary from an unwritten informal policy to one that is formal and published in a company handbook.

2.4.2 POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Brewster and Richbell (1981) point out that many sound personnel policies, although formally accepted by the organisation, are never implemented. Torrington and Hall (1991) emphasise the same point and suggest that there is a critical need for close attention to the implementation of policy as many declarations of policy seldom get beyond the stage of being agreed in principle.

Organisations must not only formulate "strategic policies" but will also have to determine how these policies are to be implemented. It may therefore be necessary to formulate an implementation strategy to aid in implementing policy. The nature of the implementation of policy will vary with the level at which they are to be implemented. Higgins and Vincze (1986) suggest that at the top management level policies may deal largely with management philosophies of staffing, leading and motivating whereas by the time these policies reach the operational level of the organisation, they may be quite detailed. This detail may be in terms of how employees will be developed, how managers will treat employees, what systems will be employed and so forth.

According to Higgins and Vincze (1986), the implementation of the master strategy is divided into four main areas namely organisational structure,
implementation systems, management of human resources and management of culture and shared values. The areas of communication, motivation and leadership style are identified as critical factors in the implementation of human resource strategy.

Torrington and Hall (1991), in dealing with policy implementation, suggest that there are four steps in putting the final policy into operation: Publicity, Procedures, Monitoring and Modifying.

Brewster et al (1981), believe that if other functions are to be convinced of the vital role personnel has to play, then personnel specialists must devote more attention to strategies which will secure the implementation of their policies.

Cohen (1990), states that partial or non-implementation of policies occurs in a number of South African organisations. This is so as personnel policy statements are often not perceived as wholly sincere. He further states that the implementation of the Industrial relations policy and procedural changes are most likely to be subject to joint regulation with trade unions through collective bargaining.

It is clear from the above that where insufficient attention is given to the policy implementation process, many policies will not become operationalised.

2.4.3 RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

"Sometimes it seems as though a great many very talented personnel specialists are wasting an awful lot of time ... they develop sensible, well thought-out policies that would make their company one of the most progressive and highly respected of employers. And then they see their efforts continually frustrated and subverted by a management team that
seems determined to ignore most of what the personnel department does”, (Brewster and Richbell 1982, p38).

They point out that this is so as the actual implementation does not always rest with the personnel department. Rather the responsibility lies with the general or line managers in their day-to-day relationships with the workforce.

Salamon (1987) has added that it is the very complexity and uniqueness of each situation which ensures that even when policies and procedures are well defined, there is still a need for individual management discretion in the implementation of the policy. The implementation of a policy is not carried out by senior management, rather by line management and supervisors in their daily interaction with employees. Top management support and guidance to line management is, however, important.

Horwitz (1987) states that industrial relations and human resources managers play the role of facilitator and advisor by giving advice and assistance to those responsible for managing industrial relations at the interface.

In dealing with affirmative action policy implementation, Hofmeyr (1993, p33) says that “the process needs to be made more participative so that the stakeholders who are so vital to its acceptance and success can contribute to its design and implementation”.

Foster (1989) believes that for the effective implementation of policy, a "check-list" should be devised, reflecting practical actions which members of the organisation can take to give effect to policy. Foster (1989) further suggests that such a list can serve as a tool for self measurement and at the same time serve as a practical basis for the evaluation of progress against targets.
As Foster's (1989) model on the implementation of human resource policy has been used as a basis for evaluating the implementation process, it is necessary to outline the steps he suggests:

- The formulation of the content of the policy
- The gaining of management commitment
- The gaining of worker support
- Refining the document
- Communicating the policy
- Ensuring implementation of the policy
- Ensuring effectiveness of implementation of the policy
- Keeping the policy current

Hence the research aims at empirically testing and refining this model.

2.4.4 CONCLUSION

Policy implementation is clearly an essential and critical part of the process and the above would seem to suggest that where specific processes or steps have either been overlooked or ignored there is a high probability of the policy not being successfully implemented. It is also clear that specific implementation strategies have to be formulated to ensure policies actually come to fruition.

2.5 STAKEHOLDERS

The literature covered confirms an increasing need to have more participation for policy issues to be legitimised. For meaningful involvement, it is necessary to, in the first instance, identify who the stakeholders are in the various policy issues.

In this section the concept of stakeholders is defined after which the expectations of stakeholders are considered. The stakeholder concept is explored as is the
stakeholder framework and the management of the stakeholder relationship. This section concludes with a look at the role of stakeholders in the process of policy formulation and implementation.

2.5.1 STAKEHOLDER DEFINED

According to Freeman (1984), the word "stakeholder" first appeared in the management literature in an internal memorandum at the Stanford Research Institute (SRI) in 1963. It was meant to generalise the notion of stockholders as the only group to whom management need be responsive. The term "stakeholders" was thus defined as those groups without whose support the organisation would cease to exist (Freeman, 1984). Stakeholders refers to groups of constituents who have a legitimate claim on the firm (Freeman, 1984; Pearce, 1982). This legitimacy is established through an exchange relationship. Hill and Jones (1992) state that each of these groups can be seen as supplying the firm with critical resources (contributions) and in exchange each expects its interests to be satisfied by inducements.

According to Hofmeyr (1993), a participative approach to Affirmative Action would suggest that all the individuals and groups who have a stake in the decisions taken and the programmes implemented should participate in the process. He suggests that the most obvious stakeholders in an Affirmative Action approach are the following: Managers, Employees, Trade Unions and Political Groups.

2.5.2 STAKEHOLDER EXPECTATIONS

The stakeholder theory thus suggests that a firm has obligations not only to shareholders and customers, but to all individuals and organisations with which it has transactions and relations (Sturdivant, 1979). According to
Honeyborne (1987), management would not be able to formulate corporate strategy without first understanding the needs and concerns of the stakeholder groups. If corporate strategy failed to take account of stakeholder groups, the support would not be forthcoming to ensure continued survival of the firm.

According to Hill and Jones (1992), the expectations are as follows: Stockholders provide the firm with capital. In exchange they expect the firm to maximise the risk adjusted return on their investment. Creditors provide the firm with finance and in exchange they expect their loans to be repaid on schedule. Managers and employees provide the firm with time, skills and human capital commitments and in exchange they expect fair income and adequate working conditions. Customers supply the firm with revenues and in exchange expect value for money. Suppliers provide the firm with inputs and seek fair prices and dependable buyers. Local communities provide the firm with locations, a local infrastructure and perhaps favourable tax treatment and in exchange, they expect corporate citizens who enhance and do not damage the quality of life. The general public, as tax payers, provide the firm with a national infrastructure, in exchange, they expect corporate citizens who enhance and do not damage the quality of life and do not violate the rules of the game established by the public through their legislative agents (Hill and Jones, 1992).

Manning (1988) further argues that the demands of these various stakeholders are usually in conflict and are seldom in alignment with management goals. In effect, these individuals and groups "vote" for or against the success of the organisation and self interest always prevails. He further states that once business had to deal with a few easy to identify stakeholders and now every manager has multiple constituencies, including insiders - employees - but also many outsiders, suppliers, customers, competitors, government, media, civic bodies and trade unions. Each has a different perception of reality, a different agenda, different ways of making its presence felt and different power to play with.
According to Hill and Jones (1992), stakeholders differ with respect to the size of their stake in the firm. They say that the magnitude of an individual actors’ stake is a function of the extent to which that actor’s exchange relationship with the firm is supported by investments in specific assets. By specific assets, we mean assets that cannot be redeployed to alternative use without a loss of value.

For example, employees with general purpose skills and knowledge can leave the firm and be replaced without productivity loss to either worker or the firm (assuming efficient labour markets). In such cases, their “stake” is low. Alternatively, employees with skills that are uniquely tailored (specialised) to the requirements of the firm, cannot leave without bearing substantial exit losses.

According to Hussey and Langham (1979), stakeholders are influenced by their perception of the firm, its markets and the environment. The ways in which employees perceive profit, for example, will affect their view of what the firm should achieve, its strategy and its wages policy, and is a potential recipe for conflict.

According to their perceptions of the firm and also their own requirements as individuals, so the stakeholder groups will behave. Furthermore, it is partly from the behaviour of the stakeholders that the management of the firm draws its own perception and in turn causes the organisation to behave in a particular way, (Hussey and Langham, 1979).

Thus, it is the responsibility of management of the firm to not only interpret the requirements of its stakeholders, but to decide which objectives it will meet and which it will not. It is therefore critical that for organisations to survive, management have the necessary competencies in order to interpret and manage stakeholder relationships effectively, (Bussin 1992).
According to Freeman (1984), the original work of the Stanford Research Institute (SRI) led to the stakeholder theory being used and applied in corporate planning, systems theory, corporate social responsibility theory and organisation theory.

The systems model of stakeholders re-emphasises participation and is a far reaching view of the nature of organisations and society. Furthermore, it has been quite useful in problem formulation and represents an ongoing stream of research using the stakeholder concept.

The question of corporate social responsibility of business organisations was also re-evaluated with reference to the stakeholder concept developed at SRI (Freeman, 1984). According to Freeman (1984), the distinguishing feature of the literature on corporate social responsibility is that it can be viewed as applying the stakeholder concept to non-traditional stakeholder groups who are usually thought of as having adversarial relationships within the firm. As a result, less emphasis is placed on satisfying owners and comparatively more emphasis is put on the public or community of employees.

Freeman (1984) states that the organisation theory literature stops short, for the most part, of producing a framework for setting and implementing direction in organisations. He further states that Thompson's (1976) classic study of organisations resurrected the notion of clientele as a way to designate outside groups, and put the notion quite simply that we are now working with those organisations in the environment which makes a difference to the organisation in question.

According to Freeman (1984), it is precisely this notion of "those groups who make a difference" which underlies the stakeholder relationships. His approach is primarily concerned with the management of the relationships
of those groups which make a difference. Or stated differently, how can executives in corporations begin to understand and manage in the external environment which they currently face?

Hence this research aims to identify those stakeholders who are considered important in the process of human resource policy formulation and implementation and in turn to examine the gap with regard to the actual involvement of these stakeholder groups.

2.5.4 STAKEHOLDER FRAMEWORK

Freeman (1984) states that from a rational perspective, a business needs to understand who the stakeholders are in the situation that are the perceived stakes. Secondly, business and the organisational processes used to either implicitly or explicitly define the organisation’s relationships with its stakeholders and whether these processes "fit" with the rational "stakeholder" map of the organisation.

Finally, the businesses must understand the set of transactions or bargains among the organisation and its stakeholders and decide whether these negotiations "fit" with the stakeholder map and the organisational processes for stakeholders. Freeman (1984) thus starts his model on stakeholders by firstly examining the "enterprise strategy" and by answering the question "what do we stand for?".

The model in Figure 2 discusses the following factors: stakeholder analysis; values analysis and societal issues.
Freeman (1984) thus suggests that in form!ulating enterprise strategy, stakeholder analysis is used to help executives think through the effects that their actions have on external groups at a macro level. Furthermore, he suggests that without such an analysis, answering "what do we stand for" will be done in a vacuum and the result may well not be acceptable to those groups whom it will affect.

Hence the understanding of the needs, values and expectations of the stakeholders is critical to the successful formulation and implementation of policy.
The move today is from stakeholder influence towards stakeholder participation and co-operation (Dill, 1975; Van Den Bergh, 1992). Through a co-operative strategy, a firm builds goodwill, credibility and trust with its stakeholders (Tombari, 1984). Furthermore, Tombari (1984) states that the firm is thus able to combine its own long-run objectives with those of its constituency and enables the firm to manage stakeholder expectations without manipulating.

Binedell (1987) states that stakeholder management is becoming increasingly important in South Africa, as multiple stakeholders make demands on organisations. He further states that the traditional managerial model of the firm has as the stakeholders, the customers, suppliers and their employees. He argues that in turbulent times, this is too narrow a focus and that the model of stakeholder analysis should be broadened to include the forces and issues that work in the macro environment.

According to Sturdivant (1979), the most efficient and effective strategies for managing stakeholder relations involves efforts which simultaneously deal with issues affecting multiple stakeholders. Furthermore, in order for the stakeholder management process to occur, a company must first be aware of its strategic options, and secondly have participative input from a number of people with diverse backgrounds and knowledge of different stakeholder groups (Sturdivant, 1979).

Binedell (1987) states that in order to understand the stakeholders, organisations need to systematically engage, understand, negotiate and respond to various stakeholders' interests in order to play a more effective role. Such analysis will furthermore give new insight to management and broaden their understanding of the values and assumptions that are driving behaviour in society and more specifically, their marketplaces. Thus,
organisations should try and find methods of managing through a fundamentally different paradigm of organisation management.

Finally, the notion of stakeholder management does not suggest that managers must change their attitudes to conform with activists or vice versa, nor does it imply that managers should roll over and play dead in the face of opposing views (Sturdivant, 1979). It does argue strongly for recognising that significant attitudinal differences are likely to exist and suggests the importance of understanding the attitudes and behaviour of stakeholder groups. It further permits stakeholder values to be incorporated with those of management, resulting in a closer, more positive relationship (Tombari 1984).

2.5.6 STAKEHOLDERS IN POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Ulrich and Lake (1976) state that an organisation's niche comprises the stakeholders who deal directly with the organisation and may include suppliers, customers, government agencies, trade associations, competitors, members of the Board of Directors, strategic alliance partners, labour unions, distributors and investors. They point out that these stakeholders play an important role in determining how management allocates the organisation's resources. Businesses succeed when they effectively and efficiently draw resources from input stakeholders (for example investors, unions, suppliers), transform resources into goods or services and return resources to output stakeholders (for example, customers).

A concern with the stakeholders listed by Ulrich and Lake (1976) is they appear not to have identified employees as a separate stakeholder group. However, in the process of identifying forces for change, they have identified that the most significant changes in the business milieu, in the next decade, are likely to derive from five trends: globalisation, technology
change, growth of equity markets and corporate restructuring, changes in public policy and demographic transitions. They continue to suggest that these trends will force managers to find new answers to traditional questions, in particular: What are the expectations of our employees? Who are our major customers?

Dunstan (1990) believes that the formulation of a housing policy is essentially a process. For this process to be successful, commitment must be secured from two key stakeholder sources namely, shop stewards on the one hand and the chief executive and top management on the other.

Hofmeyr (1993) contends that processes need to be made more participative so that all stakeholders who are vital to the acceptance and success of any policy can contribute to its design and implementation.

Hence we see an increasing need to involve those critical stakeholders who will be both directly and indirectly affected by the formulation and implementation of any policy issue. The research aimed at identifying who the stakeholders in the selected policy issues are in order to establish the current state of play in South Africa.

2.6 CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The literature review has provided a broad basis of information on the policy formulation and implementation process as well as an in depth insight into the notion of stakeholders. There are many pieces to the jigsaw puzzle but nothing integrating the areas of practice and no empirical evidence appears to be available on the involvement of stakeholders in the area of human resource policy formulation and implementation.

Hence, the literature review has provided the context and framework in which the research questions are posed:
Question 1: To identify what are the factors involved in the process of human resource policy formulation and implementation.

Question 2: To determine who the stakeholders are in the formulation and implementation of selected human resources policies.

Question 3: To determine whether the formulation and implementation process is different for different types of human resources policies.

Question 4: To examine the applicability of Foster's (1989) model for the formulation and implementation of policy whilst also expanding on this model and developing a more holistic one.
 CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The research methodology used to investigate the research questions identified in Chapter One and Chapter Two is discussed in this Chapter. Specifically it discusses the use of the survey approach, the design of the research questionnaires used for data collection, the survey samples, the structure of the research questionnaire and the data collection process.

3.1 THE SURVEY APPROACH

The survey is used when the researcher wishes to elicit opinions and not hard facts as the primary objectives (Pirow, 1990). Furthermore, surveys tend to be more efficient and economical than observation, in that it can expand (if a questionnaire is used) the geographic coverage at a fraction of the cost and time required by observation.

Babbie (1989) states that surveys may be used for descriptive explanatory and exploratory purposes. Furthermore, the survey research is probably the best method available to social scientists interested in collecting original data for describing a population that is too large to be observed.

Groenewald (1989, p55) describes the survey method of research as "the collection of information about a selected number of characteristics of a great number of cases at a given time within circumscribed boundaries".

The survey method of research has been used for this study for the following
reasons:

- The research is essentially descriptive and exploratory in nature
- The research sample is geographically widespread
- The survey approach is more economical and efficient

3.2 THE SURVEY POPULATION

This study, which is a new area of empirical research, sets out to determine the de facto procedures and practices with regard to human resource policy in a broad cross section of South African companies.

The research conducted was aimed at determining which stakeholders are involved in a select number of human resource policy issues whilst also establishing whether a gap exists between the identified stakeholders and those who were actually consulted in the policy formulation and implementation process.

The survey population was therefore broadly identified as "South African companies as a whole".

3.3 THE SURVEY SAMPLES

With the survey population being such a large and open-ended group, a suitable method of sampling had to be determined. The purposive method of sampling described by Groenewald (1989) is the result of a process of selection which is intentional or non-random.

The population was divided into two sub-groups as follows:
SAMPLE A

This sample was identified as those companies where the researcher was able to gain reasonable access to data, either directly through having a contact person in the company or indirectly through other contacts in the human resource discipline. The person targeted for the collection of data was the most senior human resources executive in the organisation.

The sample was defined as those organisations which were perceived as being progressive and therefore likely to have developed policies in the areas to be researched. A total of 75 questionnaires were sent out, of which 51 were collected. All 51 were found to have been completed comprehensively enough to be of some practical value for this research. A detailed list of companies that have provided data is included as Appendix I.

The companies also had to substantially conform to the following criteria:

- employing a minimum of 250 people
- with a human resource function of some description
- were unionised or had some degree of union membership

SAMPLE B

This sample was identified as those companies where the 1993 Post Graduate Diploma in Management (PDM) students at the Witwatersrand School of Business did their internship. There were 83 of these students. This sample differs from Sample A in that it covered a broader spectrum of companies and included some smaller companies. The advantage of this being to examine the state of play with regard to human resource policy in these small companies.

It was recognised that not all of these students had access to professional human resource management within the companies where they were doing their
internship. Furthermore, some of the students were in small organisations which could not be expected to have adequate policies on the topics being researched. Nonetheless, a total of 44 sets of usable data were submitted and constitute Sample B.

A detailed list of all the companies covered in this sample are listed in Appendix II.

It should be pointed out that four of the companies in Sample B were also covered in Sample A. Where there has been an overlap, the data has not been discarded as, in some cases, it was sourced from a different person and provides additional input. In seven of the companies, there was more than one intern. However, in these companies only, the most comprehensively completed questionnaire was included so as to ensure there was no double counting.

3.4 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

3.4.1 SELECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE METHOD

According to Pirow (1990) the most frequently used method of collecting mensural and observational data for survey research is that of the questionnaire. As the research involved soliciting perceptions and views of the respondents, whilst also covering a wide geographical spread of companies, a questionnaire was used as the method of collecting survey data.

Babbie (1989) states that the term "questionnaire" suggests a collection of questions, but an examination of a typical questionnaire will probably reveal as many statements as questions. Some of the pitfalls of questionnaire design that Babbie (1989) outlines are particularly relevant to this research and are as follows:
Questionnaire items should be clear and unambiguous. They should also be precise so that the respondent knows exactly what the researcher wants to do.

Double barrelled questions should be avoided. The researcher needs to ensure that he is not asking for a single answer to a combination of questions.

Respondents must be competent to answer the question and the researcher should continually ask himself whether respondents are able to do so reliably.

Questions that are asked of respondents should be relevant. When an issue is real, there may be no way of telling which responses genuinely reflect attitudes and which reflect meaningless answers to an irrelevant question.

The respondent should be able to read an item quickly, understand its intent and select or provide an answer without difficulty, therefore, the researcher should provide clear, short items that will not be misinterpreted.

Negative items should be avoided, as well as biased items and terms.

In asking questions, researchers have two options. They may either ask open or closed ended questions (Babbie, 1989). Closed ended questions are very popular, as they provide greater uniformity of response and are more easily processed. The chief shortcoming of closed ended questions lies in the researcher's structuring of responses whereas, open ended questions must be coded before they can be processed for analysis (Babbie, 1989). Furthermore, the coding process of open ended questions often requires that the researcher interpret the meaning of responses,
opening the possibility of misunderstanding and researcher bias (Babbie 1989). There is also a danger that some respondents will give answers that are essentially irrelevant to the researcher’s intent.

Emory and Cooper (1991) state that the questioning technique has its shortcomings, however, the major weakness is that the quality of information secured depends heavily on the ability and willingness of the respondents to co-operate.

However, open ended questions are usually used for complex questions that cannot be answered in a few simple categories (Pirow, 1990). Furthermore, they are desirable when the research requires detail and discussion from the respondents and when his unique views, philosophy or goals are being probed. Questionnaire design is therefore a complex process.

3.4.2 DESIGN OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The process followed in the design of the questionnaires used in this research, attached as Appendix IV and V, follows.

3.4.2.1 PDM QUESTIONNAIRE

The first questionnaire designed was the one used by the PDM students. This was designed after having conducted the initial literature review and having considered the research objectives.

The draft questionnaire was validated by using the researcher’s own company data as a model as well as input from the research supervisor.
3.4.2.2 Sample A Questionnaire

In the first instance, the questionnaire was designed having taken due consideration of the literature review discussed in Chapter Two and the research objectives. The PDM questionnaire served as the initial base. This was expanded, refined and then validated through conducting in depth personal interviews with four senior and highly experienced human resources executives. These were:

- P Townsend - Anglovaal Limited
- P Strydom - Boumat Limited
- B Dakers - Federated Timbers
- B Burger - South African Druggists Limited

These interviews covered both the content, wording, layout and structure of the questionnaire. The above organisation's data was used to test the applicability of the questionnaire as well as to establish the amount of time required to complete the questionnaire. According to Pirow (1990), one important thing to get out of the pilot questionnaire is the estimated time of completion, the non-response questions and questions to which the answers show little deviation.

3.5 Structure of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in this research was seven pages long, comprising open and closed ended questions (See Appendix IV and V). The questionnaire in Appendix V included six sections that the respondents had to answer. The questionnaire was accompanied by a covering note from the researcher and the Research Co-ordinator from the Wits Business School (See Appendix III). A
personal letter from the researcher was also included.

Section A of the questionnaire dealt with the essential biographical information needed to classify the research data. In Section B respondents were asked to provide information on human resource policy manuals, how these are distributed, the confidentiality or restriction of access to these manuals as well as how staff are kept informed of policy changes and developments.

Sections C, D, and E dealt with Aids, Affirmative Action and Industrial Relations policy issues respectively. Here the respondents were asked whether the company had policies on these issues and what form these policies took. This was followed by an identification of who respondents considered to be stakeholders in the policies in question and which of the stakeholders had actually been consulted in the process of formulating and implementing these policies. A question to identify what triggered the need for the policy follows.

The next part of each of these sections deals with the question of policy implementation. This question has been developed from the model proposed by Foster (1989) on how an employment or social policy may be formulated, adopted and implemented. The method of determining how the implementation of the policy was completed, whether it is original to the company or a "hybrid" from another company's policy, whether or not the policy has been effectively implemented and finally these sections conclude with a question on whether the policies are regarded as having been successful by meeting their objectives.

In Section F, the final section in the questionnaire, respondents were asked to complete open-ended questions aimed at eliciting their personal opinions and perceptions regarding:

a. The rewards and recognition for effective policy implementation as well as what punitive action is taken where policy is not implemented.

b. Those factors the respondents found to be most difficult in dealing with
both aspects of policy formulation and policy implementation.

Finally respondents were requested to broadly classify their organisation's culture.

3.6 COLLECTION OF THE SURVEY DATA

The method of data collection varied marginally between the two samples:

3.6.1 SAMPLE A

Having identified the most appropriate Human Resource Executive in the various companies, the researcher personally phoned them and enquired as to whether they would be prepared to participate in the survey. Having secured their initial consent, the researcher either faxed or hand delivered a copy of the research questionnaire to each potential respondent, after which the respondents were again contacted, either in person or telephonically by the researcher, to take them through the detail and structure of the questionnaire. This was done to ensure as much consistency to the completion of the questionnaire as possible.

The completed questionnaires were then either posted or faxed back to the researcher.

3.6.2 SAMPLE B

The 1993 PDM students were given a detailed brief by the research Supervisor, M Sutherland, on the rationale and objectives of this research. The research questionnaire was included in their internship packs and they were requested to interview the most
appropriate executive responsible for human resource matters at the company where they were doing their practical internship.

This approach served the purpose of being both a development opportunity for the PDM students whilst simultaneously providing some of the necessary data for this research. The completed questionnaires were returned to the University when the students returned from their practical internship.

3.7 LIMITATIONS AND KEY ASSUMPTIONS OF THE METHODOLOGY

The following limitations and key assumptions should be considered before examining and interpreting the results.

The researcher assumed that all respondents were competent at interpreting the research questionnaire. Emory and Cooper (1991) state that respondents may interpret a question or a concept differently from what was intended. Furthermore, a respondent may intentionally mislead the researcher by giving false information.

Thus, it becomes quite important to keep in mind that survey responses must be accepted for what they are - statements by others which reflect varying degrees of truth (Emory and Cooper, 1991). As many of the respondents in Sample A are known to the researcher, the temptation to answer questions in such a manner as to make their organisation appear more favourable than they actually are cannot be ignored.

This research is limited by the nature and size of the samples in that the convenience and purposive methods of sampling were used as the researcher had limited access to financial resources and considerable time constraints. These methods of sampling were selected as the most suitable available given the circumstance.
According to Pirow (1990), whenever a questionnaire is applied to a non-uniform group, there is a danger that some members of the group will misinterpret one or more of the questions. Whether the danger of this arising has been sufficiently addressed by the choice of wording in the research questionnaires is difficult to assess.

The three human resource policy issues selected for the purposes of this research cannot be seen as all embracing of the vast number of human resource policy issues.

The policies that have been identified for this research are to a large extent influenced by the current socio-political environment. This research has been conducted in a society undergoing rapid and far reaching transformation which could result in this research quickly becoming outdated. A discussion of the survey results is contained in the following Chapter.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULTS

4.0 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter presents a summary of the research results and statistical analysis employed in the research design. The sample demographics are detailed, describing the sample composition. This is followed by a discussion of the statistical techniques employed and the corresponding results. The results are discussed and interpreted in Chapter 5.

4.1 SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

The following tables set out some of the basic biographical data of the companies researched. Sample A which comprises 54 companies is considered to be the more reliable and comprehensive of the data basis of the two samples. The companies researched in this sample were identified by using the purposive sampling technique.

A comprehensive list of the companies in Sample A is attached as Appendix I. A review of this list confirms the vast spread of large and progressive companies that were researched.

The Sample B data was collected via the PDM students and the list of companies in this sample is attached as Appendix II. Again, a very representative spread of companies was covered in this sample. The data in Sample B is however not considered to be as valid or comprehensive as the data in Sample A as there was less control over the data collection. Of the total of 73 questionnaires returned
in Sample B, 18 were discarded as they had not been adequately completed. A further 13 were excluded, as these were from companies where there was more than one PDM student. It is worthy to note that of the 18 questionnaires discarded, all of the companies employed less than 250 staff. This seems to be a common denominator of the companies excluded, as they all appear not to have sufficient data on human resource policies.

An examination of the results indicates a high degree of consistency between the findings for Samples A and B. This indicates the value of using the data from both Samples.

The size of the companies researched, as measured by the number of employees was as follows:

**TABLE 1: COMPANY SIZE AS CLASSIFIED BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 250</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 - 500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 1 000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 001 - 2 000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 000 +</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spread of companies employing less than 250 people through to those with more than 2 000 employees is representative of a wide range of companies.

Out of the total of 98 companies in the survey, 54,1% had more than 2 000 employees. This further emphasises that the Sample is adequately representative of some of the larger employers in South Africa.
A classification of those companies surveyed, by industry type, follows:

**TABLE 2: COMPANY CLASSIFICATION BY INDUSTRY TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRY TYPE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMPLE A</td>
<td>SAMPLE B</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Wholesale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Leisure/Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This broad cross section of industry type, whilst heavily weighted in the manufacturing sector, is well representative of all of the other major industry groupings.

A classification of the companies surveyed by type of registration follows:

**TABLE 3: COMPANY REGISTRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGISTRATION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMPLE A</td>
<td>SAMPLE B</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Quoted Company</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Non-Quoted Company</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Company</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of the total sample of 98 companies, 66% is made up of public companies. This representative sample of companies with various types of registration further validates the suitability of the samples for the purposes of this research.

The following five companies have data in both Samples A and B:

- Adcock-Ingram Pharmaceuticals
- Anglo-Alpha Limited
- Samcor
- Transnet
- Sun International Limited

As this data has, in each instance, been gathered from a different source, it has been included in both samples.

OBSERVATION

The companies included in the research provide an adequate representation of companies in South Africa in order to assess the current state of play regarding human resource policy formulation and implementation.

4.2 HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUALS

Some background information on the current state of affairs regarding human resource policy manuals and their distribution/access as determined by this study follows:
As can be seen from the above, by far the majority (88.5%) of the companies surveyed have human resource policy manuals.

The twelve companies without policy manuals warrant some comment: In Sample A, eight companies have indicated they do not have policy manuals. Of interest is that five of these companies are large corporations employing in excess of two thousand people. Policy issues appear to be handled primarily through memoranda from Head Office, discussions and minutes of formal meetings.

The four companies without policy manuals in Sample B do not follow any particular pattern. Two of them employ less than 250 people. One is a partnership in the financial services industry and employs between 501 - 1 000 people. The other company relies entirely on their Head Office for any policy directives.
In three companies the policy manuals were also distributed to staff association representatives and in nine companies they were given to recognised unions/shop stewards.

The difference in the responses between the samples regarding general staff is explained by the fact that the Sample A question referred to policy manual "distribution", whereas the Sample B question referred to "access". The term "access" means there is no restriction in terms of the content and staff may see the policy if they so requested. Distribution on the other hand dealt more specifically with how the policy manuals were "issued".

43 RESTRICTIONS

TABLE 6: RESTRICTED ACCESS TO HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESTRICTED ACCESS</th>
<th>SAMPLE A</th>
<th>SAMPLE B</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No restrictions</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Access</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 59 -
Where there is restricted access to human resource policy manuals, the following types of restrictions were listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF RESTRICTION</th>
<th>SAMPLE A</th>
<th>SAMPLE B</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only made available to users</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only given to Management/Directors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain policies have restricted access/confidential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No specific pattern seems to emerge from the restriction of access, however, the distribution to so called "users" and senior management seems to indicate that confidentiality is the primary reason for restricted access.

4.4 COMMUNICATION

As the communication of policy issues is a critical factor in the success of any policy implementation strategy and given the wide cross section of languages and cultures in South African society, the current approach to human resource policy communication was examined.

Respondents were asked, in an open ended question (Section E, question 6 - Sample A), how staff are kept up-to-date on policy and procedure changes and/or developments.

The table that follows presents the research findings.
TABLE 7: COMMUNICATION OF POLICY CHANGES/UPDATES

NOTE: This table is only applicable to Sample A as this question was not asked to respondents in Sample B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD OF COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefing Groups</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Notices</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memoranda</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Meetings</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Updates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house Magazines</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Electronic Database</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction Training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payslips</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Annual Company Diary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the above, a wide variety of methodology and mediums are employed in communicating human resource policy changes and/or updates. The use of Briefing Groups as the most frequently adopted method of policy communication is an interesting development which warrants further research.

It may be that the very heterogeneous nature of the South African employee profile is such that a written communication on a policy, in say English, would simply not be fully understood and is, as a result, more likely to be ineffective.
4.5 **AIDS POLICY**

In Sections C of both Samples A and B, respondents were asked to provide information on their companies' policy regarding Aids. The tables and narrative that follow present the research findings.

**TABLE 3: COMPANIES WITH AIDS POLICIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>SAMPLE A</th>
<th>SAMPLE B</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Aids Policy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Aids Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 54 companies in Sample A, 72.3% have an Aids policy whereas 81.9% of the companies in Sample B have a policy on Aids. As 76.6% of companies in the total sample have a policy on Aids, this represents a meaningful and sizeable data base. The very high formal response of having positioned the company through a policy on what is a relatively new issue is an interesting finding.

**TABLE 4: FORMS OF AIDS POLICY**

As policies take on many forms, respondents were asked in question 2 of Section C to indicate what form their Aids policy took:
As can be seen from the above, the approach to the Aids Policy varies considerably. In addition to the forms referred to above, the following were also identified:

- Inclusion in life threatening diseases policy
- Trained Aids "educators" used to communicate company philosophy and approach
- Inclusion in conditions of employment manual
- Company has issued a "guideline" only.

### 4.5.1 AIDS POLICY FORMULATION

Respondents were asked in question 9 and 7 in Samples A and B respectively to indicate whether the policy was original to the company or a "hybrid" policy developed from using the policy of another company as the base.
TABLE 10: IS THE AIDS POLICY A HOME GROWN POLICY OR A HYBRID DEVELOPED FROM ANOTHER COMPANY'S POLICY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>SAMPLE A</th>
<th>SAMPLE B</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents were not sure how to answer this question. This was possibly because of the choice of wording where the word "hybrid" appeared not to be readily understood.

4.5.2 AIDS POLICY STAKEHOLDERS

In question 3, participants were asked to indicate who they perceived as stakeholders in an Aids policy. This section was therefore also completed by respondent companies who did not have an Aids policy and hence the frequency of responses does not add up to the total number of companies with a policy on Aids.

Respondents were then asked to indicate which of the stakeholders were actually consulted in the process of formulating and implementing their company's policy on Aids. Finally, respondents were asked to indicate who initiated the Aids policy.

TABLE 11: AIDS POLICY STAKEHOLDERS

This data is only applicable to Sample A, as the question was not asked of respondents in Sample B.
The very high rating of the Human Resource function across all three factors - perceived stakeholders, stakeholders consulted and responsible for initiation of the policy is a key observation.

An interesting outcome is that the trade union and general staff were cited more frequently than line management as perceived stakeholders. A detailed examination of the survey data does not present any obvious explanation for this. Notwithstanding the fact that outside specialist consultants were not very often identified as perceived stakeholders, they were, nonetheless, extensively consulted in the process of formulating and implementing the Aids policy.
4.5.3 AIDS POLICY 'TRIGGERS'

In question 4 of both samples, respondents were asked to identify what the factors were that triggered the need for an Aids policy.

**TABLE 12: FACTORS THAT TRIGGERED THE NEED FOR AN AIDS POLICY**

Please note that respondents may have reflected more than one of the factors as having triggered the need for the policy in their company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAMPLE A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors perceived need</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee contracted Aids</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Department believed company needed Ppolicy</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Aid Benefit exclusions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Benefit Fund liabilities</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the category "other", the following were given as reasons that triggered the need for an Aids policy:

* Parent company abroad required policy be put in place
* Strategic Business Plan of Holding Company
The modal frequency for the time taken from date of trigger to date when policy was published is 4 - 6 months in both samples. The majority of the Aids policies (90.4%) were developed in a period of less than 12 months from date of trigger.

### 4.5.4 AIDS POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

In examining the process followed in implementing the Aids Policy, a set of steps as proposed by Foster (1989) were asked. The following represents the frequency that each step was followed by the company in the actual implementation process.

#### TABLE 14.1: AIDS POLICY IMPLEMENTATION VS FOSTER'S MODEL - SAMPLE A

The following table sets out the frequency that each step was followed during the implementation of the Aids Policy.
Refining and understanding document by getting specialist input | 35
---|---
Gaining management commitment | 39
Consulting key stakeholders prior to finalisation | 31
Gaining of worker support through communication | 28
Ensuring implementation of policy through progress reviews, checklists | 19
Ensuring effectiveness of implementation through policy audits | 20
Has any Aids Awareness Training been done | 35
Is policy kept current through regular reviews | 33
| N | 39

### TABLE 14.2: AIDS POLICY IMPLEMENTATION - SAMPLE B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of policy content</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refining and understanding - getting specialist input</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining management commitment</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining of worker support</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating the policy to all employees/interest groups</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring policy implementation through progress reviews, checklists</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring effectiveness of policy through audits</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping the policy current</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The various steps suggested are all followed to varying degrees with the formulation of the policy content and the gaining of management commitment receiving the highest frequency ratings.

**TABLE 15: HOW DID COMPANIES DETERMINE THE AIDS POLICY WAS COMPLETE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAMPLE A</th>
<th>SAMPLE B</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved by Managing Director/Board</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published in Policy Manual</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announced in staff notice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated through Briefing structures</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted that in many cases more than one of the above factors were identified as indicators that the Aids Policy was complete. The following were also cited as indicators that the policy was complete:

- Outside Consultants verified that it was complete
- Consultations with Trade Unions who “approved” the policy
- Consultations with broad spectrum of employees

In four cases, companies indicated they had an Aids Policy but pointed out that it was not yet complete.
4.5.5 AIDS POLICY COMMUNICATION

In question 8 of Sample A, respondents were asked how the Aids policy was communicated.

**TABLE 16: AIDS POLICY COMMUNICATION**

This question was not asked of respondents in Sample B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIUM OF COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefing Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff notices</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Newsletter/Journal</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Policy directive in Manual</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prominence of briefing groups as the preferred method of communication is an interesting finding.

Other communication methods used included:

Discussion Groups, Aids Awareness Training sessions and inclusion in the Union Agreement.

In questions 10 and 8 in Samples A and B respectively, respondents were asked whether the Aids policy is in any way a confidential document with restricted access. The following table is a summary of the responses:
Where there is restricted access to the Aids Policy, reasons for this were as follows:

- Confined to HR, Medical Centre and Senior Line Management for confidentiality reasons
- Three companies felt it was too sensitive to allow general access
- Restriction was automatically imposed where there is restricted access to the HR policy manual in three companies
- Where it is an unwritten policy, this automatically resulted in restricted access

Finally, respondents in Sample A were asked in question 12 whether the Aids Policy had been implemented effectively and whether or not the policy was successful. Success being measured by whether the policy was fully meeting its objectives. The research findings follow:
TABLE 13: HAS THE AIDS POLICY BEEN IMPLEMENTED EFFECTIVELY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS Policy implemented effectively</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy successful, ie fully meeting its objectives</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data is only applicable to Sample A, as it was not asked of respondents in Sample B.

The majority of respondents felt that the Aids policy had been implemented effectively. Whilst only five respondents were of the view that the policy had not been implemented effectively, eleven respondents indicated that the policy was not fully meeting its objectives. The underlying reason for this apparent contradiction is not clear.

4.6 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

In Sections D for both Samples A and B respondents were asked to provide information on their Affirmative Action Policy. The tables and narrative that follow present the research findings.
Out of the total sample of 98 companies, 80.7% have an Affirmative Action policy. This represents a significant sample.

### 4.6.1 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY FORMULATION

Policy formulation is an important component for successful policy implementation. The basis of the formulation of the Affirmative Action policy was determined by asking respondents in questions 9 and 7 in Section D of Samples A and B respectively whether the policy was original to their company or a "hybrid" that had been developed having used another company's policy as a base.

### TABLE 20: IS THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY A HOME GROWN POLICY OR A HYBRID DEVELOPED FROM ANOTHER COMPANY'S POLICY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>HYBRID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 21: FORMS OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sample A</th>
<th>Sample B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal policy in HR Manual</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal written but unpublished policy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwritten policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just an informal approach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A strategic objective</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents further indicated that Affirmative Action was also included in other areas of policy such as Recruitment and Selection. It is referred to as a "guideline" rather than a policy by one company. Affirmative Action policy is also incorporated in one company's Mission Statement.

4.6.2 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY STAKEHOLDERS

In question 3, Section D of Sample A, respondents were asked to indicate who they perceived as stakeholders in an Affirmative Action policy. It should be noted that some respondents completed the perceived stakeholder column even where the company did not have an Affirmative Action policy.
The State appear to becoming key players in future Affirmative Action strategies. They were not indicated as a possible stakeholder. It is worthy of note that none of the respondents identified the State as a perceived stakeholder in the section "other". The omission of the State as a perceived stakeholder is a definite oversight which should be considered in future research.

The frequency of response across all categories emphasises that all stakeholders have a degree of influence and have been extensively consulted in the process of formulation and implementation.
4.6.3 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY TRIGGERS

TABLE 23: FACTORS THAT TRIGGERED THE NEED FOR AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sample A</th>
<th>Sample B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic future business needs</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from staff/union</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated legislation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Department perceive need for policy</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pressure from parent company abroad was also cited as a trigger for three companies initiating an Affirmative Action Policy. It should be noted that respondents may have selected more than one option as having triggered the need for an Affirmative Action policy.

TABLE 24: TIME FROM DATE OF TRIGGER TO DATE WHEN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY WAS PUBLISHED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTHS</th>
<th>Sample A</th>
<th>Sample B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The modal time frame in both samples was between 4 - 6 months with 78.6% of the sample indicating that the policy was developed and implemented in less than twelve months from date of trigger.

4.6.4 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

In examining the process followed in implementing the Affirmative Action Policy, a set of questions as proposed by Foster (1989) were asked. The following represents the frequency that each step was followed by the company in the actual implementation process.

**TABLE 28.1: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION - SAMPLE A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refining and understanding document by getting specialist input</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining management commitment</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting key stakeholders prior to finalisation</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining of workforce support through communication</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring implementation of policy through progress reviews, checklists</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring effectiveness of implementation through audits</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has any Awareness Training been done</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is policy kept current through regular reviews</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foster's (1989) suggested model was slightly modified and served as the basis against which the implementation was measured. The frequency of response indicates that all steps were followed to varying degrees.
Respondents may have indicated that more than one of the above indicators determined that the policy was complete. In one case the policy was "passed down from the Holding Company".

### 4.6.5 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY COMMUNICATION

In Section D, question 8 and 10 of Sample A and B respectively deal with how the Affirmative Action policy was communicated.
Once again, briefing groups emerge as the 'deferred' method of communication.

Other communication methods used included:

- Four companies used special briefings to management
- Three companies used general staff meetings
- One respondent's medium was the Affirmative Action steering committees
- In two cases there had been no communication.

### Table 27: Affirmative Action Policy Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium of Communication</th>
<th>Sample A</th>
<th>Sample B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefing Groups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff notice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company newsletter/journals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR policy directive in manual</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 28: Affirmative Action Policy Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Sample A</th>
<th>Sample B</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted access</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No restricted access</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where there was restricted access to the Affirmative Action Policy, reasons given for this included: still finalising document, not ready to disclose content, only management and authorised staff are allowed access. In one instance, a two-tier policy is envisaged - one for executive information and a less detailed policy for disclosure to staff.

**TABLE 2: HAS THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY BEEN IMPLEMENTED EFFECTIVELY?**

In question 12 of Section D, respondents in Sample A were asked to indicate whether or not the Affirmative Action Policy had been implemented effectively and then in question 13 how successful the policy had been. Success being measured on whether or not the policy was fully meeting its objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy effectively implemented</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy successful, ie fully meeting its objectives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst 40% of the respondents indicated that the Affirmative Action Policy had not been successfully implemented, 55.6% indicated that the policy was not meeting its objectives. In other words, 15.6% of the respondents felt that despite having successfully implemented the policy, it was not fully meeting its objectives.
4.7 **INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY**

This Section deals with the current state of play regarding Industrial Relations Policy and practice in Sample A. There was no question on Industrial Relations Policy posed to the respondents in Sample B.

**TABLE 30: NUMBER OF COMPANIES WITH INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have Industrial Relations Policy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have no Industrial Relations Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked in question 2 to indicate what form the Industrial Relations Policy took.

**TABLE 31: FORMS OF IR POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY FORM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Policy in Policy Manual</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal written but unpublished policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwritten Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the category "Other" the forms referred to included:
Flexible policy so as to avoid any IR incidents
- Formal policy whilst not unionised
- IR Code of Practice (not considered as a formal policy)
- Agreements concluded at Labour Council

4.7.1 INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY STAKEHOLDERS

In question 3 of Section B - Sample A respondents were asked to indicate who the perceived stakeholders were in an Industrial Relations Policy. They were also asked which of these stakeholders were consulted in the process of formulating/implementing the Industrial Relations Policy and finally who initiated the need for the Industrial Relations Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEIVED STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED</th>
<th>INITIATION OF POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Management/Department</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Management</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Specialist Consultant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Council</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the category "Other", the following were identified as stakeholders: Chamber of Mines, Group Head Office, various bargaining forums both
within plants and nationally. Worthy of note is that the State was not identified as a perceived stakeholder despite the fact that Industrial Relations Legislation is essentially initiated by the State. The prominence of the human resource management/department across all three categories is quite significant, however, all stakeholders identified appear to have been extensively consulted.

4.7.2 INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY TRIGGERS

**TABLE 32: FACTORS THAT TRIGGERED THE NEED FOR AN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approached for Union Recognition</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In anticipation of unionisation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors perceive need for policy</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR/IR Department perceive need to position company</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of conflict</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strike Action</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors identified as having triggered the need for an Industrial Relations Policy included:

- The industry having been unionised for decades but company not formally positioned
- Informal union recognition
- No Industrial Relations Department

Respondents were asked in question 5 to indicate when the Industrial Relations Policy was first published.
The modal period for the Industrial Relations Policies being published was between 1986 and 1990. The significance of this being that many Industrial Relations Policies have been in place for a number of years whereas the other policies in the research are more current.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75 - 80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 - 85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 - 90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 +</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The modal time taken from trigger to date when the Industrial Relations Policy was published is 4 - 6 months, which is the same for both of the other policy issues covered in this research.
In question 7, respondents were asked to indicate to who’s wishes the Industrial Relations Policy ultimately conformed. Table 36 gives a breakdown of the frequency of response. It must be remembered that respondents were asked to select more than one interest group in their response.

**TABLE 36: TO WHO'S WISHES DID THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY FINALLY CONFORM?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEREST GROUP</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shareholders</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Council</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other factors that were identified as influencing the policy included:

- Legal constraints
- Market trends in terms of the types of agreements already concluded

The table that follows gives a breakdown of whether the policy has been implemented effectively and whether or not it is considered successful. Success in this context being measured by whether or not the policy is fully meeting its objectives.
TABLE 37: HAS THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY BEEN IMPLEMENTED EFFECTIVELY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR Policy implemented effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is IR Policy successful, ie. fully meeting its objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 FACTORS INFLUENCING POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

This Section of the Research aimed to determine some of the general factors that influence both policy formulation and implementation. Respondents were asked a set of open ended questions. These were then analysed using Groenewald's (1989) "content analysis" technique. This technique, Groenewald (1989) states, is designed to achieve exactly what is implied by its name, viz an analysis of the content of communication.

The answers to the open ended questions were listed and then broad categories established. The responses were then tallied into these categories.

In question (A), Section F, respondents were asked to indicate what type of rewards or recognition were given for effective policy implementation. The following table sets out the findings following a content analysis of the responses.
### TABLE 39: RECOGNITION/REWARDS FOR EFFECTIVE POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No recognition or rewards given</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better salary increases and bonuses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognised as an effective manager therefore eligible for promotion</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured in management objectives and rewarded according to achievement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commendation from Human Resource and/or Directors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable working environment and high morale</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent management approach and therefore credibility for human resource function as co-ordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst some forms of recognition are given for effective policy implementation, by far the majority of companies give no recognition or reward whatsoever.

In question (B), Section F, respondents were asked to identify what punitive actions are taken if human resource policy is not implemented. Table 39 sets out the findings following a content analysis of the responses:
This question was perhaps not well worded as it did not clearly identify "who" would be required to take disciplinary action, i.e., the action against the human resources department/person or the line manager responsible for the implementation of the policy within his/her department.

Respondents were asked in question (C) to indicate what they found to be the most difficult part of human resource policy formulation. The following table sets out the responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary action (up to dismissal depending on severity)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling and warnings from Human Resources Director</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No punitive action is taken</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion is hindered</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention by management</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sideways move/Demotion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in management objectives - if not achieved, is 'punished' according to severity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question was perhaps not well worded as it did not clearly identify "who" would be required to take disciplinary action, i.e., the action against the human resources department/person or the line manager responsible for the implementation of the policy within his/her department.

Respondents were asked in question (C) to indicate what they found to be the most difficult part of human resource policy formulation. The following table sets out the responses:
The complexity of trying to meet the needs of all of the stakeholders and then gaining commitment and reaching consensus were considered by far the most difficult part of policy formulation.

In question (D), Section F, respondents were asked to identify the most difficult part of human resource policy implementation as a distinctly different process to that of policy formulation. The following is a summary of the findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To meet the needs of all stakeholders</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining commitment and consensus (to philosophies and concepts)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To persuade senior executives their needs are no: paramount/exclusive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation process prior to formulation - (great divergence of opinions)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping abreast of changes in legislation/ market/environment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring policy aligns to business strategy and goals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly review policy content - research is time consuming</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying what you want to achieve and why</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor quality consultants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring it works in practice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a very wide variety of issues raised which must have been influenced by the organisation as well as possibly the "stage of development" of the human resource practitioner who answered the question. This is an area which warrants further research and is discussed in Chapter 6.

Respondents in Sample B were asked a slightly different question in that they were required to ask the Human Resources or General/Managing Director in the company where they did their internship what they found
to be the most difficult part of "policy development".

The following table is a summary of the findings following a content analysis of the responses:

**TABLE 42: MOST DIFFICULT PART OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaining everyone's commitment and consensus</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy that meets needs of stakeholders</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting policy implemented</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting business needs (and employee expectations)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to research and develop policy on &quot;key issues&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining everyone's input</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility - balance theory practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing policy on ongoing basis - &quot;updating&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating effect of policy VS desired impact</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualisation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common interpretation and application</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing top management their ideas are not paramount</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting policy approved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By using the term "policy development", this was considered to be more all embracing and covered both the formulation and implementation of policy. The purpose of wording the question slightly differently was to validate the findings from Sample A by identifying whether there were any similarities. As can be seen, the results were remarkably similar.

4.9 ACROSS POLICY COMPARISONS

This section deals with an evaluation of the findings across the various policies covered in the survey. The aim here was to determine if there are either consistencies or differences in policy formulation and implementation between the three policy areas chosen for this study.

The Chi-squared test, using the Number Cruncher Statistical System was used to test for differences between the policies. The tests were all conducted at the significance level of 0.05. These tests have been done on the data from Sample A only unless otherwise indicated. The findings of these tests are summarised in Table 43.

4.9.1 Chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between the type of policy and whether or not the companies have a policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have Policy</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Policy</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not have Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The alternate hypothesis is accepted in that there is a relationship between the type of policy and whether the companies have a policy or not.

4.9.2 Chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between the policy being implemented effectively and the different policies surveyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY IMPLEMENTED EFFECTIVELY</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 2
\( x^2 = 22.42 \)
Probability level = 0.0000
Result - Reject H0

The alternate hypothesis is accepted in that there is a relationship between the type of policy and whether it has been implemented effectively.

As Industrial Relations Policies have been in place for some time and in view of the dispersion of response, the above test was conducted excluding the Industrial Relations data.
df = 1
\[
\chi^2 = 6.7065
\]
Probability level = 0.0096

Result - Reject Ho

There is a relationship between the type of policy and whether it has been implemented effectively.

4.9.3 Chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between the type of policy and whether or not it is seen as successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS POLICY SUCCESSFUL</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, this test has been conducted both with and without the Industrial Relations data as it may be different because these policies were formulated a number of years ago (see Table 34).

INCLUDING INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

\[
\chi^2 = 32.2363
\]
Probability level = 0.0000

Result - Reject Ho
EXCLUDING INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

df $= 1$
$x^2 = 5.9389$
Probability level $= 0.0148$
Result - Reject $H_0$

In both cases the alternate hypothesis is accepted in that there is a relationship between the type of policy and whether it is considered to be successful or not.

4.9.4 Chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between the home grown policy or the hybrid policy versus the Aids and Affirmative Action policies. This question was not asked of Industrial Relations policies as they have generally been in place for a number of years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY TYPE</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Grown</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df $= 1$
$x^2 = 3.0954$
Probability level $= 0.0785$
Result - Accept $H_0$

There is no relationship between whether the policy is home grown or a hybrid from another policy and the type of policy.
4.9.5 Chi-squared test to measure the relationship between communication and the type of policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD OF COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefing Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Notices</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Manual Updates</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Newsletter/Journal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 4

$x^2 = 6.2647$

Probability level = 0.1802

Result - Accept $H_0$

There is no relationship between the method of communication and the type of policy.

4.9.6 Chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between perceived stakeholders and type of policy. This test is being restricted to the four main stakeholder groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEIVED STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Management/Department</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Management</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 97 -
df = 3
$x^2 = 1.5766$
Probability level = 0.9542
Result - Accept H0

There is no relationship between the perceived stakeholders and the three policies.

4.9.7 Chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between stakeholders consulted during the implementation of the policy and the various policy types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Management</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Management</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This test has been done both with and without the Industrial Relations Policy data for the same reasons as set out in 4.9.3.

INCLUDING INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

df = 4
$x^2 = 4.0232$
Probability level = 0.8550
Result - Accept H0
EXCLUDING INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

\[ \text{df} = 4 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 2.7969 \]
\[ \text{Probability level} = 0.5924 \]
\[ \text{Result} - \text{Accept } H_0 \]

In both cases the null hypothesis is accepted in that there is no relationship between the stakeholders consulted and the type of policy.

4.9.8 Chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between the "forms" of policy and the various policies surveyed.

This test includes data from Samples A and B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM OF POLICY</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Policy in Manual</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal written but unpublished Policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwritten Policy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{df} = 3 \]
\[ \chi^2 = 11.3123 \]
\[ \text{Probability level} = 0.0792 \]
\[ \text{Result} - \text{Accept } H_0 \]

There is no relationship between the form of the policy and the policy type.
4.9.9 Chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between the implementation steps suggested by Foster (1989) and the policies on AIDS and Affirmative Action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION STEPS</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refining and gaining understanding through specialist input</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining management commitment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting key stakeholders</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining worker support through communication</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring implementation through progress reviews</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy audits</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness training</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring policy is kept current through regular reviews</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[df = 7\]
\[\chi^2 = 8.2468\]

Probability level = 0.3113

Result - Accept \(H_0\)

There is no relationship between the types of policies and the use of the steps as set out in Foster's model.
4.9.10 **TABLE 43: LENGTH OF TIME FROM DATE OF TRIGGER TO DATE WHEN POLICY WAS IMPLEMENTED**

This table includes data from Samples A and B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTHS</th>
<th>AIDS</th>
<th>AFFIRMATIVE ACTION</th>
<th>INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample A</td>
<td>Sample B</td>
<td>Sample A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The modal time taken from date of trigger to date when policy was finalised is 4 - 6 months across all policies and samples.
This table summarises the results for Section 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy exists</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy implemented effectively</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy implemented effectively</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy successful</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy successful</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home grown VS Hybrid Policy</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy communication</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Policy Stakeholders</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders consulted</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders consulted</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forms of Policy</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster's Policy steps</td>
<td>AIDS: x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to complete</td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>4 - 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = Denotes that the data on the policy was included in the test.

* = Modal length of time to develop policy was the same for all policies.
SUMMARY

Table 4.4 summarises the findings of the statistical tests carried out on the cross policy evaluation. These can broadly be divided into two main categories, namely process and outcome. A significant finding of the tests is that the process issues were all found to be the same across the three policies. The process issues in this context include the communication of the policy, stakeholder consultation, policy form, the steps followed in implementation as well as the time taken to complete the policy.

A most interesting finding is that despite the process being the same, the outcome is quite different. This is evident for whether or not the policy exists, whether or not it has been implemented effectively and whether or not it is considered as successful.

The implication being that despite the process issues being the same, this does not automatically mean the "result" will necessarily be accepted.

4.10 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this Chapter presented a summary of the research findings and statistical analysis. In Chapter 5 the research findings will be discussed and interpreted with reference to the research questions and the Literature Review in Chapter 2.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

5.0 INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 5, the research results presented in Chapter 4 will be analysed with their relevance to the reviewed literature in Chapter 2. The research questions posed at the end of Chapter 3 are explored and discussed in greater detail. The relevance of the actual policies used in this study are not examined as this was covered in Chapter 4. The emphasis in Chapter 5 is more at bringing together the relevant findings into a cohesive framework.

5.1 FACTORS INFLUENCING HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Research Question 1 aimed to identify what are the factors involved in the process of policy formulation and implementation. The purpose of this question was to establish a basis from which the research into a framework for policy conceptualisation, development and final implementation would follow.

The process of identifying the factors that play an influence in human resource policy formulation and implementation commenced with the initial literature review discussed in Chapter 2. The design of the research questionnaire followed. The research questionnaire was designed and tested through a pilot study involving extensive consultation with experts in the field of human resource management. This is discussed in Chapter 3. This process identified the key factors involved in policy formulation and implementation and determined the basis from which the final questionnaire was set.
The research results show that there is a very wide complexity of factors that influence the process of human resource policy formulation and implementation. These are summarised as follows:

5.1.1 STAKEHOLDERS

There is extensive and varied consultation across a wide spectrum of both internal and external stakeholders. The internal stakeholders are consulted to a far greater extent than external stakeholders. This is explained by the fact that human resource policies are essentially designed for the internal usage of management and staff. The definition of policy considered most appropriate for this research was summarised in the literature review under section 2.2, and re-enforces this finding. Policy is defined as: "A set of proposals and actions that act as a reference point for managers in their dealings with employees" (Brewster et al 1982, p35).

The stakeholders identified and the extent to which they were consulted vary according to the nature of the policy. The Aids policy stakeholders are summarised in Table 11. An interesting outcome in this particular instance is the fact that Outside Specialists were consulted for advice and guidance more so than they were considered stakeholders. Affirmative Action policy stakeholder findings are summarised in Table 22. These findings show a close relationship between the perceived stakeholders and the extent to which they have been consulted. The Industrial Relations policy stakeholders are summarised in Table 32. The research findings show that across all three policies there is extensive consultation with the perceived stakeholders. The stakeholders and their consultation are mentioned here as a critical factor influencing the process of policy formulation and implementation but the whole question of stakeholder involvement is examined in Section 5.2.
An important factor in policy formulation and implementation is the form the policy will take. The form of the H.R. policies covered in the study do vary, dependent to an extent, on the nature of the policy issue. However by far the most common form for H.R. policies to take is that of a "formal written policy" published in the human resource policies manual.

The study revealed that other forms that H.R. policy take include: formal written but unpublished policy; unwritten policy; letter to staff; a strategic objective; just an informal approach; outcome of other contractual agreements eg part of medical aid and other insured benefit agreements; and in many instances policy takes the form of what is generally described as an "administrative guideline". These findings are summarised in Tables 9, 21, 31 and the associated narrative.

Zeach (1980) contended that policies should be in writing but pointed out that countless companies have never bothered to reduce their practices, customs and traditions to writing.

The finding of the study is that policies mostly take the form of formal written documents indicating that there appears to have been a shift in this regard since the early 1980's. The practise of reducing policies to writing is further supported by Cohen (1990) who states that a written policy may be easier to change in the light of changed circumstances than one based solely on custom and practise. Cohen's (1990) view that booklets and longer policy documents are directed primarily within the company is further supported by the findings of this study.

5.1.3 POLICY FORMULATION

A most critical factor influencing policy formulation is the basis from
which the policy is formulated. In the case of the Aids policy there is a
virtual 50/50 split between the policy having been developed from another
company's policy and being original. Whereas in the case of the
Affirmative Action policy 68% of companies developed original policies.
See tables 10 and 20.

Torrington and Hall (1991) believe that the above two (most common)
methods of devising policy are both inadequate. Whilst the pitfalls
highlighted by Torrington and Hall (1991) cannot be overlooked the
findings of this study are of particular interest. In the case of the Aids
Policy with a 50/50 split between method of formulation the policy success,
as rated by whether it fully meets its objectives, indicates that in 71% of
cases the policy fully meets its objectives. This would seem to suggest that
either method of formulation has its merits.

3.1.4 POLICY TRIGGERS

The factors that triggered the need for companies to formulate a policy
varied considerably and is very much dependent on the nature of the
policy. The one factor that is common to all three of the policies is that
the human resource people were mostly identified as the policy triggers.

This is so as they are at the pivotal point of policy development and
responsible for monitoring the environment, networking and advising the
organisation on appropriate actions in respect of policy issues. See Tables
12, 23 and 33.

Of particular interest however is the significance of the finding that in the
case of the Affirmative Action policy, strategic future business needs was
cited as the trigger for developing the policy. In this study it was
mentioned twice as often as the next most frequent trigger.
5.1.5. TIME

The modal time taken from date of trigger to date where the policy was finally published is the same for all three the policy issues covered in the research. The time being between 4 and 6 months. This is a considerable time span and increases to significantly beyond this in some cases. This long time span also reflects the complexity of policy formulation and implementation. See tables 13, 24 and 34.

5.1.6 COMMUNICATION

Policy communication was also identified as a critical factor, particularly in the process of policy implementation. In the South African context where racial, ethnic, cultural and linguistic variances considerably, the issue of communication becomes even more critical and indeed complex. Briefing groups were identified as the most commonly used method of policy communication with policy directives in policy manuals, company newsletters and staff notices also being used to a large extent. See Tables 7, 15, 27.

The extensive use of Briefing Groups as the preferred method of policy communication is very interesting given the communication complexities outlined above. Of particular interest would be to further examine how these communication barriers are dealt with.

The study also revealed that there are some very innovative and creative communication techniques that are being used for policy communication. Worthy of note is the use of videos, discussion groups which, in addition to imparting information, provide a working forum for gaining both understanding and commitment and in a few cases steering committees were used. Other more creative communication techniques identified include the use of the electronic network as well as the inclusion of
abbreviated policies in the company issued diary.

Beach (1980) states that policies can only be communicated to employees when they are reduced to writing. This ensures that everyone receives the same information. This study supports Beach’s recommendation in that the majority of policies are in a formal written form, (see Tables 9, 21 and 31).

5.1.7. RECOGNITION AND REWARD SYSTEMS

Recognition/reward systems and punitive action where policy was not implemented effectively were examined as factors playing a role in the process of policy implementation. Of interest is that in the majority of cases no recognition or reward of any nature is given for effective policy implementation (see Table 38) whereas disciplinary action, which could even be as severe as dismissal, is imposed for non compliance (see Table 39).

As policy formulation and implementation is a key success factor for senior human resource practitioners, it is suggested that positive recognition and development could be achieved by the inclusion of this as a formal review factor in the appraisal. Reward could then be in terms of the appraisal rating.

5.1.8 POLICY FORMULATION DIFFICULTIES

Policy formulation or conceptualisation covers a wide variety of factors. The most difficult part of policy formulation as seen by the H.R. practitioners who completed the questionnaire related to the need to meet the needs and expectation of all the stakeholders. This was closely followed by the difficulties experienced in gaining commitment and
consensus to the philosophies and concepts to be covered by the policy. The summary of all the factors identified as making policy formulation so difficult can be seen in Table 40. This finding is further reinforced by the findings in Table 42 which indicated that gaining commitment and consensus is the most difficult factor involved in policy development.

5.1.9 POLICY IMPLEMENTATION DIFFICULTIES

Policy Implementation as a distinctly different process to policy formulation revealed that the three most difficult issues included; getting line management commitment and support, ensuring effective communication and ensuring consistency of application and interpretation. The other myriad of factors identified are summarised in Table 4.1. The difficulties encountered with policy formulation are essentially the same as those for policy implementation.

5.1.10 POLICY ACCESS

Policy access was examined as a factor involved in the process of policy formulation and implementation. The purpose of this being to establish whether or not the policy content and how it impacted on the organisation, was readily known to all of those who were affected by it. This was measured at two levels (a) the specific policy and (b) the human resource policy manual.

There is limited restricted access to the AIDS and Affirmative Action policies, (see Tables 17 and 27 respectively). The restriction of access generally related to the fact that the policy was either incomplete or it was only necessary to issue the policy to those responsible for its administration.
A relatively higher incidence of restriction is placed on the access to H.R. policy manuals (see Table 6) with confidentiality of certain information being the underlying reason for the restriction of access. The distribution of policy manuals (see Table 5) further reinforces that policies are essentially designed for management control purposes in that distribution is mainly to managers and supervisors.

Beach (1980) states that many executives are actually opposed to writing the personnel policies on paper and disseminating them to all employees. According to Cohen (1990), executives believe that doing this would tie their hands and limit their freedom of action. For the policies covered in this research there appears to be wide dissemination of and access to policy information which would seem to suggest that there is a positive move away from the practices outlined by Cohen and Beach.

The extensive involvement of stakeholders in policy issues (see 5.1.1 and 5.2) reinforces the move away from autocratic management control of the policy formulation process and will increasingly bring pressure to bear for more transparency and information disclosure. This transparency will also increase the legitimacy of the policy and practice.

5.1.11 COMPLETION OF POLICY

A further factor that was considered in evaluating the process of formulation and implementation of policy was to establish what served to determine whether the policy was "complete". The main indicators of this were identified as follows: policy being approved by the Board of directors; being published in the policy manual, and the communication of the policy through the briefing group structures, (see Tables 15 and 26).

Policy implementation was measured against Foster's (1989) model for the three policy issues covered in the research. This model identified some
additional factors involved in the process of policy formulation and implementation. These include: refining and understanding the document by getting specialist input which has also been covered by the section on stakeholders, ensuring implementation of policy through progress reviews and checklists, ensuring effectiveness of implementation through policy audits and finally ensuring the policy is kept current through regular reviews, (see Tables 14.1, 14.2, 25.1, 25.2).

These findings not only emphasise the wide variety of factors involved in the process of human resource policy formulation and implementation but indeed the extreme complexity of integrating these factors. The many steps involved as well as the spread of competencies required by the human resource practitioners in managing the process, are further significant findings to emerge from this exploratory research.

5.2 HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY STAKEHOLDERS

Research Question 2 was aimed at determining who the stakeholders are in the formulation and implementation of human resource policies. The purpose of this question was twofold. In the first instance to identify who the stakeholders are and secondly to determine to what extent these stakeholders are consulted in the process of policy formulation and implementation.

This is particularly important in the light of the changes that organisations and society are currently undergoing and the extent to which so called "pressure groups" are increasingly bringing their influence to bear. Furthermore, most organisations still "think" in terms of traditional stakeholders such as employees, customers and suppliers which in the current turbulent environment is considered to be too narrow a focus.

The research found that there is a wide cross section of stakeholders across all
the policy issues covered (refer to the research questionnaires). The internal stakeholders appear to be more important than the external stakeholders. In the Aids policy the critical stakeholders as rated by frequency of response were: directors, HR manager at/department, trade union, general staff and line management. Whilst rated in this order as the most important stakeholders the frequency with which they were consulted had quite a different order namely: HR management, directors, line management, trade union and general staff (see Table 11). This pattern is virtually identical for the affirmative action policy (see Table 22).

An important and significant finding is the pivotal role the human resource practitioners play in policy formulation and implementation. The fact that they are rated so highly as perceived stakeholders is explained by the fact that they were mostly responsible for initiating the various policies (see Tables 11, 22, 32). The human resource role as stakeholders is not as much in ownership of policy but more so by the considerable variety and complexity of competencies they require to initiate policy and gaining consensus from the various stakeholder groupings.

This high stakeholder rating is related to their functional responsibility/authority for devising policy. The implementation of the policy is more a line management function. Furthermore, as policy formulation is such a key success factor at the senior human resource management level providing the functional specialist input, the high stakeholder rating is understandable.

In the Aids policy question, the state was specifically listed as a potential stakeholder whereas in the sections on affirmative action and industrial relations this was not the case. This is considered to be an oversight. It is quite clear that the state are definite stakeholders in these two policy issues. In the industrial relations policy from the legal and human rights perspective whereas affirmative action will unquestionably be a critical issue of any future government. The fact that respondents did not identify the state as a stakeholder under the section "other" would seem to suggest that either respondents did not give too much
thought to this section when completing the questionnaire, alternatively they do not see the state as a significant stakeholder in these policy issues.

Whilst some of the external stakeholders have been cited quite frequently eg. communities in the case of affirmative action and trade unions in the case of industrial relations the extent to which they were consulted on the policy issues is very low. This may be a factor of power as suggested by Manning (1988) or, in the case of the communities in the Aids policy it may be that the community "leaders" are not readily identifiable. Alternatively, as suggested by Hussey and Langham (1979), management do not consider them to be of great importance to the success of the policy.

A chi-squared test was carried out to evaluate whether or not there is any relationship between the stakeholders consulted during the process of policy implementation and the various policy types, (see Section 4.9.7). These findings show that there is no relationship between the stakeholders consulted and the type of policy.

The above findings seem to confirm that the main stakeholders are not dependent on the type of human resource policy issue. The similarity that has been identified between the various groups of stakeholders is a significant outcome and provides an important basis for stakeholder identification and consultation in the process of policy formulation and implementation.

The frequency with which the perceived stakeholders have been cited and the extent to which they have been consulted clearly illustrates that they have varying degrees of influence over the formulation and implementation of the policies. This study did not go beyond the identification of perceived stakeholders and the frequency of consultation. It is therefore recommended that further research should be conducted into the degree of influence the various stakeholders have, how this influence is exercised as well as the nature and form of the consultation in the process of policy formulation and implementation.
Manning (1988) argues that the demands of various stakeholders are usually in conflict and are seldom in alignment with management goals. Furthermore each has a different perception of reality, a different agenda, different ways of making it's presence felt and different power to play with. Hussey and Langham (1979) state that stakeholders have certain expectations and perceptions of the firm and also their own requirements as individuals. It is partly from the behaviours of the stakeholders that the management of the firm draws its own perception and in turn causes the organisation to behave in a specific way. Hussey and Langham (1979) further state that it is the responsibility of the management of the firm to decide which objectives it will meet and which it will not. As such management have therefore aligned their time with those stakeholders they perceive to be of greatest importance to the business success and are more forthcoming in verbalising or demonstrating their expectations of management than the other stakeholders.

The findings of this study support these views as can be seen by the relative importance management give to the stakeholders consulted in the process of policy formulation and implementation, (see Tables 11, 22 and 32).

5.3 POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Research question 3 aimed to determine whether the process of policy formulation and implementation is different for different types of human resource policies. The purpose of this question was to gather empirical data that would assist in developing a holistic model that would facilitate the process of policy formulation and implementation.

Underlying the expression of any policy are certain values and constraints as stated by Cuthbert (1973). Torrington and Hall (1991) point out that the two most common methods of devising personnel policy are both inadequate. The one is to use the policy of another organisation as a model; the other being to start with a clean sheet of paper to produce something that sounds good.
Questions 9 in sections C and D of the questionnaire (Appendix V) ask whether the policy is "home grown" or a "hybrid" from another company's policy. The research findings indicate that there is a virtual 50/50 split between the "home grown" and "hybrid" policy development approaches for the Aids Policy, (see Table 10). The finding is somewhat different for the Affirmative Action Policy with 68% of the respondents indicating that the policy was original to the company, (see Table 20).

A chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between the policy being implemented effectively and the different policies covered in the study found that there is a relationship between the type of policy and whether it has been implemented effectively. This same test was carried out excluding the Industrial Relations policy as these policies have generally been in place for some time. The results in both instances confirmed there is a definite relationship between the type of policy and whether or not it has been implemented effectively, (see 4.9.2.).

A chi-squared test to measure whether there is a relationship between the type of policy and whether or not it is seen as successful was done. Success was measured in this case by whether or not the policy was fully meeting its objectives, (see Tables 18, 29, 37). The results show that there is a definite relationship between the type of policy and whether it is considered to be successful. In this instance all three the policies covered were found to be mostly meeting their objectives, (see 4.9.3.).

It is interesting to note that there is no relationship between whether the policy is home grown or a hybrid from another company's policy, (see 4.9.4.). Similarly there is no relationship between the type of policy and the method of communication (see 4.9.5.); no relationship between perceived stakeholders and the type of policy (see 4.9.6.); no relationship between the stakeholders consulted and the type of policy (see 4.9.7.) and no relationship between the form of the policy and the type of policy (see 4.9.8.).
The findings of the study also indicate that there is no relationship between the method of communication and the type of policy. Cohen (1990) supports the view that policy should be communicated to all employees so they are able to assess management's intention. This, he suggests, further supports the need for a "formal written document" which will in turn ensure that, in the process of communication, all employees receive the same information.

In establishing whether there is any significant difference or relationship between the form of the policy and the type of policy a chi-squared test found there to be no relationship. Brewster and Richbell (1982) point out that personnel policy take on two forms. The espoused policy which refers to the collection of proposals, objectives and standards that top management hold versus the operational policy which refers to the action or behaviours of managers and supervisors. The results of this research confirms that there is no difference between the forms of the three policies covered as seen from an "espoused" perspective.

The process of policy implementation was measured against the model suggested by Foster (1989). The results are set out for two of the three policies namely Aids and Affirmative Action in Tables 14.1; 14.2; 25.1; 25.2. These findings were further tested by doing a chi-squared test on the implementation steps set out by Foster. The findings are that there is no relationship between the type of policy and the steps. In other words all the suggested steps were generally followed.

Finally the research found that the modal time taken from date of trigger to final implementation of policy was the same across all the policies and samples, (see Table 43).

It has therefore been conclusively established that the de facto process of policy formulation and implementation is no different across the three policies covered in this research. The measures used to determine this are summarised as follows:
The empirical findings of this research contradict Cohen (1980), a South African, who believes that the process of policy formulation varies greatly depending on the nature of the policy being formulated and the organisational climate and culture.

These findings are also in contradiction to Hofmeyr's (1993) view that the process of policy formulation in South Africa is based on a "top - down" philosophy. Hofmeyr (1993) states that management takes decisions, formulates and implements policy in a somewhat autocratic way. Also that management is comfortable with this, in that a top - down approach generally fits the "culture" of many South African organisations. Whilst the writer would tend to agree that, on the face of things, Hofmeyr's views are probably correct, this body of research seems to contradict this. The underlying reason for the contradiction is that there appears to be extensive consultation, across a wide spectrum of stakeholders and over a considerable period of time. The considerable amount of time taken and its consistency across the three policies would seem to support the view that this allowed for a process of consultation, consensus seeking, research and communication to take place.

The research reveals that H.R. practitioners find the most difficult part of policy formulation to include meeting the needs of all stakeholders as well as the gaining of commitment and consensus, (see Table 40). Both these outcomes would further suggest that a process of interaction is taking place whereas Hofmeyr
(1993) contends that in South Africa it is a simple top-down philosophy. Whilst Hofmeyr's views may have been accurate, this body of research clearly shows that there is a definite shift in this regard toward a more inclusive process.

This exploratory research, the first of its kind in South Africa, has provided sound empirical data that supports the finding that the process of human resource policy formulation and implementation is the same for the different types of policy covered in the research. It is fair to conclude therefore that the process to be followed for human resource policy formulation and implementation would be the same or similar irrespective of the type of policy being developed and hence it would be appropriate to develop a generic model for these processes.

5.4 A MODEL FOR HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Research Question 4 was aimed at examining the applicability of Foster's (1989) model for policy formulation and implementation. The purpose being to expand and/or refine Foster's model by using the empirical evidence gathered by this study.

5.4.1 FOSTER'S MODEL

The research results indicate that the policy formulation and implementation steps suggested by Foster are in fact extensively followed. Tables 14.1 and 14.2 indicate that Foster's steps are all followed in the implementation of the Aids policy with particular emphasis on the formulation of the policy content and the gaining of management commitment. Similar results are evident in the implementation of the Affirmative Action policy with consulting of key stakeholders also receiving high priority, (see Tables 25.1 and 25.2).

The research findings confirm that Foster's steps are by and large followed
in the process of policy formulation and implementation. However, certain of the suggested steps are considered to have too narrow a focus and were found not to be sequentially appropriate. Foster’s steps are listed below followed by the Researcher’s proposed steps which are further contextualised within a broader model on page 122.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOSTER’S STEPS</th>
<th>RESEARCHER’S STEPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Formulation of policy content</td>
<td>1. Conceptualisation of policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Drafting and understanding policy through specialist input</td>
<td>2. Identifying policy stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gaining of management commitment</td>
<td>3. Soliciting stakeholder and specialist input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gaining of worker support</td>
<td>4. Defining and understanding the document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communicating the policy to all employers/interest groups</td>
<td>5. Gaining stakeholder commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ensuring policy implementation through progress reviews, checklists</td>
<td>6. Communication of policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ensuring effectiveness of policy through Audits</td>
<td>7. Ensuring policy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Keeping the policy current</td>
<td>8. Ensuring compliance and measuring/monitoring effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>9. Keeping the policy current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of particular significance is the different emphasis that the researcher’s proposed steps highlight in regard to stakeholders. Foster, in steps 3 and 4 has a rather narrow focus on policy stakeholders in that reference is only made to management and worker involvement. The empirical data in this study has shown that it is accepted practice to include the viewpoints of a far broader set of stakeholders.

Each of the steps proposed in the researcher’s model have distinct components which can be seen in the Model in Figure 3.
5.4.2 A MODEL FOR HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Freeman (1984) points out that by using the concept of "stakeholder" managers and theorists will come to see these groups as having a "stake". Furthermore, the term "stakeholders" connotes "legitimacy" and while managers may not think that certain groups are "legitimate", in the sense that their demands on the firm are inappropriate, strategic managers need to acknowledge the legitimate claims of other stakeholders on the firm (Pearce, 1982).

In the traditional managerial model, the firm has as the stakeholders; customers, suppliers and their employees. Binedell (1987) states that in turbulent times "this is too narrow a focus and that the model of stakeholder analysis should be broadened to include the forces and issues that work in the macro environment.

This critical observation serves to introduce the researcher's model of human resource policy formulation and implementation in Figure 3. This model is adapted using Foster's model as a framework and is based on the empirical findings of the de facto situation in the 93 companies covered in this study. The purpose of the model is to encompass both the macro- and micro issues in the external and internal environment into a single framework, highlighting these inter-relationships and factors involved in this complex process. It also served to simplify these complexities and put them into a logical sequence.

Firstly, the model has several major components starting with the macro environment and external stakeholders. This macro environment has both direct and indirect influence over the internal environment and its stakeholders.

Secondly, the internal environment is covered indicating the stakeholders
FIGURE 3: A MODEL FOR HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

- **EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS**
  - **POLITICAL FORCES**
  - **ECONOMIC FORCES**
  - **LEGAL FORCES**
  - **CULTURAL FORCES**

- **INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT**
  - **MISSION**
  - **STRATEGY**
  - **STRUCTURE**
  - **CULTURE**
  - **VALUES**
  - **CORES**
  - **EXPECTATIONS**
  - **CONSTRAINTS**

- **FEEDBACK LOOP**
  - **MONITOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT**
  - **ANTICIPATE POLICY REQUIREMENTS**
  - **UNDERSTAND STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR EXPECTATIONS**
  - **CONSULT WITH STAKEHOLDERS**
  - **CONCEPTUALISE POLICY**
  - **BUILD CONSENSUS**
  - **PROVIDE LEADERSHIP**
  - **FACILITATE**
  - **COMMUNICATE**
  - **NETWORK**
  - **ADVISE**
  - **GAIN CONSENT**
  - **INNOVATE**

- **POLICY FORMULATION/IMPLEMENTATION**
  - **OBJECTIVES**
  - **FRAMEWORK**
  - **PRINCIPLES**
  - **STANDARDS**
  - **IDENTIFYING POLICY STAKEHOLDERS**
  - **SOLICIT STAKEHOLDER INPUT**
  - **REFINING AND UNDERSTANDING THE DOCUMENT**
  - **GAINING STAKEHOLDER COMMITMENT**
  - **COMMUNICATION OF POLICY**
  - **ENSURING POLICY IMPLEMENTATION**
  - **ENSURING COMPLIANCE/MEASURE EFFECTIVENESS**
  - **KEEPING POLICY CURRENT**

- **FEEDBACK LOOP**
  - **CONSULT ADVISE COMMUNICATE**
  - **BUILD CONSENSUS**
  - **COMMUNICATE**
  - **GAIN CONSENT**
  - **INNOVATE**
  - **ENSURE ADVISE**

- **SPECIALIST INPUT**
  - **INNOVATION**
  - **COMMUNICATION MEDIA**
  - **LANGUAGE**
  - **BRIEFING GROUPS**
  - **POLICY MANUAL**
  - **NEWSLETTER**
  - **VIDEO**
  - **DISCUSSION GROUPS**
  - **ELECTRONIC MEDIA**

- **Internal Competencies in Policy Development**
  - **Understand Stakeholders and Their Expectations**
  - **Consult with Stakeholders**
  - **Conceptualise Policy**
  - **Build Consensus**
  - **Provide Leadership**
  - **Facilitate**
  - **Communicate**
  - **Network**
  - **Advise**
  - **Gain Consent**
  - **Innovate**

- **Steps**
  - **Objectives**
  - **Framework**
  - **Principles**
  - **Standards**
  - **Identifying Policy Stakeholders**
  - **Solicit Stakeholder Input**
  - **Refining and Understanding the Document**
  - **Gaining Stakeholder Commitment**
  - **Communication of Policy**
  - **Ensuring Policy Implementation**
  - **Ensuring Compliance/Measure Effectiveness**
  - **Keeping Policy Current**
and factors that play a significant role. It is from both the external and internal environmental forces that the human resource practitioner must anticipate the organisational policy requirements. The link to these environments being through the internal and external stakeholders (see Feedback Loops in Figure 3).

Thirdly, the human resource practitioner who is seen as the pivotal player in this process and the complex and varied competencies required to perform this task are summarised in the model. These skills requirements, whilst not specifically covered in the literature review, have emerged as a very important and significant outcome of this research.

These skills requirements are highly varied and complex. For many of them there are no specific training and development programmes available. This further reinforces the complex nature of this process which is expected to even increase in complexity in the future as the process of inclusion continues to gain momentum.

Fourthly, the policy formulation and implementation steps proposed by the researcher are set out. Each step in the process comprises of various components dealing with content, skills and form. The first step entails the conceptualisation of policy. This deals with the process of monitoring the internal and external environment for developments requiring policy statements. Once the overall policy has been conceived, the actual policy must be formulated which involves the following components; setting the policy objectives, purpose, framework and principles. Deciding on what form the policy will take and what standards it will require.

Having conceptualised and formulated the broad policy, the next step involves identifying the policy stakeholders and soliciting their input. The components of this vital step include consulting stakeholders, seeking advice, general communication, motivating the policy objectives to gain interest and building consensus. As Hofmeyr (1993) points out, this
process needs to be made more participative so that the stakeholders who are so vital to its acceptance and success can contribute to its design and implementation.

This is followed by what is broadly categorised as the communication phase. The steps involved include refining and understanding the document; gaining stakeholder commitment and communication of the policy.

The communication phase of policy implementation was identified as one of the most difficult areas in the process (see table 41). In Figure 3, the model highlights the need of "innovation" in this area. The study found that there are some creative and exciting approaches already being used to enhance the understanding and acceptance of policy. Worthy of mention are the following:

- A company diary where the introductory section is devoted to a summary of the key human resource policies and values.
- Establishing human resource policies on the electronic network which ensures that they are always current and easily accessible.
- The use of discussion groups and video material to communicate policy changes and developments.
- The inclusion of policy reviews in Business Review meetings. This serves the purpose of re-enforcing understanding as well as measuring compliance.

The next step is to ensure the policy is implemented which may include the use of checklists and progress reviews. This is a critical step that requires strategising. Brewster and Richbell (1982) point out that the actual implementation does not always rest with the personnel department.
but rather the responsibility lies with the general or line managers in their day-to-day relationship with the workforce.

The ongoing compliance and effectiveness of the policy follows. This may be done through audits of the policy on a more formal basis or a reward system to incentivise line management to comply with the policy requirements.

The next step in this ongoing process is to ensure that the policy is always kept current as the environment and organisational needs change. This entails researching and monitoring the internal and external environment. The model illustrates the ongoing nature of this process through the feedback loop which links back into the HR competencies and the internal and external environments.

Fifthly, specialist input may be sought for the various steps, if this is required. Specialists and consultants were extensively identified as an important resource in the stakeholders consulted phase, (see Tables 11, 22 and 32).

Finally, a word of caution. The sensitivity of "labels" that often arise out of the choice of wording in policy statements is a key issue. This emerged particularly in the case of Affirmative Action and must be carefully guarded against.

In conclusion, this model (Figure 3) encompasses the broad variety of skills/competencies required for policy formulation and implementation, it encapsulates the steps and components involved and illustrates the interaction with the environments and stakeholders that influence the process and outcome. It is based on empirical evidence and, in the view of the researcher, provides an holistic approach to the complex and involved process of human resource policy formulation and implementation.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.0 INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter, final conclusions will be made with regards to the investigation. Limitations of the research are highlighted and recommendations for future research made.

6.1 SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

The overall purpose of this study was to identify the key factors involved in the process of policy formulation and implementation as well as to develop a model based on empirical data. The rationale for embarking on this study was to assist human resource practitioners and organisations to more effectively manage the highly complex process of policy formulation and implementation within the morass of stakeholders and the turbulent socio-political and socio-economic environment.

A further objective was to identify the de facto practices regarding human resource policy formulation and implementation. This would enable the development of a policy formulation and implementation framework that would be both holistic and sufficiently flexible to cope with the vast array of policy issues and stakeholders that influence the process.

The research method used was effective in identifying the stakeholders involved in selected human resource policies. In addition it was successful in identifying the communication methods, some of which are highly innovative, used in the implementation of policy. It also provided a clear understanding of the numerous factors that human resource practitioners need to be mindful of in the process of
policy formulation and implementation.

Furthermore it provided an empirical framework of steps to be followed in the implementation of policy by validating Foster's (1989) model which formed the basis of this study.

6.2 CRITICISMS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

The limitations and criticisms of the research are discussed below:

A limitation of the research is that in completing the questionnaire respondents are open to overstating their position. This could occur as people may like to appear in a better light than they actually are.

Secondly, as the subject of human resource policy is such a broad and varied one, covering a wide number of topics the research had to be limited to a select number of policy issues. Whilst care was taken to select those policy issues which would be germane to most human resource policies it cannot be guaranteed that this is necessarily correct.

The policies that have been identified for this research are to an extent influenced by the current socio-political environment. This research has been conducted in a society undergoing rapid and far reaching transformation which could result in this research soon becoming outdated.

The questionnaires were completed by the human resources managers of the organisations they were sent to. As the human resource practitioners are the custodians of these policies and therefore responsible for their efficacy the results are greatly influenced by their perceptions of the position. The questionnaire should perhaps have been sent to a number of other stakeholders in the organisation in order to get a more balanced representation.
The research questionnaire was structured to only identify who the stakeholders are in the policies covered. It is now apparent that the stakeholders have varying degrees of influence over the various policy issues, consideration could have been given to the weighting of the importance of the various stakeholders identified.

The "State" was not specifically identified as a stakeholder in two policy questions on Affirmative Action and Industrial Relations, yet this question was asked for the AIDS policy. No respondent under the section "Other" suggested that the State was a potential stakeholder in these policies. However given the legal parameters that govern Industrial Relations and the anticipated pressure in the Affirmative Action area that is going to be brought to bear by a future black majority government, there is no doubt that the State should have been identified as a stakeholder in these questions. Hofmeyr (1993) in fact states that the most obvious stakeholders in an Affirmative Action approach are managers, employees, trade unions and political groups.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The following areas of research are recommended for further study:

- The research found that briefing groups are extensively used in the communication of policy issues. In the South African context where society comprises of so many multi-lingual and multi-cultural groups with vastly differing literacy capabilities the effectiveness of this method of communication needs to be further examined.

- The study was limited to identifying the methods used for the communication of the selected policies. Future research, of distinct value to employers in particular, would be to examine whether there are other more effective mediums for this purpose and the underlying reasons for this.
W. not covered in the literature, the research revealed that human resource practitioners require a complex set of competencies in policy formulation and implementation. These competencies include, but are not limited to, skills such as the conceptualisation of the policy, capabilities of consulting across wide and varied groups of stakeholders, outstanding communication skills as well as the ability to forecast and anticipate the future implications of policies for the organisation. The skills requirements specifically related to the various roles the human resource practitioner must assume in the process of policy formulation and implementation are worthy of further research.

The study was limited to identifying who are considered to be stakeholders in the three policies covered and whether or not these stakeholders were consulted in the process of formulation and implementation. The area that warrants further study is to examine the type and extent of consultation that takes place, ie opinion seeking, advice, joint problem solving, joint decision making or any other form.

The study revealed that policy takes on various forms and is referred to by many titles. A few of these include the following:

- Policy
- Administrative Guideline
- Practice
- Statement of Intent

These varied definitions may be related to the organisational culture and the researcher believes is an area worthy of in-depth study. Such research could specifically focus on the effectiveness and nature of policy and practice as related to the organisational culture.

The literature review has highlighted that a gap is often evident between what is referred to as the operational versus the espoused policy. This
practice introduces the concept of "malicious compliance". In other words, the espoused policy is complied with but with its own "interpretation". Future research in this area could aim to determine whether this gap is related to the organisational culture, industry type or perhaps operational efficiency.

6.4 USEFULNESS OF THE STUDY

The researcher is of the opinion that this research has resulted in numerous findings which will be of definite use in many different respects. Firstly, the study has resulted in the development of a generic policy formulation and implementation model, based on empirical data which will be of use to, not only human resource practitioners but will be of value to organisations generally when involved in this process. The model provides a structured and logical approach to this complex issue.

The research has also identified the wide variety of factors that are involved in, and influence human resource policy formulation and implementation. These are listed and discussed in Chapter 5. The importance of this is that it provides an immediate focus into the core factors to be considered for effective and successful policy formulation and implementation. It also creates the necessary awareness for the parties involved to be sensitive to the wide variety of factors that will influence the final outcome.

Of particular value and use has been the identification of the broad cross section of both internal and external stakeholders that have an influence over and interest in certain policy issues. The massive and critical role that these stakeholders have been found to have is particularly useful. This will be of particular value as the fast changing socio-political environment, continues to put pressure on organisations for more transparency in many areas previously not subjected to much external scrutiny, interference or involvement. Furthermore, the study has highlighted that stakeholders are increasingly being involved in the policy
positioning of the organisation. The understanding that a more inclusive process of stakeholder involvement is critical for policy acceptance, commitment and final implementation.

The identification of the broad complexity of skills required by the human resource practitioners involved in policy formulation and implementation is a valuable finding. It provided a sound basis from which skills development programmes can be initiated. This is of particular significance as there are no training and development programmes, known to the researcher, which are aimed at developing the required competencies for human resource practitioners in this area.

The research has furthermore resulted in the development of a sound reference document for use by human resource practitioners and managers involved in human resource policy formulation and implementation.

Furthermore it has also provided a sound basis for any further research into this area. The possibilities for future research have been introduced and discussed in Section 6.3.

A particular benefit from this research is the new insights that have been provided into this hitherto relatively unexplored, highly complex and critically important responsibility of senior human resource managers, namely human resource policy formulation and implementation.

6.5 CONCLUSION

In conclusion the nature of the research was exploratory and took the form of both theory validation and theory building. For the first time in South Africa an attempt at determining the extent to which stakeholders are recognised in the human resource policy formulation and implementation process was conducted. Furthermore, for the first time an empirical basis was established which validated
a previously unsubstantiated theory/model proposed for policy formulation and implementation.

The research resulted in the development of what is believed to be a more holistic framework for human resource policy formulation and implementation and unquestionably highlighted that there is scope for further research in the areas of human resource management competencies and the role of stakeholders in human resource policy formulation and implementation.
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RESEARCH SAMPLE A

Adcock Ingram Limited
Adcock Ingram Pharmaceuticals
A E C I Limited
Agricor
Alexander Forbes
Anglo-Alpha Limited
AngloVaal Limited
AngloVaal Mining Division
Associated Automotive Distributors

Barlow Motor Investments Limited
Barlow Rand Industries Limited
Blue Circle Limited

Cast nild
Ciba-Geigy (Pty) Limited
Consol Limited

Eli Lilly (SA) (Pty) Limited
Evertite Group Limited

Federated Timbers (Pty) Limited

Grinaker Construction
Group Five Projects (Construction)
Glaxo South Africa (Pty) Ltd

Hulet Aluminiwm (Pty) Limited
Imperial Motor Group Limited
Irvin & Johnson Limited

Janssen Pharmaceutica (Pty) Limited
Johannesburg City Council

Kwikot Limited

Lonrho SA Limited

McCarthy Group Limited
Mercedes Benz of South Africa
Midas Limited
Murray and Roberts - Engineering Trading Division

National Brands Limited
National Chemical Products
Nedcor Bank
Nestle
Noristan Limited

PG Glass

Ready Mix Materials (Pty) Limited
Revacon (SA) (Pty) Limited
Roche Products
SA Druggists Limited
Samcor (Pty) Limited
SA Phillips (Pty) Limited
SA Post Office
Sentrachem Limited
Sino Kwinho Films (Pty) Limited
Sun International Limited

Transnet
TW Becketts

Upjohn (Pty) Limited

Vaal Poterries (Pty) Ltd

Wellcome (Pty) Limited
Weshank Limited
RESEARCH SAMPLE E

1993 POST-GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN MANAGEMENT STUDENTS

Adcock Ingram Pharmaceuticals
Afrox
Anderson Consulting
Anglo-Alpha Limited
Atlas Aviation

BMW

Colgate Palmolive

Deloitte and Touche
Druggists Wholesale

Edgars Limited
Engen Marketing
Ernst and Young
Eskom
Epic Oil Mills

Fein Power Tools SA
First Bowring

Highveld Steel
Hunt, Lechards and Hepburn Limited

Johannesburg Consolidated Investments
Liberty Life

Natal Portland Cement (Pty) Ltd  
National Beverage Services (Pty) Ltd  
NDS

Permark International  
Pick 'n Pay  
Plascon Paints (Pty) Ltd  
Polycell  
Premier Mines - De Beers Consolidated Mines

Rennies Group

Sanmor  
Shell SA (Pty) Ltd  
South African Breweries  
SA Permanent Building Society  
Standard Bank  
Sun International (Sun City)  
Supervision Food Services

TEK Corporation  
Three M (Pty) Ltd  
Tongaat Foods  
Transnet  
TWS Communications

Vandenberg's - Unilever

Woolworths/Wooltru

XPS Services
September 1, 1993

Dear Respondent

RE: HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY SURVEY

I am in the final stages of completing the Masters of Management (Human Resources) Degree at the Wits Business School. Part of the requirements of the Degree is the completion of an independently conducted Research Report on an approved topic.

The title of my Research Report is: "FACTORS INFLUENCING THE FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY".

The research is being conducted as there is very little data published on the state of human resource policy formulation and implementation in South Africa. I would be most grateful for your input into the survey.

All information gathered will be treated in the strictest confidence and no information relating to a specific organisation will be published.

We would appreciate your assistance by completing the attached questionnaire and faxing a return at your earliest convenience. Should you need any assistance or clarification in completing the questionnaire, kindly contact George Cameron-Dow on (011) 453-3088, during office hours or on (011) 908-3710, after hours.

Please fax your completed questionnaire to the following:

Attention: George Cameron-Dow
Fax No: (011) 453-3088 Ext. 128.

If you wish to receive the summarised results of the survey, please complete the last section of the questionnaire.

Thank you in anticipation of your valuable assistance.

George Cameron-Dow
Student

[Signature]

Dr. M. Hendeken
Research Co-ordinator
Wits Business School

The University of the Witwatersrand rejects racism and racial segregation. It is committed to non-discrimination (particularly in the rand-based student body, to the selection, and promotion of its staff, and in its administration.)
SECTION A

POLICY FORMULATION PROJECT

COMPANY NAME: ____________________________________________________________

STUDENT NAME: ____________________________________________________________

CITY WHERE LOCATED: _______________________________________________________

Please mark the appropriate box(es) with a Bold X.

TOTAL STAFF NUMBERS: 

[ ] 0 - [ ] 251 - 500 [ ] 501 - 1 000 [ ] 1 001 - 2 000 [ ] 2 001 +

TYPE OF INDUSTRY:

[ ] MANUFACTURING [ ] RETAIL [ ] AUTO [ ] MINING

[ ] FINANCIAL SERVICES [ ] HOTEL/LEISURE/SERVICE [ ] OTHER

[ ] PUBLIC QUOTED COMPANY [ ] PUBLIC NON-QUOTED COMPANY

[ ] PRIVATE COMPANY

One of Management's major functions is that of Policy Formulation and Implementation. The terms 'Policy' and 'Strategy' are often used interchangeably. 'Policy' can be defined as a standing decision that applies to recurring questions and problems. 'Strategy' would be 'a general approach to be followed in achieving an objective.

The purpose of this exercise will be to expose you to some approaches and practices adopted in Policy/Strategy Formulation. The data gathered will be used by WITS Business School for research purposes.

SECTION B

1. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE A HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUAL? [ ] YES [ ] NO

2. IF NO, PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MATTERS ARE HANDLED:

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

3. IF YES, WHO HAS ACCESS TO THE MANUAL?

[ ] MANAGEMENT [ ] SUPERVISORS [ ] ALL STAFF

___________________________________________________________________________
4. HOW WERE/ARE HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUALS DISTRIBUTED?

5. IS ACCESS RESTRICTED IN ANY WAY? □ YES □ NO

6. IF YES, PLEASE ELABORATE:

SECTION C

AIDS POLICY

1. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE AN AIDS POLICY? □ YES □ NO

2. WHAT FORM DOES THE AIDS POLICY TAKE:
   - □ FORMAL POLICY IN HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUAL
   - □ LETTER TO STAFF
   - □ UNWRITTEN POLICY
   - OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY:

3. PLEASE SPECIFY WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WERE CONSULTED/INVOLVED IN THE FORMULATION OF THE AIDS POLICY:
   - □ DIRECTORS
   - □ HR MANAGER/OFFICER
   - □ LINE MANAGEMENT
   - □ GENERAL STAFF
   - □ TRADE UNION
   - □ OUTSIDE SPECIALIST CONSULTANTS
   - OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY:

4. WHAT TRIGGERED THE NEED FOR AN AIDS POLICY? (Mark more than one if applicable)
   - □ DIRECTORS PERCEIVE NEED
   - □ AN EMPLOYEE CONTRACTED AIDS PRECIPITATING PRESSURE ON THE COMPANY
☐ HR DEPARTMENT BELIEVED COMPANY NEEDED A POLICY
☐ EXCLUSIONS PLACED ON MEDICAL AID BENEFITS
☐ BENEFIT FUND LIABILITIES, ie DEATH AND DISABILITY FUNDS

Other, please specify: _____________________________________________________________

5. HOW LONG DID IT TAKE FROM DATE OF TRIGGER TO DATE THAT A FORMAL POLICY WAS
PUBLISHED? ................................................................................... MONTHS

6. HOW DID THE COMPANY DETERMINE THAT THE POLICY WAS COMPLETE?
☐ APPROVED BY MANAGING DIRECTOR/BOARD
☐ ANNOUNCED IN STAFF NOTICE
☐ PUBLISHED IN POLICY MANUAL
☐ COMMUNICATED THROUGH OFFICIAL BRIEFING STRUCTURES

Other, please specify: _____________________________________________________________

7. WAS THE AIDS POLICY "HOME GROWN" OR A HYBRID FROM ANOTHER COMPANY'S POLICY?
☐ ORIGINAL  ☐ HYBRID

8. IS THE AIDS POLICY A 'CONFIDENTIAL' POLICY WITH RESTRICTED ACCESS?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO

9. IF YES, PLEASE ELABORATE:

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

SECTION D

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

1. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO

2. WHAT FORM DOES THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY TAKE:

_____________________________________________________________________________
☐ FORMAL POLICY IN HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUAL
☐ LETTER TO STAFF
☐ UNWRITTEN POLICY
☐ JUST A FORMAL APPROACH (ie EVERYBODY KNOWS THE COMPANY STANCE)
☐ IS IT A STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE
OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: ...................................................................................................................

3. PLEASE SPECIFY WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WERE CONSULTED/INVOLVED IN THE FORMULATION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY:
   ☐ DIRECTORS          ☐ HR MANAGER/OFFICER       ☐ LINE MANAGEMENT
   ☐ GENERAL STAFF       ☐ TRADE UNION           ☐ OUTSIDE SPECIALIST CONSULTANTS
OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: ...................................................................................................................

4. WHAT TRIGGERED THE NEED FOR AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY?
   ☐ STRATEGIC FUTURE BUSINESS NEEDS
   ☐ PRESSURE FROM STAFF/UNIONS
   ☐ ANTICIPATED LEGISLATION
   ☐ HR DEPARTMENT INITIATED NEED FOR POLICY
OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: ...................................................................................................................

5. HOW LONG DID IT TAKE FROM DATE OF TRIGGER TO DATE THAT A FORMAL POLICY WAS PUBLISHED?........................................................................................................................................

6. HOW DID YOU DEFINE THAT THE POLICY WAS COMPLETE?
   ☐ APPROVED BY MANAGING DIRECTOR/BOARD  ☐ PUBLISHED IN POLICY MANUAL
   ☐ ANNOUNCED IN STAFF NOTICE             ☐ COMMUNICATED THROUGH OFFICIAL BRIEFING STRUCTURES
OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: ...................................................................................................................

7. IS THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY "HOME GROWN" OR A HYBRID FROM ANOTHER COMPANY'S POLICY?
   ☐ ORIGINAL          ☐ HYBRID
OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: ...................................................................................................................

8. IS THIS A "CONFIDENTIAL" POLICY WITH RESTRICTED ACCESS? ...............................................................................................................................
   ☐ YES  ☐ NO
9. IF YES, PLEASE ELABORATE:


10. HOW WAS THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY COMMUNICATED?

☐ BRIEFING GROUPS
☐ STAFF NOTICES
☐ COMPANY NEWSLETTER
☐ HR POLICY DIRECTIVE IN MANUAL
☐ VIDEO

OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY:______________________________________________________________

SECTION E

The following steps have been outlined as a "pre-form" recommendation on how policy may be formulated, adopted and implemented. Please indicate which, if any, of these steps were followed by the Company with regard to both policies.

(A)                                                                                     AIDS POLICY                     AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

1. Formulation of the content of the Policy                                               ☐                             ☐
2. Refining and understanding the document - getting expert input in specialist fields    ☐                             ☐
3. The gaining of Management commitment                                                  ☐                             ☐
4. The gaining of worker support through communication                                    ☐                             ☐
5. Communicating the Policy through appropriate mediums to all employees/Interest Groups ☐                             ☐
6. Ensuring implementation of the Policy through progress reviews, checklists, etc        ☐                             ☐
7. Ensuring the effectiveness of implementation of the Policy through Audits and agreed practices ☐                             ☐
8. Keeping the Policy current                                                             ☐                             ☐

(B) PLEASE ASK THIS QUESTION OF EITHER THE HEAD OF HUMAN RESOURCES OR THE GENERAL MANAGER/MANAGING DIRECTOR.
WHAT IS THE MOST DIFFICULT PART OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT?

(C) LASTLY, PLEASE WOULD YOU CLASSIFY THE COMPANY: (Tick whichever are applicable)

☐ AUTOCRATIC
☐ PARTICIPATIVE
☐ DECENTRALISED
☐ CENTRALISED
☐ INNOVATIVE
☐ CONSERVATIVE
POLICY FORMULATION SURVEY

One of Management's major functions is that of Policy Formulation and Implementation. In the context of this report 'Policy' is defined as a standing decision that applies to recurring questions and problems. 'Stakeholder' is defined as all the individuals and groups who have a legitimate stake in the organisation.

The purpose of this research is to gather data on approaches and practices adopted in Policy Formulation and Implementation. The data gathered will be used by the WITS Business School for Research purposes.

The assurance is given that all information provided will be treated as confidential and results will only be presented in an aggregate form.

SECTION A: BASIC COMPANY DATA

COMPANY NAME: ........................................................................................................................................

CITY WHERE HEAD OFFICE IS LOCATED: ........................................................................................................

Please mark the appropriate box(es) with a Bold X

TOTAL STAFF NUMBERS: □ 0 - 250 □ 251 - 500 □ 501 - 1,000 □ 1,001 - 2,000 □ 2,001 +

TYPE OF INDUSTRY: □ MANUFACTURING □ RETAIL/WHOLESALE □ AUTO □ MINING □ FINANCIAL SERVICES □ HOTEL/LEISURE/SERVICE □ OTHER

IS COMPANY?: □ PUBLIC QUOTED COMPANY □ PUBLIC NON-QUOTED COMPANY □ PRIVATE COMPANY □ OTHER

CONTACT PERSON: .......................................................... POSITION: ..........................................................

SECTION B: HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUALS

1. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE A HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUAL? □ YES □ NO

2. IF NO, PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MATTERS ARE COMMUNICATED:
(a) To Managers: ........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................................

(b) To Staff: ............................................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................................................

3. IF YES, TO WHO ARE MANUALS DISTRIBUTED? (Mark more than one if applicable)
☐ DIRECTORS ☐ MANAGEMENT ☐ SUPERVISORS ☐ GENERAL STAFF
OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY (eg. TRADE UNION):
...........................................................................................................................................................

4. IS ACCESS TO HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUALS RESTRICTED IN ANY WAY? ☐ YES ☐ NO

5. IF YES, PLEASE ELABORATE:
...........................................................................................................................................................

6. HOW ARE STAFF KEPT UP-TO-DATE ON POLICY AND PROCEDURE CHANGES/DEVELOPMENTS?
...............................................................................................................................................................

SECTION C: AIDS POLICY

1. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE AN AIDS POLICY? ☐ YES ☐ NO

2. WHAT FORM DOES THE AIDS POLICY TAKE:
☐ FORMAL POLICY IN HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUAL
☐ FORMAL WRITTEN BUT "UNPUBLISHED" POLICY
☐ LETTER TO STAFF
☐ UNWRITTEN POLICY
☐ PART OF MEDICAL AID AGREEMENT
OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: ____________________________________________________________

3. PLEASE SPECIFY: (A) WHO OF THE FOLLOWING YOU CONSIDER TO BE STAKEHOLDERS IN THE FORMULATION/IMPLEMENTATION OF AN AIDS POLICY?

(B) WHO OF THE FOLLOWING WERE CONSULTED IN THE FORMULATION/IMPLEMENTATION OF YOUR COMPANY POLICY?

(C) WHO INITIATED THE AIDS POLICY? (IF YOU HAVE ONE)

(MARK AS MANY AS ARE APPLICABLE): A  B  C

DIRECTORS □  □  □
HR MANAGEMENT/DEPARTMENT □  □  □
LINE MANAGEMENT □  □  □
GENERAL STAFF □  □  □
TRADE UNION □  □  □
OUTSIDE SPECIALIST CONSULTANT □  □  □
PENSION FUND BROKERS/ADMINISTRATORS □  □  □
MEDICAL AID ADMINISTRATORS □  □  □
COMMUNITIES WHERE EMPLOYEES RESIDE □  □  □
STATE □  □  □

4. WHAT TRIGGERED THE NEED FOR AN AIDS POLICY? (Mark more than one if applicable)

□ DIRECTORS' PERCEIVED NEED
□ AN EMPLOYEE CONTRACTED AIDS PRECIPITATING PRESSURE ON THE COMPANY
□ HR DEPARTMENT BELIEVED COMPANY NEEDED A POLICY
□ EXCLUSIONS PLACED ON MEDICAL AID BENEFITS
□ POTENTIAL BENEFIT FUND LIABILITIES, ie DEATH AND DISABILITY FUNDS

OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: ____________________________________________________________

5. HOW LONG DID IT TAKE FROM DATE OF TRIGGER TO DATE THAT A FORMAL POLICY WAS PUBLISHED? ____________________________________________________________ MONTHS
6. HOW WAS THE AIDS POLICY IMPLEMENTED? (Please answer all Questions)

- Refining and understanding the document by getting expert input in specialist fields  
- Gaining Management commitment  
- Consulting key stakeholders prior to finalisation  
- Gaining of worker support through communication  
- Ensuring implementation of the policy through progress reviews, checklists, etc  
- Ensuring effectiveness of implementation through policy audits  
- Has any Aids Awareness training been done?  
- Is policy kept current through regular reviews?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. HOW DID THE COMPANY DETERMINE THAT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AIDS POLICY WAS COMPLETE?

- □ APPROVED BY MANAGING DIRECTOR/BOARD  
- □ ANNOUNCED IN STAFF NOTICE  
- □ PUBLISHED IN POLICY MANUAL  
- □ COMMUNICATED THROUGH OFFICIAL BRIEFING STRUCTURES  
- OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY:

8. HOW WAS THE AIDS POLICY COMMUNICATED?

- □ BRIEFING GROUPS  
- □ STAFF NOTICES  
- □ COMPANY NEWSLETTER/JOURNALS  
- □ HR POLICY DIRECTIVE IN MANUAL  
- □ VIDEO  
- OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY:

9. WAS THE AIDS POLICY "HOME GROWN" OR A HYBRID FROM ANOTHER COMPANY'S POLICY?

- □ ORIGINAL  
- □ HYBRID

10. IS THE AIDS POLICY A 'CONFIDENTIAL' POLICY WITH RESTRICTED ACCESS?  

- □ YES  
- □ NO
SECTION D: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

1. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY? □ YES □ NO

2. WHAT FORM DOES THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY TAKE? (Mark more than one if applicable)
   □ FORMAL POLICY IN HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUAL
   □ FORMAL WRITTEN BUT "UNPUBLISHED" POLICY
   □ LETTER TO STAFF
   □ UNWRITTEN POLICY
   □ JUST AN INFORMAL APPROACH (i.e. EVERYBODY KNOWS THE COMPANY STANCE)
   □ IS IT A STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE

   OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: __________________________________________________________

3. PLEASE SPECIFY:  (A) WHO OF THE FOLLOWING YOU CONSIDER TO BE STAKEHOLDERS IN THE FORMULATION/IMPLEMENTATION OF AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

   (B) WHO OF THE FOLLOWING WERE CONSULTED IN THE FORMULATION/IMPLEMENTATION OF YOUR COMPANY'S AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY

   (C) WHO INITIATED THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY
### Directors' Perceived Need for Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Leave Blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR Management/Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Specialist Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What Triggered the Need for an Affirmative Action Policy?

- [ ] Strategic future business needs
- [ ] Pressure from staff/unions
- [ ] Anticipated legislation
- [ ] HR Department perceived need for policy

**Other, please specify:**

### How Long Did It Take from Date of Trigger to Date That a Formal Policy Was Published?

- [ ] ___________ months

### How Was the Affirmative Action Policy Implemented? (Please answer all questions)

- Refining and understanding the document by getting expert input in specialist fields
- Gaining management commitment
- Consulting key stakeholders prior to finalisation
- Gaining of worker support through communication
- Ensuring implementation of the policy through progress reviews, checklists, etc
- Ensuring effectiveness of implementation through policy audits
- Has any awareness training been done?
- Is policy kept current through regular reviews?

### How Did the Company Determine That the Policy Was Complete? (Mark more than one if applicable)

- [ ] Approved by Managing Director/Board
- [ ] Published in Policy Manual
ANNOUNCED IN STAFF NOTICE

OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY:

COMMUNICATED THROUGH OFFICIAL BRIEFING STRUCTURES

8. HOW WAS THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY COMMUNICATED?

☐ BRIEFING GROUPS
☐ STAFF NOTICES
☐ COMPANY NEWSLETTER/JOURNALS
☐ HR POLICY DIRECTIVE IN MANUAL
☐ VIDEO

OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY:

9. IS THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY "HOME GROWN" OR A HYBRID FROM ANOTHER COMPANY'S POLICY?

☐ ORIGINAL  ☐ HYBRID

10. IS THIS A "CONFIDENTIAL" POLICY WITH RESTRICTED ACCESS?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

11. IF YES, PLEASE ELABORATE:

12. HAS THIS POLICY BEEN IMPLEMENTED EFFECTIVELY?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

13. DO YOU REGARD THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY AS SUCCESSFUL?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

SECTION E: INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY

1. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE AN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY?

☐ YES  ☐ NO
2. WHAT FORM DOES THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY TAKE?  (Mark more than one if applicable)

- FORMAL POLICY IN HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY MANUAL
- FORMAL WRITTEN BUT "UNPUBLISHED" POLICY
- UNWRITTEN POLICY

OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: ..........................................................................................................................................................................

3. PLEASE SPECIFY:  

(A) WHO OF THE FOLLOWING YOU CONSIDER TO BE StakeHOLDERS IN THE FORMULATION/IMPLEMENTATION OF AN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY

- DIRECTORS
- HR MANAGEMENT/DEPARTMENT
- LINE MANAGEMENT
- GENERAL STAFF
- TRADE UNION
- OUTSIDE SPECIALIST CONSULTANT
- INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL

OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: ..........................................................................................................................................................................

(B) WHO OF THE FOLLOWING WERE CONSULTED IN THE FORMULATION/IMPLEMENTATION OF YOUR COMPANY'S INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY

(C) WHO INITIATED THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY

(MARK MORE THAN ONE IF APPROPRIATE):  

4. WHAT TRIGGERED THE NEED FOR AN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY?  (Mark more than one if appropriate)

- APPROACH FOR UNION RECOGNITION
- IN ANTICIPATION OF UNIONISATION
- DIRECTORS PERCEIVED NEED FOR POLICY
- HR/IR DEPARTMENT PERCEIVED NEED TO FORMALLY POSITION COMPANY
- HIGH LEVELS OF CONFLICT
- STRIKE ACTION

OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY: .............................................................................................................................................................................
5. WHEN WAS THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY FIRST PUBLISHED?            YEAR

6. HOW LONG DID IT TAKE FROM DATE OF "TRIGGER" TO DATE THAT A FORMAL POLICY WAS PUBLISHED?

7. TO WHOM'S WISHES DID THE POLICY ULTIMATELY CONFORM? (Mark more than one if appropriate)
   □ SHAREHOLDERS/BOARD
   □ MANAGEMENT
   □ EMPLOYEES
   □ UNION
   □ INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL
   OTHER, PLEASE SPECIFY:

8. HAS THIS POLICY BEEN IMPLEMENTED EFFECTIVELY?         □ YES □ NO

9. DO YOU REGARD THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS POLICY AS SUCCESSFUL?    □ YES □ NO

SECTION F

(A) WHAT RECOGNITION/REWARDS OCCUR FOR EFFECTIVE HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY IMPLEMENTATION?

(B) WHAT SANCTION ACTION IS TAKEN IF HUMAN RESOURCE POLICY IS NOT IMPLEMENTED?

(C) WHAT, IN YOUR VIEW, IS THE MOST DIFFICULT PART OF H.R. POLICY FORMULATION?
(D) WHAT, IN YOUR VIEW, IS THE MOST DIFFICULT PART OF H.R. POLICY IMPLEMENTATION?

(E) PLEASE WOULD YOU CLASSIFY THE COMPANY: (Select only one choice in each group)

(i) ☐ PARTICIPATIVE  (ii) ☐ DECENTRALISED  (iii) ☐ INNOVATIVE  (iv) ☐ FLEXIBLE
☐ NON-PARTICIPATIVE  ☐ CENTRALISED  ☐ CONSERVATIVE  ☐ INflexible

SECTION C

PLEASE COMPLETE IF YOU WISH TO RECEIVE A COPY OF THE SUMMARISED RESULTS:

NAME: ____________________________________________

ADDRESS: ____________________________________________

POSTAL CODE: ____________________________________________