

# **SURVEY OF MUNICIPAL WORKERS IN THE CMA**

**Presented to the Unicity Commission  
by International Labour Resource and Information Group  
in Partnership with Municipal Services Project  
30 May 2000**

---

## **Table of Contents**

[Executive Summary](#)

[Section 1: Introduction](#)

[Section 2: Survey Results](#)

[Section 3: Analysis of Findings](#)

[Section 4: Conclusions and Recommendations](#)

[Appendix A: Notes on the research process and method](#)

**Appendix B: Survey Timetable**

[Appendix C: Survey Questionnaire](#)

[Appendix D: Focus Group Questions](#)

[Appendix E: Notes for Administering the Unicity Survey Questionnaire](#)

**Appendix F: Frequency Tables of Responses to Survey Questionnaires**

---

## **Executive Summary**

On 18 April the International Labour Resource and Information Group (ILRIG), in partnership with the Municipal Services Project signed a contract to carry out a “Worker “Survey” amongst municipal workers in Cape Town. This report presents the findings of that research, submitted on 30 May, 2000.

The survey comprised administering 182 questionnaires to workers in job grades 12 and below. Because of time constraints, workers were drawn from only four of the Cape Metropolitan Area’s (CMA) seven municipalities: Cape Town, Cape Metropolitan Council, Oostenberg and

Tygerberg. An effort was made to recruit a representative sample in terms of race, gender, age, job category, and resource levels of communities of work.

In addition to the surveys, focus group interviews were carried out with 4 to 6 shop stewards and office bearers in each of the municipalities.

Content of the survey centred on work organisation, labour relations, service delivery and municipal restructuring (including the Unicity).

Overall the research findings present a work force that is disappointed with local government's performance, extremely concerned about job security, and at best sceptical of the prospects of improvement through the Unicity process.

Some of the key findings of the research were:

- 63% of the respondents stated that they felt less secure in their jobs than five years ago. A major source of increasing insecurity was the extensive outsourcing of "non-core" functions. This was reported in all four municipalities.
- Only a 34% of the survey participants reported receiving any training at all in the last five years
- Assessment of labour relations was mixed but nearly a quarter (22%) characterised relationships between management and workers as "very bad"
- Responses on management methods indicated little use of worker participation type processes. "Team building" was the most common of such processes (46%) but other like "value sharing" were present in less than 15% of workplaces.
- Both focus groups and surveys indicated a negative view toward the amalgamation/restructuring of 1996/7. Key issues raised were the failure of the municipalities to actually come together, a ballooning of the ranks of management, and lack of progress toward parity in wages and conditions of service. A number of respondents linked the failure to achieve parity to continuing racism in local government. Several in the survey referred to the restructuring as "a waste of time and money."
- In nearly all topics covered by the research, workers reported lack of consultation and communication. In particular, participants highlighted lack of consultation around restructuring, redeployment, and reorganisation of work.
- With regard to the Unicity, 37% of those surveyed were not aware of the initiative. Those who were familiar with it were generally pessimistic. Nearly all reported a lack of sufficient information. Those in the focus groups feared that the Unicity would mean further outsourcing, retrenchments and more jobs for highly paid managers.

The number of workers covered by the research was neither completely random nor statistically significant. On the other hand, this is first instance in which the voice of labour has been formally injected into the Unicity process. Workers and the communities where workers live are central to the transformation process. Hence, the research team believes that the issues presented by respondents in the survey need to be given serious attention if the local government in the CMA is to become more accountable and a more effective deliverer of services. In particular,

the issues of consultation and communication with workers need to be incorporated into the planning and overall approach of the Unicity process.

## **Section 1: Introduction**

### **1.1. General Background and Context**

The International Resource and Information Group (ILRIG) in partnership with the Municipal Services Project (MSP) was contracted by the Unicity Commission to carry out a worker survey. The survey is part of the Commission's process of developing a plan to transform the Greater Metropolitan Area. The specific purpose of our research is to inject the views of workers into the Unicity Commission's decision-making process, particularly with regard to service delivery.

This research occurs at a time when a number of global, national and local forces are pressing for change in key areas of local government. Before undertaking the survey, ILRIG had to examine a number of these forces. Those we identified as critical to our research were:

- Inequity in terms of quality and access to services—largely a legacy of the apartheid past
- The declared intention of Cape Town city planners to develop a “world class city”
- The ongoing process of change regarding local government legislation and processes (e.g. demarcation, systems, implementation of IDPs)
- The financial crises of dozens of municipalities across the country
- The existing tension between government and labour around public sector wages and privatisation of services
- The restructuring plans in other metropolitan areas in South Africa, particularly the Igoli 2002 of Johannesburg
- The restructuring process which took place in Greater Cape Town in 1996/7

The forces listed above highlight that the present restructuring takes place amidst a number of conflicting claims on municipal resources. For example, the notion of becoming a “world class city” implies prioritising resource allocation to tourist and investor infrastructure. By contrast, unequal access to basic services implies prioritising resource allocation to services like water, housing and electricity. Similarly, the high unemployment rate indicates a need to prioritise job creation, but the need to use “world class” technology may imply the displacement of large numbers of workers by machines. Moreover, all of these competing demands on resources come in the context of global trends and national policies which emphasise reduction of local government budgets and the promotion of an enabling role, rather than a developmental role for municipalities. In particular, the prioritising of budget deficit reduction in South Africa's GEAR macroeconomic framework has placed considerable restraint on the capacity of local governments to deliver. In summary, local government is expected to deliver more for less, including shouldering an ever-increasing range of unfunded mandates.

Furthermore, while there is tension over resources, there is also conflict over political process. While the urgency of service delivery and meeting planning deadlines require speedy decision-making, the stakeholders impacted by municipal restructuring demand consultation and

participatory processes—all of which take time. The potential for political conflicts is exacerbated in the Western Cape since there is no clear majority political party.

Apart from this, there are also unresolved problems from the previous restructuring. The 1996/7 process was viewed as more of a administrative unbundling and amalgamation of municipalities than a restructuring of service delivery and conditions of service of workers. While there is a need to move ahead with finalising the new Cape Metropolitan Area, there are considerable outstanding issues from both the previous restructuring (and even the pre-1994 regime) which are a drag on any steps forward.

This then, is the context in which our project emerged. Lastly, we must add that in the middle of our research process the Unicity Commission produced a draft “Strategic Choices Document”. While the document was presented as a “chopping block”, its publication and contents highlighted the urgency of workers’ participation in the process of restructuring the Cape Metropolitan Area.

Despite the breadth of the contextual factors noted above and the short time frame for our research, we have tried to consider these factors in our research project design and analysis.

## **1.2 Origins of the Project**

The Unicity Commission has the task of developing a transformation plan for the Cape Metropolitan Area. A key component of their mandate, according to the Unicity Commission establishment notice, is to: “develop a proposed service delivery and institutional strategy for the Unicity with a view to informing the content of the notices to be published by the Provincial Minister in terms of the Structures Act.” As part of this process (entitled “Rethinking the City”) the Unicity commissioned a survey of management in all seven municipalities in Greater Cape Town. Some 500 managers were interviewed, mostly by telephone. The results of the management survey were presented to the Unicity in March. No written narrative report was made to accompany the study.

In response to the management survey, Dr David McDonald, Co- Director of the Municipal Services Project, in consultation with the South African Municipal Workers’ Union (SAMWU) submitted a proposal to the Unicity Commission to carry out a survey of workers’ attitudes. The proposal designated ILRIG as the organisation to do the actual research work. A contract to this effect was signed on 18 April 2000.

The broad outlines of the worker survey, according to ILRIG’s contract, were to:

- Conduct a series of interviews with a representative sample of 175 municipal employees below post level 12 to ascertain their views on current municipal performance and practice, restructuring and improving service delivery
- To conduct a series of focus groups with a representative sample of at least 25 employees below post level 12 to clarify and deepen understanding of the issues raised
- To prepare a report detailing the initial findings of this survey to be submitted by the end of April 2000

- To prepare detailed report describing and evaluating the results of the interviews and focus groups to be submitted by 14 May.[\[1\]](#) The report is to be workshopped with the Unicom team prior to being finalised.
- To make a presentation of the final report to the Unicity Commission

Given the time frame and number of workers involved, it was agreed that the sample would not be precisely random or statistically significant. However, selecting a representative cohort of workers was important. Essential factors in terms of representivity were: municipality of employment, job category and grade, level of resources of geographical area of employment, gender, race and age.

It was also agreed that ILRIG would work closely with the two major unions which organise in this sector, SAMWU and IMATU, to gain access to workers. ILRIG's extensive experience of workplace research informed us that such an approach was crucial for two reasons. Firstly, workers are generally reluctant to participate in such processes if they are not endorsed by the union. Secondly, in order to gain access to workers, arrangements for time off would need to be made. Unions have considerable experience in securing such arrangements. Furthermore, time off given directly by management without union involvement would also be likely to contribute to worker reticence.

### **1.3 Project Design and Implementation**[\[2\]](#)

Due to time constraints, the number of municipalities surveyed was limited to four: Cape Town, Tygerberg, Cape Metropolitan Council (CMC) and Oostenberg. These four were seen as crucial and representative. Cape Town and Tygerberg were the two largest and best-resourced municipalities. CMC and Oostenberg included a range of workers in small towns, peri-urban areas and as well as those employed in municipal services not found in the other municipalities. (e.g. dams, markets, abattoirs)

In consultation with SAMWU[\[3\]](#) we drew up a table of depots or workplaces in each of the four municipalities. The selection was meant to encompass the range of workers agreed upon in the original project. That table is included as Appendix B.

SAMWU agreed to assist us in setting up meetings at the various venues. They consented to provide a shop steward to assist in co-ordinating each of the sessions. We agreed to the shop stewards' participation, but also cautioned ILRIG researchers and SAMWU that shop stewards should not be in a position to influence participants' answers to the survey.

### **1.4 The survey questionnaire**

The survey questionnaire contained 35 questions, divided into five sections: personal details, work details, work organisation, labour relations and restructuring. The questionnaire was compiled in English and translated into isiXhosa and Afrikaans.

Broadly the survey questionnaire focused on work related issues, except Part Five. We emphasised work related issues because workplace experience is rarely noted by researchers and

planners, yet the organisation of work and the quality of labour relations have an enormous impact on the potential for enhancing local government's performance.

A copy of the questionnaire and a more detailed discussion of the content is included as Appendix C.

### **1.5 Content of the Focus Group Questions**

Apart from personal details, six questions were planned for the focus groups. These questions were structured so that the breadth of the topics covered increased as the questions proceeded.

The topic of the focus group questions was the impact of municipal restructuring on workers and on service delivery. Considerable attention was dedicated to assessing the previous restructuring of 1996/7 as well as examining the Unicity plans.

A copy of the focus group questions is included as Appendix D.

### **1.6 Our Process for Conducting the Survey**

Sufficient ILRIG staff were to be available in each session to ensure proficiency in English, Afrikaans and isiXhosa. Workers could choose the language they preferred. The forms were filled out in groups. To promote full co-operation, we spent considerable time briefing workers on the background and purpose of ILRIG and the research project.

We began each session with a prepared introduction. A copy of this is contained in Appendix E. We used flip charts with sample questions on them to show people how to answer the various types of questions. We also encouraged the respondents to ask questions of clarity of the ILRIG researcher or of each other.

We allocated about 1 hour and 15 minutes to each survey session-- 25 minutes to brief participants and 50 minutes for all participants to complete the survey.

### **1.7 Our Process for Conducting the focus groups**

Focus group discussions were not as tightly structured as the survey sessions. In many instances answers to the early questions led to in-depth discussions of subsequent questions. In those instances, the latter questions were not repeated. We recorded all sessions on audio cassettes.

We allocated about an hour for each focus group.

### **1.8 Organising and carrying out the research**

Arranging the survey sessions was often complex. Most municipal workers in the lower grades are not easy to contact. They do not work in one place, few have access to telephones. Since representivity required gathering workers from a number of departments and job grades, we had to organise several venues per municipality. This tasked the shop steward or organiser with

mobilising transport and arranging time off. Despite these obstacles, we were able to complete surveys with 182 workers, seven more than the target.

The focus groups were much easier to organise. They comprised shop stewards and office bearers who are often allocated time off for union business. Many also have personal vehicles. Four (including the pilot) of the focus groups were conducted in English, one in Afrikaans.

## Section 2: Survey Results

This section of the report summarises the results of the survey questionnaires. Full results of each question will not be reported here. Only key points will be extracted. Frequency tables for each of the questions are contained in Appendix E. Analysis of the results will be covered in Section 4. Answers to most questions revealed fairly similar views and experiences in each of the municipalities. Where there were notable differences, they will be included here.

### 2.1 Personal details

182 workers participated in the survey. Of these 150 were men, 29 women. Three people did not answer the question on sex. The breakdown according to municipality and gender is contained in the table below:

**Table 1. Gender breakdown by municipality**

Municipality	Participants	Male	Female	Blank
Cape Town	80	65	13	2
CMC	40	32	8	
Oostenberg	28	27	1	
Tygerberg	34	26	7	1
TOTAL	182	150	29	3

The majority of participants were over 35 years of age, comprising 108 (59%) of the total. Only two (1%) participants were over sixty years and 11(6%) under the age of 24.

More than half of the participants (102 or 56% ) identified Afrikaans as the language they spoke most frequently at home. Forty five (25%) identified English as the language used at home while 35 (19%) answered isiXhosa.

Some 54% of the participants stated that their highest level of education completed was between standard six and standard nine. 31 (17%) of the respondents had completed matric, with an additional ten (5%) having post matric qualifications. Only five (3%) people reported no formal schooling at all.

Nearly all participants were union members with 149 (82%) being affiliated to SAMWU and 26 (14%) to IMATU. No other union affiliation was recorded but three (2%) people were not union members.

### **3.2 Work Details**

These questions were intended to establish basic information about those surveyed. Primarily we wanted to find out what sort of work interviewees were doing and how long they had been employed by the municipality. Surprisingly, responses to some questions in this section were inconclusive. We had a wide range of job titles and grades some of these seemingly unlikely (e.g. “A”). Thirty two (18%) people answered “don’t know” to job grade, 20 (11%) said they had no grade, 4 (2%) were “unsure”. Similarly with job titles there were 63 (35%) different titles out of the 182, likely indicating either a lack of standardisation or concrete knowledge of titles. However, despite the variety of reported job titles and grades, they do indicate workers who were grade 12 and below. Other details reported by the researchers such as venues and uniforms worn by participants confirm this assessment.

The majority (102 or 56%) had worked for 1 to 4 years. Nineteen surveyed workers had been employed for less than a year. At least eighteen respondents had more than 15 years of service as municipal workers.

### **2.3 Work Organisation**

When filling in the surveys in groups most participants’ indicated orally that their work week conformed to the collective bargaining agreement. Yet the answers to the question on length of the work day still varied from 7-7,5 to 9-9,5 hours. It is unclear if discrepancies are due to real differences or relate to the inclusion or exclusion of lunch and breaks.

Less than half reported the introduction of the listed forms of workplace change in the last five years. However all five of the changes (new equipment, new technology, new work methods, teams, job rotation and new shifts) recorded some positive responses. The most common form of change was introduction of team work which came from 84 (46%) of the respondents, including at least 18% of the total from each municipality. The least common form of change was new shifts with only 30 (16%) positive responses.

Sixty one (34%) of the workers stated that they had received some training in the last five years. The most common type of training noted was “on the job” (10 or 5% of responses). Other common responses were computer courses and first aid or health and safety. Only one person reported receiving training around local government.

Far fewer instances of the creation of workplace committees were noted. While health and safety committees were reported by 145 (80%) respondents, the next most common committee form was quality circles with only 25 (14%) yes answers. Oostenberg had notably fewer committees than the other municipalities with no one reporting the use of green areas, value sharing, or self-directed teams.

Less than a third of the workers reported receiving “enough relevant information” in each of the four categories suggested.



When asked if their job needed to be improved, one hundred and fifty (82%) respondents answered yes. Common suggested improvements included:

“More teams”

“Communication can be improved”

“Management must change their attitudes to work”

“Unicity will improve my job since it will be representative”

“Information needs to be distributed more effectively”

“More specific or job related training”

“more staff is needed”

## **2.4 Labour Relations**

Opinion over management-worker relations was divided but with a significant percentage (40 or 22%) recording “very bad”. By contrast only twenty two (12%) replied “very good”. Forty-seven (26%) reported “satisfactory.” Only Oostenberg showed the number of “very good” replies exceeding the number of “very bad” responses.

Supervisor-worker relations were slightly more favourable. One hundred and thirty four (74%) responded that these relations were either “satisfactory”, “good” or “very good.” Twenty eight (15%) characterised these relations as “very good” as compared to twenty-five (14%) “very bad” responses. Only CMC recorded an excess of “very bad” (10) over “very good (6).

One hundred and six (58%) workers answered that they did not have adequate equipment to do their job properly. Suggestions for improvements included:

“There is a lot of equipment that is not suitable to do the job”

“Provision of more computers at the District Inspectors’ office will be most welcome”

“Insufficient and inadequate equipment at Oostenberg”

“Needs to be an improvement in equipment for health reasons”

With regard to job security, one hundred and fifteen (63%) replied that they had less job security now than five years ago. Tygerberg recorded the highest figure in this regard (82%) but more than 50% of workers in each municipality reported decreased job security.

## **2.5: Restructuring**

Response to redeployment was mixed. Some said it was “ a good thing” or “it has advantages since you can be redeployed closer to your home.” Others had negative views: “it was not a good thing, some of us had to start all over again” or simply “it does not work.”

Views on the 1996/7 restructuring were mainly negative. Typical comments were:

“things are just as bad as they were before”

“a waste of money for both the workers and the council”

“it sounded like a good idea but it did not deliver what it promised”

One hundred and forty one (77%) respondents reported awareness of the plans to create a new Unicity. Thirty seven (20%) were unaware of the plans. 22 (12%) said they were adequately informed.

Considerable scepticism was expressed about the process. Some common views were:

“The entire process is not to the satisfaction of workers on the ground”

“The different municipalities always did their own work and will continue to do so”

“Will cause loss of job security”

“too many people are uninformed around Unicity “

There were a few positive opinions:

“it will allow us to work better since at the moment one municipality is competing with another”

“it will suit workers from all the councils”

## **2.6 Additional Comments**

Ninety eight workers chose to make additional comments. They touched on a wide variety of themes but predictably nearly all raised problems. Comments included:

“Privatisation is one of our biggest problems “

“There are a lot of things that are unclear but we need to be happy”

“We need more information about Unicity”

“In terms of our circumstances at work there is need for improvement before “the Unicity can be implemented”

“There is a lot of dissatisfaction at our workplace”

“I feel that as workers we should receive better training and proper information should be given to us”

“In this era of democracy workers have the right to be informed about any changes that have to be made”

### **SECTION 3: Analysis of Findings**

This section of the report analyses evidence from the focus groups conducted with shop stewards and office bearers from Cape Town, CMC, Tygerberg and Oostenberg. The analysis combines a discussion of key themes which emerged from the focus groups with an examination of survey responses on related or comparable issues.

Before starting the analysis, a few comments on the focus group process are in order. Overall, focus group participants were eager to talk about all topics raised, including their experiences of the previous restructuring and their views on the Unicity. The open-ended nature of our questioning process meant that nearly all of the topics were covered by asking one or two questions. Secondly, the participants provided a wealth of detail about what was taking place in their municipalities. While time precluded verifying this information, numerous specific examples are included in the report. Thirdly, there was very little difference between the focus groups in terms of their analysis of past experience, workplace issues, and prospects for the future. All were highly critical of the current trends in local government and extremely concerned about the future of workers in their municipality.

#### **3.1 Themes emerging from focus groups and the survey**

The following are the major themes which emerged from the focus group discussions:

- The 1996/97 amalgamation/restructuring
- Conditions of service
- Outsourcing and service delivery
- Transformation of local government
- Expectations from Unicity

The above list of common themes is by no means exhaustive, rather it is a clustering of many critical issues that have local nuances which are beyond the scope of this project.

The report will cover each of the above themes in turn.

#### **3.2 1996/97 amalgamation/restructuring**

In an attempt to explore the current state of affairs with regards to service delivery, the changes that were introduced since 1996/97 were used as our starting point. This process was referred to

by workers with a number of apparently interchangeable terms: “unbundling”, “amalgamation” and “the restructuring”.

Beginning our analysis with this issue had the potential danger of ignoring the problems faced by workers in the former ‘Black Local Authorities’. A brief explanation of this is in order. One of the outcomes of the 1996/97 process was the “takeover” of small municipalities by bigger substructures. Consequently the focus groups revealed a sentiment among the former Black Local Authority (BLA) workers that their peculiar past is being ignored in the current change process. As one shop steward remarked:

“It ( the 1996/97 amalgamation process) has brought about a situation where the smaller municipalities are regarded as if they never existed.”

These attitudes were further evidenced in discussing issues of administration of workplace issues in areas like Guguletu. A typical example was if a worker from one of these areas has a problem, he or she is now referred to the head office where the matter must be investigated before a solution is provided. One shop steward noted that “sometimes workers (from former BLAs) don’t even know where to go if they have a pay query.” This has engendered a feeling amongst these workers that their old municipalities lost what little authority they had. This is contrary to what the workers expected of the restructuring process. One worker’s conclusion was:

“Workers from a smaller municipality must also be included in the transformation or amalgamation in every respect.”

The points raised above likely form part of the explanation why all the focus groups revealed a negative assessment of the amalgamation. Almost all interviewees reflected the view that the amalgamation exercise was a ‘waste of money and time’. The reasons given for this varied, but all were based on the perceived failure of the process to deliver tangible results for both municipal workers and poor communities. Many similar sentiments were expressed in the surveys as well.

The most common criticism made by interviewees was that the amalgamation failed at the most basic level: uniting the different municipalities into one cohesive structure. All four focus groups raised examples of fragmentation coinciding with the old municipal boundaries. According to the shopstewards, amalgamation often amounted to simply redeploying a handful of individuals from the smaller municipalities to the head offices of the new substructures. In Cape Town, one shop steward said that Civic Centre “played the big daddy” by simply taking three or four blacks to the CBD, “leaving the former BLA area worse off.”

Focus group interviews also revealed a feeling that there was lack of consultation with workers around the restructuring. Their sense of what happened in 1996/97 is that they were not allowed to influence the process. The best that they got was “observer status”. It was management that presented the ‘macro-design’ and the organograms. The impression they were given was that the first phase was about the macro structures, which would be followed by the ‘micro-design’. But interviewees stressed that as the process unfolded, it began to touch working conditions, an area

they understood to be subject to negotiation with worker representatives. Consultants brought into manage the process were not seen as helpful as they reportedly only interviewed foremen and managers, not workers.

Feelings of being excluded extended to the issue of service delivery as well. Shop stewards expressed dismay that a number of proposals tabled by SAMWU for improving service delivery in “previously disadvantaged communities” were overlooked. In their view, the old councils apparently saw expanded service delivery as an almost inevitable result of the increased tax base which would result from amalgamation. Interviewees felt that worker views and participation were not seen as important to this process of redistribution.

Lastly, all the focus groups raised the issue of the restructuring actually creating more high salaried posts. At the time of the restructuring, there was talk of developing ‘leaner’ management structures, something the workers had been advocating for many years. Instead the new substructures came to be characterised by even bigger bureaucracies. Many workers perceived the exercise as nothing short of ‘creating jobs for pals’. Where workers thought that two or three area managers were needed, five or six posts were created after 1996. A worker from Oostenberg accurately summarised the views of all focus groups:

“It (the amalgamation) created big problems - too many directors in Oostenberg.”

But whilst more posts were created at the top, focus groups participants reported that virtually no new jobs were created at the bottom. In fact the number of workers decreased for a number of reasons. Chief amongst these in the late 1990s were ‘early retirement packages’ offered to workers. According to the shopstewards, many workers took the packages after jobs were re-evaluated. Another factor that led to these early retirements was the manner in which redeployment was implemented. In Tygerberg, shop stewards said that there was “redemption without consultation.” Those who refused were allegedly sacked.

In another case a worker who lives in Grassy Park was transferred to Tygerberg. After twenty three years service and being just three years from retirement, he is now arriving late for work for the first time in his life due to transport problems. He fears that management is actually trying to find an excuse to dismiss him in order to avoid pension payments.

Even workers who wanted to be redeployed often encountered problems. Instead of improvements they experienced continued domination by new managers. One worker who moved to another substructure after more than twenty years service in the council is left with frustration in the new job. His perception of his immediate superiors is that they lack knowledge of the job, but they will not consult him “because of the colour of my skin”.

Likely problems noted here have heavily contributed to the perceived lack of job security for municipal workers has continued to the present day. This is reflected in their responses to question 27: Compared to five years ago do you have job security now? 63% answered “no”. In Tygerberg only one person out of 32 answered “yes”.

Perhaps the focus groups' general attitudes concerning the impact of restructuring on employment in the municipalities was best expressed by a Cape Town shop steward. During the discussion he got up from his chair to draw the new employment pyramid of Cape Town on a white board. He drew an inverted pyramid, arguing that instead of a flatter management structure the new employment structure had many at the top and few at the bottom. His presentation concluded with the comment "the ones that are fat are being made even fatter but we that are lean are getting even leaner."

### **3.3 Conditions of service**

Legally, when the amalgamation took place all the municipalities were "going concerns", and therefore conditions of service had to be transferred. This obviously meant that within each new substructure there would be different conditions of service. The focus groups revealed that years later this has not been rectified. While 'parity' became one of the buzzwords in local government, shop stewards related incidents of co-workers doing the same job, with the same grade who were paid differently and worked different hours.

Survey questionnaires about job grades, job titles and departments revealed a lack of parity as well as the absence of basic information about conditions of service. As noted in Section 2, many people did not know basic information about their job. The wide variety of job titles likely reflected both a lack of information and the maintenance of systems from previous municipalities.

Apart from grading and pay, other conditions of service such as leave days also remain different. In one focus group discussion such discrepancies were attributed to the different collective bargaining structures prior to 1997. In some instances workers in the former BLA's started in the old white City Council, and were transferred to the Bantu Affairs Administration Board (BAAB), then to the BLA, and after 1997 back to the former white city councils. Therefore, expectations of redress, or parity, at least amongst these workers, were very high.

What has compounded the problem of conditions of service is the withdrawal of certain "privileges". For instance, most areas complained of the unilateral withdrawal of transport for workers. In fact, as we conducted this research shop stewards from one municipality were meeting in the next room to consider industrial action over this issue. Whilst the origins of this condition of service were not investigated, the seriousness of the issue is not in doubt. Working without the provision of transport means that the workers have incurred an additional cost of living as well as a longer portion of their day allocated to working. The problem of transport withdrawal is also connected to redeployment in some cases. One interviewee was re-deployed to Oostenberg. He previously had transport via council vehicles and spent just fifteen minutes travelling to work. Now he must travel for two hours each way and is spending some R300 per month on taxi fares.

A similar process took place with the withdrawal of clinic services for workers in the old Bellville municipality. This has led the workers to believe that management is prepared to change conditions of service when they benefit. According to interviewees, the explanation given by management for these changes is that such benefits cost money.

Interviewees reported that cost saving seems to dominate all discussions about improving working conditions. In one substructure discussions on parity were progressing well until management allegedly discovered that elsewhere managers were recording cost savings. In another example a change was effected by management around the 'Group Scheme' ( an insurance scheme), which resulted in less benefits for workers. Again the rationale proffered by management was that this would help in the drive to cut costs. When the cost-saving drive is linked to the shift to discarding 'non-core' functions by local authorities, it is not surprising that 115 out of 182 respondents in the survey said that they had less job security now than five years ago.

### **3.4 Outsourcing and service delivery**

There was an acknowledgement by most shopstewards that at the early stages of the change process some improvements were made in terms of service delivery in the poor communities. But all of that, according the shopstewards, has been halted by the shift towards privatisation via outsourcing. This shift by management commenced with the attempts to "focus on core business". In Cape Town Central the libraries outsourced book binding since it was apparently not adjudged to be core business. This left the libraries with all the equipment used in this function standing idle. Further examples of seemingly arbitrary definitions of "core business" came from Cape Town parks and recreation where the cutting of grass had been outsourced as "non-core." In the CMC, even toilet cleaning was defined as "non-core".

Another cited example of idle capacity was that of asphalt production. Historically this was done by Cape Town and provided to the other municipalities. But this process changed when other substructures opted to source supplies from the private sector in order to cut cost. Whilst this study could not delve into issues of cost-effectiveness in service delivery, comments were received from shopstewards about the manner in which business is conducted in their substructures. One shop steward stated that "you can go through branch by branch and find equipment lying idle...in every branch they've outsourced."

Focus groups also complained about outsourcing via the use of temporary labour agencies like Teamster and Kelly Girls. They argued that these workers get less than half the pay package of their full-time employee counterparts.

Yet another issue raised about the use of outside contractors was the situation cited in CMC where workers remain on the job but their actual work is outsourced. Particular irritation was expressed over this practice since the supposed rationale for outsourcing is cutting costs.

Focus group participants also noted the use of pricing as way of promoting outsourcing. They stated that in the past councils overcharged each other for services. But now, they argued it is as if the pricing of services is used to redirect attention away from local authorities as 'competitive' providers of these services.

The above suspicions from the workers are fuelled by the manner in which privatisation of services takes place. Shopstewards reported instances where the size of the workforce has been depleted such that the quality of service delivery came under the spotlight. The Cape Town

nursery reported a decrease in staff from more than a hundred to about forty. Yet the forty were still expected to carry out the same tasks as before. However, fearing for their jobs and rumours of the closure of the facility altogether, there were few options other than compliance.

Another commonly reported cost-cutting solution from management is to sub-contract or outsource functions to companies run by ex-council employees. The workers that are affected by this form of restructuring are offered jobs by these small companies. In other words, for these worker leaders there is nothing inevitable or logical in the privatisation of service. On the contrary, they perceive that the process is being actively encouraged from within local government.

In the Tygerberg substructure shopstewards cited the privatisation of refuse collection as an example of the flaws in the current approach to restructuring. As SAMWU members they had forwarded proposals to management about redirecting resources within the substructure in order to redress past imbalances. Proposals even included splitting the workers' working week between the areas of the substructure. They presented this as the best way of effecting redeployment. These proposals were complemented by Tygerberg SAMWU workers volunteering to go and clean up in Khayelitsha.

Instead of accepting the workers' proposals, a private company, Billy Hattingh, was employed. When the private concern failed to deliver a quality service, forty workers from other departments were redeployed into cleansing to complete the job. To make matters worse, the workers who had volunteered to clean up in Khayelitsha were also disciplined by management.

Interviewees added another dimension to the issue of outsourcing: that they have been put into a confrontational situation with the communities they serve. Improvement of service delivery was turned into an emotive issue through promises of job-creation in 'Previously disadvantaged' areas. Focus group participants reported that this has led to the rejection of current council workers in these areas. An example from Tygerberg shop stewards illustrates such a situation. They mentioned that a new depot in Delft cannot operate due to community protest. Many workers from Bellville have been redeployed to the depot. But the community feels that outsiders should not be working there when local people are unemployed. Workers cited this as further proof of the council's failure to consult before implementing changes.

### **3.5 Transformation of local government**

For many workers and their communities, transformation of local government had positive connotations. It was seen as ushering in a post-apartheid dispensation where democracy and equity in service delivery would prevail. But many municipal workers reported that they now find themselves confronting councillors whom they perceive as unaccountable. Structures appear untransformed. Workers see the old council officials continuing to control the situation. One went so far as to say, "we've got dictatorship rather than partnership. Council decided what they want to do on behalf of workers."

This lack of transformation is also reflected in the survey section of work organisation. For example, there is very little usage of management practices consistent with worker participation.



Only 22 respondents, slightly more than 10% reported the existence of teams in their workplaces. Value sharing was even less common with only 13 positive responses. The only common structure was the Health and Safety Committee, a longstanding practice in South African workplaces, where 145 respondents noted the presence of such a structure. Moreover, the fact that only respondent indicated having received training on local government likely points to an important omission in the transformation process.

Workers also related how lack of transformation had impacted on service delivery as well. For many, lack of proper service delivery is closely linked to remnants of past racism and the practice of favouritism at the workplace. This also blocked possibilities for advancement. Training is almost non-existent for most workers. In the survey, only about a third of workers reported receiving training in the last five years. Moreover, most of this is inservice specific skills training—not really capacity building.

As one worker in Tygerberg put it: “If the conditions of workers improve, then service will improve.” This was echoed by another participant: “If they take the time to listen to what we say, most of the problems will be resolved.”

Despite the problems noted above, when probed in focus groups, workers brought forward many suggestions on how to improve service delivery. For them, worker participation in improving service delivery was a key aspect of transformation. For example, one focus group noted that amalgamation presented an opportunity to improve services such as fire-fighting and emergency services:

“Training of staff can be co-ordinated and improved throughout. Specialised equipment that is only available to one municipality can now be utilised throughout.”

One shopsteward expressed these sentiments as follows:

“ We are the ones that do the work on the ground. Together we can do it.”

### **3.6 The Unicity**

As pointed out above, most focus group discussions automatically led to the Unicity process without probing from the researchers. But most of the views expressed were through the prism of the current situation and the last restructuring in local government. This indicated considerable anxiety on the part of workers about the Unicity process. Perceptions of lack of communication and inadequate ‘consultation’ on the process has exacerbated the situation. As it stands, the process is closely associated with future job losses.

For most shopstewards in the focus group the Unicity gazette of April this year has not solved the communication problem. One of the concerns expressed is the extent to which workers can understand the technical type of language used in the Unicity process. The views of workers in this regard were summed up by one participant as follows:

“ I do not think anyone is really against it. It is the way it is being dealt with. It is being handled by the officials ... they act in their own interests.”

The role of the officials in local government was a constant concern expressed by all the groups when discussing the Unicity. As one shop steward put it, “these officials manipulate the process for their own gain.” An even harsher assessment of the Unicity process came from a Cape Town participant: “All the way along limbs are falling off and people are getting hurt.” One focus group participant questioned whether the IMF and World Bank were not behind the current proposals. He said that with such institutions “you must fall in line with the rest of the world.”

All groups emphasised that the notion of redistribution of resources must apply to the Unicity process. However, with extensive outsourcing and the ballooning of management structures, workers were at best sceptical of the outcome of the Unicity. The legacy of both the apartheid past and the previous amalgamation loomed large in most participant’s assessment. The views of one shop steward were illustrative of the general sentiments:

“ It would be nice if the planned Unicity would be different from what happened in the 1997 amalgamation. Because it was said then that poorer municipalities would be improved. The only thing that we witnessed was that we were swallowed up by the old Cape Town. And in Cape Town racism is still alive. You can notice this if you are trying to solve a work related problem at the Civic Centre. If you cannot speak English or Afrikaans, then you do not get attention.”

#### **Section 4: Conclusions and recommendations**

The new mission statement of Cape Town paints the following picture of the city:

“Cape Town, a dynamic, developing **cosmopolitan** city, reaches out to all it’s people and works towards creating a **unified** and **harmonious** environment in which **everyone** can enjoy all the benefits and amenities of a **world-class** city on an equal basis in **safety** and **freedom**.”

This rather glossy image of Cape Town contrasts starkly with what workers in our survey have presented.

In general, the findings in this survey are cause for considerable concern. The focus groups present a highly disillusioned and demoralised work force, while the surveys do little to alter the picture and in many cases reaffirm the points made by shop stewards.

In response to what has been presented here, we think a number of key issues need to be noted and addressed by the Unicity:

- a) Perhaps most important is the question of consultation and participation. There is a need to create and extend processes through which workers and the communities where workers live can participate in the planning of the new Cape Metropolitan Area. We consider this research project to be a small beginning of such a process.

- b) A more thorough analysis of the 1996/7 unbundling and amalgamation needs to be completed. This analysis should include extensive solicitation of the views of workers and the members of “previously disadvantaged communities.”
- c) Management structures need to be investigated to determine the extent effective to which structures and channels of communication are operating. With nearly a quarter of respondents describing worker-management relations as “very bad”, suggestions of a “caring management”, let alone a “world class” management seem badly out of touch with workplace reality. Our research indicates that most municipalities have not yet advanced to even the most rudimentary forms of worker participation such as team building. Moreover, with the alleged ballooning of management structures, there needs to be a careful examination of the organisational organogram.
- d) Linked to a transformation of management structures is the question of training and education for workers. Only one respondent out of 182 reported receiving training on local government. If this is representative of the overall trend in the municipalities, there is little chance of transformation moving smoothly. But training needs also go beyond the topic of local government. Less than a third of the respondents reported receiving any training at all in the last five years. If service delivery is to be extended and improved, enhancing the capacity of the workforce is crucial.
- e) A process needs to be put in place to examine the public sector option. According to the National Framework Agreement, this is supposed to be the preferred option. All the focus groups reported a shift toward outsourcing and other forms of bringing in the private sector. There was little evidence of capacity-building or consultation with an eye to improving public sector delivery. In this regard the bare minimum is the establishment of clear guidelines as to what constitutes sufficient consideration of the public sector option. Such guidelines should detail the processes of consultation and negotiation involved. As part of creating such guidelines, there also needs to be a debate around defining the “core business” of local government. Unilateral decisions to outsource, which seem to be taking place at present, amount to a renunciation of the notion of stakeholder participation.
- f) Workers expressed extreme anxiety over job security. This needs to be addressed urgently. Job security needs to be at the heart of any new planning process, not seen as a by product or incidental to building a world class city.
- g) Parity remains a key issue for many surveyed. A large number of workers expressed the view that no serious efforts had been made to establish parity. Moreover, many felt that the problems on this issue were related to continuing racism at the level of municipal management.
- h) There is a need to carry out a more systematic examination of the international experience of privatisation in all its forms. In particular, research has revealed a number of cases of corruption and inequitable service provision. Given the past inequities of South Africa and the problems of corruption, these are issues which can only be ignored at the peril of the Unicity of the future. While a detailed review of the Strategic Choices Document is beyond

the scope of this research, we would note that the document did not seem to reflect such an examination.

Lastly, perhaps inadvertently, this research project provided all participants an opportunity to reflect on how the Unicity process would affect their particular workstations or functions. We hope ultimately this has helped to open up the debate about 'service delivery' and how workers might be involved in restructuring that delivery. The extension of that debate and the involvement of workers is essential to the transformation of the Cape Metropolitan Area.

---

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix A: Notes on the Research Process and Method**

#### **a) Difficulties in Finalising the project**

From the outset of project conceptualisation, it was clear that time frames would be short due to the deadlines of the overall Unicity process. This was further complicated by a delay in finalising the appointment of ILRIG and the Municipal Services Project. At a meeting on 4 April, where the Unicity Commission, SAMWU and ILRIG were present, it was agreed that the survey should proceed. However, the appointment of ILRIG was only confirmed in writing by a letter from Nico Mclachlan on 18 April 2000.

#### **b) Consultation on the project design**

The shorter time frames prompted ILRIG to propose a reduction in the number of municipalities from the original seven. These proposals were communicated to Unicity and discussed in a meeting on 12 April. After this meeting, plus consultations with SAMWU, the final decision was to do the survey in four municipalities

We drafted a questionnaire and a list of focus group questions. These were circulated to the Unicity Commission for comment. We held a meeting with David Schmidt and Ayesha Foflonker of the Unicity Commission on 12 April to review the documents. We agreed to include more questions which dealt with training, changes in the municipality aside from the 1996/7 restructuring, expectations of workers, the type of changes workers would like to see at their workplace, and their attitudes toward re-deployment. Each of these suggestions were addressed in the revised questionnaire. We then piloted the focus group questions and questionnaire on 19 April. Five shop stewards took part in the focus group and five answered the questionnaire. We agreed on the focus group questions but modified the wording of some questions and the design on the questionnaire. The questionnaire was then translated into Xhosa and Afrikaans.

#### **c) The structure of the survey questionnaire**

The final questionnaire contained five parts. Part one focused on the personal details of the person—age, sex, language, education and union affiliation. Name was excluded to ensure anonymity.

Part Two is entitled “work details”. This part helps to ascertain the type of job and work done by the person. Part Three is “work organisation.” The intention of this part is to examine to what extent management had engaged in innovation (e.g. teams, green areas, job rotation, new technology) and whether they had provided training. Part Four is shopfloor relations. Here workers were asked to assess the general character of labour relations. Part Five is “restructuring”. This addressed workers’ views on the 1996/7 process and on the Unicity. If workers were not aware of the Unicity, they were simply asked to indicate this. They were then not expected to answer further questions on the Unicity.

We concluded with a question which allowed respondents to add any additional comment they wanted to make. Altogether, the questionnaire contained 35 questions. Of these five were open-ended, seven were yes/no answers; eleven involved filling in a blank with a specific piece of information and twelve involved ticking a box in a table.

We then let them fill in questions 1 to 5 on their own. Questions 6 to 16 which covered some personal and work details were filled in via plenary session. Since these did not include opinions, we did them collectively. This avoided some confusion we experienced in the pilot. For example, under the question of how many hours a person worked per day, many people work a different number of hours on different days. Other people found it difficult to calculate their monthly hours. A number of people were not sure about their job grade. On this type of question we assisted participants and also allowed them to be assisted by other participants.

#### **d) Liaison with SAMWU**

We attended a SAMWU Metro Branch Shop Steward meeting on 19 April and outlined our purpose and programme. In each of the targeted municipalities the organiser was given the task to set up the required meetings.

Despite this briefing of SAMWU organisers and worker leaders, logistics for the survey sessions was complex. In some instances, there were delays in getting time off. The numerous holidays during the research period reduced the number of possible research days. However, despite these logistical problems, 182 workers took part in the survey. The variances at the municipality and venue level were due to different numbers arriving than planned. If extra workers turned up, our policy was to allow them to fill in the form. This also avoided potential conflicts with supervisors who might have accused us of getting time off for no purpose. A full summary of the number of workers interviewed in the various municipalities and venues is included with the data from the survey (Appendix D).

Our most complicated problem was that in at least three of the venues workers were resistant to filling in the questionnaire. In one case, workers had simply been told to come to a meeting without being briefed on the nature of the “meeting.” But in two other instances, Khayelitsha and Mitchell’s Plain, workers were highly suspicious of the Unicity, of ILRIG and the entire research

process. Some were concerned about whether this would lead to job losses. Others disagreed with the idea of sampling. They believed that everyone should be interviewed. It was only after considerable heated discussion that workers agreed to participate.

### **Appendix C: Survey Questionnaire**

This research is being conducted by the International Labour Resource and Information Group (ILRIG) in Cape Town in conjunction with the Municipal Services Project. We are conducting interviews with municipal workers to find out what workers think about the restructuring of local government in the Cape Town area and how it may affect the work that you do. This research is being conducted on behalf of the Unicity Commission.

#### **INSTRUCTIONS:**

Every question must be answered. Put a tick in the right box, or write the answer on the line.

Thank you.

#### **PART ONE: Personal details**

##### **1. How old are you? (Please tick)**

<b>16 – 17</b>	
<b>18 – 24</b>	
<b>25 – 34</b>	
<b>35 – 44</b>	
<b>45 – 54</b>	
<b>55 – 59</b>	
<b>60 and above</b>	

##### **2. Are you a male or female?**

<b>Female</b>	
<b>Male</b>	

##### **3. What language do you speak mostly at home?**

<b>English</b>	
<b>Afrikaans</b>	
<b>Xhosa</b>	
<b>Zulu</b>	
<b>Sotho</b>	
<b>Other</b>	

##### **4. What is the highest standard or grade of education you have completed?**

No school	
Sub A to standard 2	
Standard 3 to standard 5	
Standard 6 to standard 9	
Completed matric	
Post-matric	

5. Which union do you belong to?

SAMWU	
IMATU	
Other	

**PART TWO: Work details**

6. What is your job title? .....

7. What is the Grade level of your job? .....

8. How would you describe your job in terms of its skill level?

Professional	
Unskilled	
Semi-Skilled	
Skilled	

9. Which municipality do you work for? .....

10. Which department do you work for in the municipality?  
.....

11. How long have you been working for this municipality? .....

12. Did you work for a municipality in the Cape Metropolitan Area before 1996?

Yes	
No	

13. If yes, which municipality? .....

14. Approximately how long were you working for that municipality? .....

**PART THREE: Work organisation**

15. How many hours do you actually work per day? .....

16. How many hours do you actually work per month? .....

17. In the last five years, has your work changed in any of these ways?

	YES	NO
Use of new equipment		
Use of new technology		
New work methods		
Team-based work		
Job rotation		
New shifts		
Other		

18. Have you received any job training in the last 5 years?.....

19. If yes, what was it?.....  
.....

20. Does your department have any of the following workplace committees?

	YES	NO
Quality Circles		
Green Areas		
Self-directed Teams		
Value-sharing		
Health and Safety		
World Class Forums		
Other		

21. Do you think workers get enough relevant information from management on these issues?

	YES	NO
The way work is done		
New machinery		
Quality of work		
Work scheduling		

22. Do you think your job needs to be improved? .....

23. In what ways? Briefly describe



.....

**PART FOUR: SHOPFLOOR RELATIONS**

**24. How would you describe the relations between workers and senior management on a day-to-day basis?**

<b>Very good</b>	
<b>Good</b>	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	
<b>Bad</b>	
<b>Very bad</b>	

**25. How would you describe the relations between workers and supervisors on a day-to-day basis?**

<b>Very good</b>	
<b>Good</b>	
<b>Satisfactory</b>	
<b>Bad</b>	
<b>Very bad</b>	

**26. Do you feel that you have adequate equipment to do your job properly? Yes/No**

(if yes, explain).....

**PART FIVE: RESTRUCTURING**

**27. Compared to 5 years ago, do you think you have job security now?.....**

**28. What do you think of redeployment of workers?**

.....

.....

**29. What do you think of the 1996/97 local government restructuring/amalgamation of municipalities?**

.....

.....

**PART FIVE: Unicity**

**30. Are you aware of the plans to create a new “Unicity” in Cape Town?.....**

**31. Where have you received your information about the Unicity?**

<b>My union</b>	
<b>Newspapers</b>	
<b>Television</b>	
<b>Managers</b>	
<b>Council</b>	
<b>Friends</b>	
<b>Other (specify)</b>	
<b>I do not get any information</b>	

**32. Do you feel that you have been adequately informed about the development of a new Unicity?**

<b>Yes</b>	
<b>No</b>	

**33. Will the creation of a single Unicity affect the way your municipality works?**

.....

**34. Why do you feel this way?**

.....

.....

.....

**35. Additional comments:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**Thank you very much for your time and co-operation.**

**Appendix D: Focus Group Questions**

ILRIG-MSP Unicity Research

Focus Group Questions

**Personal Details**

(Ask each of the participants )

1. To which union do you belong?
2. What is your position in the union?
3. For how many years have you held this position?
4. For how many years have you worked for the municipality?

**General questions:**

5. In 1996/7 there was a process of restructuring in Greater Cape Town. From your experience of that restructuring, what suggestions could you make about present and future plans to transform or restructure local government?
6. What steps do you think need to be taken to improve the quality of service delivery in the Cape Town Metropolitan Area (Greater Cape Town)?
7. What steps do you think need to be taken to extend municipal services to more people in the Cape Town Metropolitan Area?
8. What role do you think unions and workers should play in transforming local government?

9. What is your expectation from the Unicity restructuring process which is going on at the moment?

10. Do you have any other comment you would like to make?

## **Appendix E:Notes for Administering the Unicity Survey Questionnaire**

### **Notes for Administering the Unicity Survey Questionnaire**

#### **1. Introduction**

Let us begin by introducing ourselves.

(give names)

We are researchers from the International Labour Resource and Information Group (ILRIG) in Salt River. We are an NGO that does research and education for the labour movement.

We will now explain the purpose of this research and then tell you exactly what you need to do here today. We hope to finish everything within an hour.

#### **2. Explanation of the work**

This work is part of the Municipal Services Project which is working with SAMWU at a national level to research municipal services delivery. We are carrying this research under a contract from the Unicity Commission. Our aim is to get the views of workers on their work in the municipality and on municipal restructuring. The Unicity has already carried out a survey of 500 managers, so this is to provide some view from workers as well. We have worked closely with SAMWU in developing this research. We have also made attempts to work with IMATU but to date they have not taken part in the process.

The results of this research will be presented to the Unicity Commission in late May as part of the discussion and debate over the restructuring of greater Cape Town. We also hope to work with SAMWU to prepare a report back to the union about the results of our research.

We thank you for your participation in this process.

#### **3. Explanation of the task**

Next we would like to explain exactly what you will be doing here today. But before we move on to this, are there any questions about what we have said so far?

(Be sure to take questions but be aware of time constraints.)

Each of you should have a questionnaire in front of you. The questionnaire should be in the language of your choice –English, Xhosa or Afrikaans. Be sure that you have all the pages. Your

questionnaire should go from question 1 to 35. We ask that you take your time in filling in your questionnaires. Remember you are not asked to put your name on the questionnaire—so your answers will not be known to other people.

We will begin by filling out one of the questions together so that everyone has a clear understanding of the process. There are two types of questions in this questionnaire: tables and filling in blanks. We will do one of each.

(Now use the flip chart to fill in question 1 and question 6. )

The last question on the last page asks you for any additional comments. Please feel free to write whatever you want to in that space.

#### **4. Helping to create an open atmosphere**

Filling in this questionnaire is not a race or a test. You must go at your own pace. If you have any questions as you are working feel free to ask us or other workers who are here.

Lastly, we ask that you try to answer every question. If you are not sure what a question requires, please ask us.

Thank you again for helping us in this research. We hope it will help to put workers' issues onto the agenda of the restructuring process in greater Cape Town.

#### **Appendix F: Data from Surveys**

---

[1] The date of submission was later changed to a draft submission on 17 May and a final submission on 30 May.

[2] The core research team from ILRIG was Hamedata Deedat, John Pape and Msokoli Qotole. David McDonald participated in his capacity as Co-Director of the Municipal Services Project. Research assistance was provided by Helga Jansen, Neil Newman, Lawrence Salmon and Mthetho Xali of ILRIG. Administrative support came from Nobuzwe Ngqwemla of ILRIG and Ayesha Foflonker of the Unicity Commission. A more detailed discussion of research issues and methods used is contained in Appendix A: Notes on the Research.

[3] We also contacted IMATU. Both Ron Field and L Scheepers of IMATU informed us that IMATU would not assist in the research. In their view, assisting in the research would be equivalent to an expression of support for the Unicity Commission. They indicated their union did not want to be seen to indicate such support. We faxed them an invitation to participate with an assurance that we would include in the report a note to stress that their participation in no

way implied endorsement or support for the Unicity Commission. They still declined to assist but said they would inform their members that such a process was taking place.