

DISCIPLINARY ENQUIRIES IN TERMS OF SCHEDULE 8 OF THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT 66 OF 1995

by

PAUL ANDRIES SMIT

Submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree

PHILOSOPHIAE DOCTOR (LABOUR RELATIONS MANAGEMENT)

in the

FACULTY OF ECONOMIC AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

at the

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

Supervisor: Prof BPS van Eck Co-supervisor: Prof LP Vermeulen

MARCH 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my wonderful wife, Elmain, who supported me all the way and who suffered silently and alone when I cancelled visits to friends or family as I sat in front of my laptop. She missed out on numerous dinners and movies because of this thesis! Thank you all my friends and colleagues who supported and encouraged me. Thank you also to my dogs, Aramis and Portos, who lay patiently at my feet when I was burning the midnight oil.

I want to express thanks especially to my study leaders, Professor van Eck and Professor Vermeulen for their wonderful guidance and assistance. They never lost faith in me, without their continuous feedback, support and encouragement I would not have been able to complete this project.

I would like to thank the University of Pretoria for its financial assistance.

Thanks are also due to Commissioner Elsabé Maree from the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration and the other panellists for the peer review.

Thank you to Kirsten Jacoby and Miempie Erasmus for all their assistance with the technical aspect and layout.

Thank you to Idette Noome for the language editing.

Finally, I would like to express my deep gratitude to our Lord and Saviour, without whom we cannot achieve anything in life.



DECLARATION

I, Paul Andries Smit, declare that *Disciplinary Enquiries in Terms of Schedule 8 of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995* is my own unaided work both in content and execution. All the resources I used in this study are cited and referred to in the reference list by means of a comprehensive referencing system. Apart from the normal guidance from my study leaders, I have received no assistance, except as stated in the acknowledgements.

I declare that the content of this thesis has never been used before for any qualification at any tertiary institution.

I, Paul Andries Smit, declare that the language in this thesis was edited by Idette Noomė (MA English Pret).

Paul Andries Smit	Date:
Signature	



CONTENTS

Ackn	owledgements	i
Decla	aration	ii
Abstr	ract	ix
List c	of abbreviations	xii
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION TO THE RESEARCH TOPIC AND DESIGN		
1.1	Introduction	2
1.2	The quest for fairness in the workplace	5
1.3	The business owner's (manager's) role as labour law specialis	st 7
1.4	Key focus of the study and background to the problem	8
1.5	The research aim, focus, scope and delimitations	12
	1.5.1 Aim of the study1.5.2 Focus1.5.3 Scope and delimitations	12 13 14
1.6	Literature review	16
1.7	The research approach and research method - qualitative as opposed to quantitative research	16
1.8	Ethical issues	22
1.9	Chapter outline	22



CHAPTER 2 - THE CONCEPT OF FAIRNESS AND ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE

2.1	Introduction	25
2.2	Organisational justice	26
	2.2.1 Distributive justice2.2.2 Procedural justice2.2.3 Interactional justice	28 30 34
2.3	Conclusion	36
	APTER 3 - THE RIGHT TO DISCIPLINE AND DISMISS: AN ERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK	
3.1	Introduction	39
3.2	Supranational instruments	40
	3.2.1 Introduction3.2.2 The International Labour Organisation3.2.3 The European Union3.2.4 The Southern African Development Community	40 40 47 51
3.3	The Netherlands	52
	3.3.1 Introduction3.3.2 Historical background3.3.3 Legislative framework for dismissal3.3.4 Compliance with Convention C158	52 53 55 58
3.4	The United Kingdom	59
	3.4.1 Introduction3.4.2 Historical background	59 60



	3.4.3 Legislative framework for dismissal3.4.4 Compliance with Convention C158	61 64
3.5	The United States of America	65
	3.5.1 Introduction3.5.2 Historical background3.5.3 Legislative framework for dismissal3.5.4 Compliance with Convention C158	65 65 69 71
3.6	Conclusion	72
CHA	APTER 4 - DISMISSAL: SOUTH AFRICAN SOURCES OF LA	\W
4.1	Introduction	77
4.2	The common-law contract of employment	77
	4.2.1 General4.2.2 Common-law duties of the employer4.2.3 Common-law duties of the employee	77 81 83
4.3	The South African legislative framework	88
	 4.3.1 Historical development 4.3.2 Primary source of current labour law 4.3.3 The South African Constitution 4.3.4 The Basic Conditions of Employment Act 4.3.5 The Labour Relations Act 	88 91 93 97 99
4.4	Conclusion	102
	APTER 5 - CODE OF GOOD PRACTICE: DISM HEDULE 8)	ISSAL
5.1	Introduction	105



5.2	Item 1(1) – General in nature	106
5.3	Item 1(2) – Collective agreements	108
5.4	Item 1(3) – Value statements	111
5.5	Item 2 – Fair reason for dismissal	112
5.6	Item 3 – Disciplinary measures short of dismissal	113
5.7	Item 4(1) – Fair procedure (elements of procedural fairness)	116
5.8	 5.7.1 Introduction 5.7.2 Investigation 5.7.3 Notice of allegation 5.7.4 Opportunity to state a case in response to the allegations 5.7.5 Reasonable time to prepare a response 5.7.6 Assistance of a trade union representative or fellow employee 5.7.7 Communicate the decision taken after the enquiry Item 4(2) – Discipline against a trade union representative 	116 116 119 121 126 129 131
5.9	Item 4(3) – Reasons and reminder of right to refer	136
5.10	Item 4(4) – Dispensing with pre-dismissal procedures	139
5.11	Conclusion	141
CHAPTER 6 - SOUTH AFRICAN DISMISSAL LAW COMPARED TO INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES		



Introduction

6.1

145

6.2	South African dismissal law and Convention C158	146
	6.2.1 Valid reason for dismissal6.2.2 Right of employee to defend himself against allegations6.2.3 Right to appeal	146 147 150
6.3	South Africa and the Netherlands	152
6.4	South Africa and the United Kingdom	153
6.5	South Africa and the United States	155
6.6	Conclusion	157
CHAPTER 7 - RESEARCH FINDINGS		
7.1	Introduction	161
7.2	Results of literature review	162
	 7.2.1 Fairness and organisational justice 7.2.2 International framework on the right to discipline and dismiss 7.2.3 Dismissal: South African sources of law 7.2.4 Code of Good Practice: Dismissal (Schedule 8) 7.2.5 South African dismissal law compared to international perspectives 	162 164 167 169 171
7.	3 Results of peer review	174
7.	4 Interpretation of results	178
7.	5 Conclusion	183



CHAPTER 8 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1	Introduction	186
8.2	Overview of the research	187
8.3	Challenges	188
8.4	Recommendations	190
	8.4.1 Introduction8.4.2 Proposed amendments or changes to Schedule 8	190 191
8.5	Conclusions	197
Bibliography Table of cases Table of Statutes, Charters and Conventions		198 211 221
ANN	EXURES	
1. Co	ode of Good Practice: Dismissal (Schedule 8)	223
2. Di	sciplinary procedures (CCMA information sheet)	230
3. IL	O Convention C158	231
4. IL	O R166 Termination of Employment Recommendation	236



ABSTRACT

DISCIPLINARY ENQUIRIES IN TERMS OF SCHEDULE 8 OF THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT 66 OF 1995

by

PAUL ANDRIES SMIT

Supervisor Prof BPS van Eck

Co-supervisor Prof LP Vermeulen

Faculty Economic and Management Sciences

Degree Philosophiae Doctor (Labour Relations Management)

One of the most dramatic events in any employee's working career is to be dismissed and even more so if the employee regards the dismissal as unfair. The right not to be unfairly dismissed is considered one of the most basic workers' rights in South Africa and is also contained in Convention C158 of the International Labour Organization (ILO).

Section 23(1)(a) of the South African Constitution states that: "[e]veryone has the right to fair labour practices." Labour legislation gives effect to this right in section 1(a) and 1 (b) of the LRA which states: "to give effect to and regulate the fundamental rights conferred by section 23 of the Constitution; to give effect to the obligations incurred by the Republic as a member state of the ILO."

Section 185(a) of the Labour Relations Act also states that: "[e]very employee has the right not to be unfairly dismissed." Section 188(1)(a) – (b) expands on this protection against unfair dismissal by providing



that a dismissal will be unfair: "if the employer fails to prove ... that the dismissal was effected in accordance with a fair procedure".

The pre-dismissal procedures that must be followed by the employer have been codified to some extent in the Code of Good Practice: Dismissal, contained in Schedule 8 of the LRA. In terms of section 138(6) and section 203(3) of the LRA, commissioners who are required to determine if a dismissal was procedurally fair are compelled to take Schedule 8 into consideration.

The main objectives of this thesis were to critically evaluate the content and application of those provisions of Schedule 8 that establish procedural requirements to disciplinary enquiries and to recommend possible changes to the Code of Good Practice: Dismissal. It is apparent that the procedural requirements for a disciplinary enquiry in terms of Schedule 8 are vastly different from those that still form the basis of most disciplinary codes and procedures implemented by employers after the *Mahlangu v CIM Deltak* judgment of the former Industrial Court in 1986. It is also clear that the principles of ILO Convention C158 are given effect in South Africa's dismissal law. Procedural fairness in disciplinary enquiries does not lie in elaborate, complex and rigid court-like procedures but in flexibility and in adhering to the *audi alteram partem* principle. A disciplinary enquiry is not a court case and the workplace is not a court of law.

The belief that South Africa's dismissal law is rigid and inflexible is inaccurate. A comparative analysis of South African dismissal law with ILO Convention C158 and three other international jurisdictions clearly demonstrates that the dismissal regime in South Africa makes provision for flexibility. Employers, employees, trade unions, labour consultants and lawyers are all to blame for the formal court-like procedures that



form the basis of most disciplinary enquiries in the workplace in South Africa today.

The guidelines provided by Schedule 8 are in line with the ILO's principles. Consequently disciplinary enquiries should be handled according to those principles. The disciplinary codes and procedures of employers should be amended to reflect the core principles of ILO Convention C158 and the five basic guidelines contained in Schedule 8. Furthermore disciplinary codes and procedures should not be used as an inflexible set of rules but as a guideline from which some deviation is permissible in certain circumstances.



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACAS - Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service

BCEA - Basic Conditions of Employment Act

CC - Constitutional Court

CCMA - Commission for Conciliation Mediation and

Arbitration

COIDA - Compensation for Occupational Injuries and

Diseases Act

CWI - Centrale Organisatie Werk en Inkomen

EA - Employment Act

EC - European Commission

ECJ - European Court of Justice

EP - European Parliament

ERA - Employment Relations Act

EU - European Community

ILO - International Labour Organization

LAC - Labour Appeal Court

LC - Labour Court

LRA - Labour Relations Act

OHSA - Occupational Health and Safety Act

SADC - Southern African Development Community

SCA - Supreme Court of Appeal

UIF - Unemployment Insurance Fund

UK - United Kingdom

USA - United States of America

WDFEA - Wrongful Discharge from Employment Act

