

Cognadev Technical Report Series

8

11th January, 2017



Comparing SST job levels with CPP-SST levels of job incumbents

This study is aimed at answering the question of whether the CPP results of individuals tend to match the complexity requirements of their work as indicated by the Stratified Systems Theory (SST).



Contents

Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction.....	5
2. Descriptive Statistics	7
3. Comparative Classification Matrices – CPP Current Level of Work	8
3.1 CCM Rounded Lower Analyses	8
3.2 CCM Rounded Higher Analyses.....	10
4. Comparative Classification Matrices – CPP Potential Level of Work.....	12
4.1 CCM Rounded Lower Analyses	12
4.2 CCM Rounded Higher Analyses.....	14

Tables

Table 1: The four constituent files, and numbers of cases in the combined sample global file.....	6
Table 2: The global file structure containing the four samples of data.....	6
Table 3: Descriptive statistics for the Aggregate Sample data file	7
Table 4: Descriptive statistics for Sample 1 data.....	7
Table 5: Descriptive statistics for Sample 2 data.....	7
Table 6: Descriptive statistics for Sample 3 data.....	7
Table 7: Descriptive statistics for Sample 4 data.....	7
Table 8: Aggregate Sample data file - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work	8
Table 9: Sample 1 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work.....	8
Table 10: Sample 2 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work.....	9
Table 11: Sample 3 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work.....	9
Table 12: Sample 4 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work.....	9
Table 13: Aggregate Sample data file - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work	10
Table 14: Sample 1 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work.....	10
Table 15: Sample 2- using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work	11
Table 16: Sample 3 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work.....	11
Table 17: Sample 4 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work.....	11
Table 18: Global Data file - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work.....	12
Table 19: Sample 1 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work.....	12
Table 20: Sample 2- using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work.....	12
Table 21: Sample 3- using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work.....	13
Table 22: Sample 4 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work.....	13
Table 23: Global Data file - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work	14
Table 24: Sample 1 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work.....	14
Table 25: Sample 2 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work.....	15
Table 26: Sample 3 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work.....	15
Table 27: Sample 4 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work.....	15

Executive Summary

- It was found that in the managerial and executive roles of the samples from the mining and manufacturing industries, which primarily represented SST Level 3 and Level 3 for 4 complexity, the job-incumbents largely showed current capability for SST Level 2, 3 and 4 and potential for Levels 3 and 4 as measured by the CPP.
- In the Retail sector where both operational and managerial positions were analysed, the work primarily entailed SST Level 1 and 2 operational-involvement and the job incumbents mostly obtained Level 1 and 2 with potential for Level 3 complexity on the CPP.
- The gamma correlations between CPP and CCM levels ranged from .42 to .98 and the classification accuracy mostly from 35% to 50%.
- The majority of job incumbents who showed operational inclinations were thus employed in operational roles, whereas the majority of those who showed strategic orientations, were involved in strategic roles.
- It should, however, be kept in mind that a large proportion of the employees in the samples analysed, were not necessarily employed at the most suitable levels of complexity due to age- and experience-related, socio-political and educational factors. Selection and placement practices in general are also not necessarily ideal.
- ***This study thus indicates a significant overlap between the SST job levels of positions and the CPP levels of job incumbents – especially at managerial and executive levels.***

1. Introduction

A perfect match between people and jobs is not expected as employees are not always carefully matched or suited to their positions. An overall comparison of job levels and people capabilities will, however, be useful given the impact of natural selection processes on job promotion – especially at managerial and executive levels.

The CPP and CCM measure 5 levels of work complexity whereas the SST specifies 7 levels. The CPP and CCM Level 5 include the requirements and capabilities associated with the SST Level 5, 6 and 7.

In this study, the jobs in question were largely analysed by HR practitioners in terms of a number of criteria linked to the Stratified Systems Theory (SST) which describes the complexity of work. These criteria are provided systematically by the Contextualised Competency Mapping (CCM) job analysis tool, which was provided to the companies involved. However, in the majority of cases, not all the positions were analysed in detail by using the CCM, but the SST levels of certain positions were merely indicated by professionally trained and CCM-accredited practitioners. The so-called CCM levels of the positions as indicated here, may therefore lack accuracy. The job levels are indicated in this study as CCM levels whereas the complexity levels of the people involved, are indicated as CPP levels.

In some cases, positions were also slotted into 9 SST categories (Level 1, Level 1 for 2, Level 2, Level 2 for 3, Level 3, Level 3 for 4, L4, Level 4 for 5, and Level 5) and at other organisations jobs were merely slotted into 5 categories (Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, Level 4, Level 5). To resolve this discrepancy in the categorisation of the positions, those job categories that spanned 2 different SST levels were “rounded lower” (*e.g. Level 1-for-2 becomes a Level 1 job*) or higher (*Level 1-for-2 becomes a Level 2 job*).

It can be expected that the CPP current level will best map onto the “rounded lower” level of the job, and the CPP potential level will be best suited to the “rounded higher” level of the position.

The normal work population is roughly estimated to function at the following SST levels:

- A good 80% of work roles represent operational work at the SST Pure Operations and Diagnostic Accumulation levels. It can also be expected that the majority of people feel most comfortable in these structured and relatively routinised and/or technical environments where they can rely on previously acquired knowledge and experience.
- Approximately 15% of roles can be regarded as representative of the Tactical Strategy level. These include most professional and business management roles where a job incumbent has to deal with tangible systems and/or the application of professional knowledge.
- A much smaller percentage, an estimated 4% of roles, can be regarded as reflecting Parallel Processing complexity where the focus is on the integration of complex, dynamic and fuzzy information, innovation, model building and considering the viability of complex systems.
- A mere fraction of a percentage point of roles in the work environment, require dealing with the chaos and emerging patterns on which Pure Strategic roles focus. These roles are normally associated with determining the strategic intent of an organisation, the long term viability and sustainability of an industry, realising emerging philosophical trends in the industry and capitalising on the offerings of alternative industries.

These estimated percentages are merely meant to contextualise the CPP scores of people in the work environment.

In the samples analysed as part of this study, employees from the mining, manufacturing and retail industries from 3 organisations were included. A large number of roles were involved which primarily span Pure Operational to Parallel Processing work complexity. A fair proportion of the roles from the manufacturing and mining industries in particular represent managerial and executive functioning.

As can be expected, the samples largely show a preference for Diagnostic (level 2) and Tactical (Level 3) work. This can be expected as normal SST level distributions which peak at Levels 1 and 2, differ from the nature of the samples included in this study where a fair proportion of the roles involve Level 3 and Level 3 for 4 functioning. The largest of the samples included here, does however, reflect mostly operational work.

The following samples (Samples 1, 2, 3, 4) were analysed:

Table 1: The four constituent files, and numbers of cases in the combined sample global file

Category	Frequency table: Sample			
	Count	Cumulative Count	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Sample 1	36	36	3.11	3.11
Sample 2	202	238	17.46	20.57
Sample 3	185	423	15.99	36.56
Sample 4	734	1157	63.44	100.00
Missing	0	1157	0.00	100.00

Table 2: The global file structure containing the four samples of data

	Multiple file SST dataset	
	1 Variable Name	2 Long Name -Description
1	Sample	
2	CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CCM Job Level - Rounded Lower
3	CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CCM Job Level - Rounded Higher
4	CPP Current LOW	
5	CPP Potential LOW	

- Each Level of Work (LOW) variable ranges between {1 and 5}.
- For the CCM, the dual category rating (e.g. L1-2) was “rounded down” into the CCM Rounded Lower LOW variable (so L1-2 would be coded as L1) and “rounded up” into the CCM Rounded Higher LOW variable (so L1-2 would be coded as L2).
- For the Sample 4 data, where only a single “Actual Job Rating” code was provided {1-5}, the same value was used in both the CCM Rounded Lower LOW and CCM Rounded Higher LOW variables.

2. Descriptive Statistics

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for the Aggregate Sample data file

Variable	Descriptive Statistics: Aggregate Sample Data File						
	Valid N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	1157	2.1	2	1	4	1	3
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	1157	2.2	2	1	5	1	3
CPP Current LOW	1157	2.4	2	1	4	2	3
CPP Potential LOW	1157	3.1	3	1	5	2	4

Table 4: Descriptive statistics for Sample 1 data

Variable	Descriptive Statistics: Sample 1						
	Valid N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	36	3.1	3	2	4	3	3
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	36	3.6	4	3	4	3	4
CPP Current LOW	36	2.7	3	1	4	2	3
CPP Potential LOW	36	3.5	3	2	5	3	4

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for Sample 2 data

Variable	Descriptive Statistics: Sample 2						
	Valid N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	202	2.9	3	2	4	3	3
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	202	3.3	3	2	5	3	4
CPP Current LOW	202	2.7	3	1	4	2	3
CPP Potential LOW	202	3.4	4	2	5	3	4

Table 6: Descriptive statistics for Sample 3 data

Variable	Descriptive Statistics: Sample 3						
	Valid N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	185	3.0	3	2	4	3	3
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	185	3.3	3	2	4	3	4
CPP Current LOW	185	2.8	3	1	4	2	4
CPP Potential LOW	185	3.4	4	1	4	3	4

Table 7: Descriptive statistics for Sample 4 data

Variable	Descriptive Statistics: Sample 4						
	Valid N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Lower Quartile	Upper Quartile
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	734	1.6	1	1	4	1	2
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	734	1.6	1	1	4	1	2
CPP Current LOW	734	2.2	2	1	4	2	3
CPP Potential LOW	734	2.9	3	1	5	2	4

3. Comparative Classification Matrices – CPP Current Level of Work

3.1 CCM Rounded Lower Analyses

It is suggested that the Current CPP levels of people be compared to the “rounded lower” estimates of the CCM levels, whereas the CPP Potential levels be compared to the “rounded higher” CCM levels.

Table 8: Aggregate Sample data file - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Aggregate Sample Data File Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
1	140	192	62	31	425
2	43	107	57	30	237
3	20	170	167	106	463
4	1	4	5	22	32
All Grps	204	473	291	189	1157

Gamma correlation = **0.52**, % classification accuracy = **38%** (sum of diagonal/total number of cases)

In this combined sample it seems that many employees with current Level 2 CPP results are employed in Level 1, 2 and 3 jobs. In the case of inexperienced employees with a CPP Level 2 capacity, employment at operational Level 1 is common, from where employees can progress further as they gain more knowledge and experience. The majority of those with current CPP Level 4 capacity, are employed at Levels 3 seeing that the majority of the roles reflected Level 3 as opposed to Level 4 complexity.

Those employees with a current level 2 CPP result, that are employed at CCM level 3 positions, are likely to approach their work in a linear, rule-based manner, without adequately focusing on the entire functional system, the interaction between systems elements and the longer term goal achievement of the functional system. In other words, these individuals can be expected to experience difficulty in planning and monitoring tactical strategies, thereby reducing the effectiveness of managerial functioning.

Table 9: Sample 1 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 1 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
2	0	2	0	0	2
3	1	14	11	3	29
4	0	0	0	5	5
All Grps	1	16	11	8	36

Gamma correlation = **0.98**, % classification accuracy = **50%**

This sample largely consisted of managers and executives within the mining and production environments. Most of the roles represented a CCM Level 3. The majority of the employees showed current CPP Level 2 and 3 capacity although a good proportion also showed a current CPP Level 4

capability. The majority of people with Level 2 and Level 3 capacity were employed in Level 3 roles. Most of those that showed a current Level 4 capacity were employed in Level 4 roles.

Table 10: Sample 2 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 2 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
2	4	20	2	0	26
3	3	62	66	40	171
4	0	0	0	5	5
All Grps	7	82	68	45	202

Gamma correlation = **0.90**, % classification accuracy = **45%**

In this sample of managers and executives too, most individuals showed a current Level 2 and 3 capability and most were employed in CCM level 3 roles. Most of those currently capable of Level 4 functioning, were slotted into Level 3 roles. The distribution of the capability levels of this managerial / executive sample does, however, look very different from broad estimates of the normal working population where 80% show Level 1 and 2 capacity.

Table 11: Sample 3 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 3 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
2	5	2	0	0	7
3	13	56	60	43	172
4	0	0	0	6	6
All Grps	18	58	60	49	185

Gamma correlation = **0.97**, % classification accuracy = **37%**

In this sample of managers and executives from a global manufacturing company, the majority of positions were classified as Level 3 work and individuals showing level 2, 3 and 4 capacity were in Tactical Strategy work. In this sample it is interesting to note that only people with a current Level 4 capacity were found in Level 4 roles, but many others with current Level 4 capacity were employed in Level 3 positions. Again this sample of executives and managers show a completely different distribution in terms of capability levels than the normal working population.

Table 12: Sample 4 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 4 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
1	140	192	62	31	425
2	34	83	55	30	202
3	3	38	30	20	91
4	1	4	5	6	16
All Grps	178	317	152	87	734

Gamma correlation = **0.44**, % classification accuracy = **35%**

Roles within this Retail organisation represent SST Levels 1 to 4 complexity, but a large majority of the roles are of an operational nature. In fact, 85% of roles reflect SST Levels 1 and 2. The employees also showed primarily Operational capacity with a good 67% of employees showing current Level 1 and Level 2 preferences and capabilities. Given the large proportion of young and inexperienced employees as well as people who have not had access to higher education, a majority of the employees in this organisation who show current Level 3 capacity are employed at Levels 1 and 2. The majority of those with current Level 1 and 2 capacity are also employed in Level 1 roles.

3.2 CCM Rounded Higher Analyses

Table 13: Aggregate Sample data file - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Aggregate Sample Data File Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
1	140	192	62	31	425
2	37	83	55	30	205
3	26	173	120	63	382
4	1	25	54	64	144
5	0	0	0	1	1
All Grps	204	473	291	189	1157

Gamma correlation = **0.50**, % classification accuracy = **35%**

It is expected that the Current CPP level of individuals should ideally be compared to the “rounded lower” CCM results and the Potential CPP levels of employees with the “rounded higher” CCM results. The somewhat mismatched people and job level results as indicated above, supports this expectation.

Table 14: Sample 1 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 1 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
3	1	10	3	1	15
4	0	6	8	7	21
All Grps	1	16	11	8	36

Gamma correlation = **0.71**, % classification accuracy = **28%**

Again, the Current CPP level of individuals should ideally be compared to the “rounded lower” CCM results and the Potential CPP levels of employees with the “rounded higher” CCM results. This result further verifies the drop in the overlap between people and job levels where job levels are adjusted upwards (from a Gamma correlations 98 to 71 and classification accuracy 50 to 28).

Table 15: Sample 2- using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 2 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
2	2	0	0	0	2
3	5	72	46	18	141
4	0	10	22	26	58
5	0	0	0	1	1
All Grps	7	82	68	45	202

Gamma correlation = **0.68**, % classification accuracy = **36%**

This result further verifies the expectation that the Current CPP level of individuals will best overlap with the “rounded lower” CCM results and the Potential CPP levels of employees with the “rounded higher” CCM results as the result indicates a drop in the overlap between people and job levels where job levels are adjusted upwards (from a Gamma correlations 90 to 68 and classification accuracy 45 to 36).

Table 16: Sample 3 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 3 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
2	1	0	0	0	1
3	17	53	41	24	135
4	0	5	19	25	49
All Grps	18	58	60	49	185

Gamma correlation = **0.70**, % classification accuracy = **36%**

This result also shows a drop in the overlap between people and job levels where job levels are adjusted upwards (from a Gamma correlations 97 to 70 and classification accuracy 37 to 36).

Table 17: Sample 4 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 4 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Current LOW 1	CPP Current LOW 2	CPP Current LOW 3	CPP Current LOW 4	Row Totals
1	140	192	62	31	425
2	34	83	55	30	202
3	3	38	30	20	91
4	1	4	5	6	16
All Grps	178	317	152	87	734

Gamma correlation = **0.44**, % classification accuracy = **35%**

In this study a four category classification of roles apply and the rounding lower or higher will not have an impact on the outcome.

4. Comparative Classification Matrices – CPP Potential Level of Work

4.1 CCM Rounded Lower Analyses

Table 18: Global Data file - using **CCM Rounded Lower** Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Aggregate Sample Data File Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)						
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Potential LOW 1	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	CPP Potential LOW 5	Row Totals
1	36	172	119	89	9	425
2	7	68	74	79	9	237
3	0	65	149	232	17	463
4	0	1	4	19	8	32
All Grps	43	306	346	419	43	1157

Gamma correlation = **0.47**, % classification accuracy = **24%**

It seems that the Current CPP level of individuals should ideally be compared to the “rounded lower” CCM results and the Potential CPP levels of employees with the “rounded higher” CCM results. This outcome merely indicates that the marginal lowering of the CCM level of jobs, significantly impacts the degree of person and job matching.

Table 19: Sample 1 - using **CCM Rounded Lower** Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 1 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	CPP Potential LOW 5	Row Totals
2	0	2	0	0	2
3	2	15	12	0	29
4	0	0	1	4	5
All Grps	2	17	13	4	36

Gamma correlation = **0.95**, % classification accuracy = **44%**

In this study the majority of positions reflected Level 3 complexity and the majority of employees showed potential for level 3 and 4. Potential CPP levels should best be compared to “rounded higher” job levels though. There is, however, a relatively high degree of overlap between people and jobs in terms of complexity criteria.

Table 20: Sample 2- using **CCM Rounded Lower** Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 2 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	CPP Potential LOW 5	Row Totals
2	15	10	1	0	26
3	18	57	88	8	171
4	0	0	3	2	5
All Grps	33	67	92	10	202

Gamma correlation = **0.87**, % classification accuracy = **37%**

In this study, the majority of people showed a potential for Level 4 complexity whereas the majority of “rounded lower” positions were classified as a level 3. This outcome merely indicates that the marginal lowering of the CCM level of jobs, impacts on the degree of person and job matching (from Gamma correlations of 90 to 87 and classification accuracy from 45 to 37%).

Table 21: Sample 3- using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 3 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Potential LOW 1	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	Row Totals
2	1	6	0	0	7
3	0	30	44	98	172
4	0	0	0	6	6
All Grps	1	36	44	104	185

Gamma correlation = **1.00**, % classification accuracy = **30%**

In this organisation, where almost all managerial and executive positions were regarded as representative of Level 3 complexity, and the majority of managers and executives showed a Potential for Level 4 functioning, the overlap between people and job levels were relatively low.

Table 22: Sample 4 - using CCM Rounded Lower Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 4 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)						
CCM Rounded Lower LOW	CPP Potential LOW 1	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	CPP Potential LOW 5	Row Totals
1	36	172	119	89	9	425
2	6	47	62	78	9	202
3	0	15	33	34	9	91
4	0	1	4	9	2	16
All Grps	42	235	218	210	29	734

Gamma correlation = **0.41**, % classification accuracy = **17%**

No rounding off of CCM levels were required for this sample as a four category job classification applied. For this sample the Current CPP levels showed a greater degree of overlap with the complexity requirements of work than the Potential CPP levels of employees.

4.2 CCM Rounded Higher Analyses

Table 23: Global Data file - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Aggregate Sample Data File Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)						
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Potential LOW 1	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	CPP Potential LOW 5	Row Totals
1	36	172	119	89	9	425
2	6	50	62	78	9	205
3	1	80	139	151	11	382
4	0	4	26	100	14	144
5	0	0	0	1	0	1
All Grps	43	306	346	419	43	1157

Gamma correlation = **0.46**, % classification accuracy = **28%**

Interesting results here include the large proportion of individuals with a level 2 and 3 cognitive potential in level 1 positions. This may be due to the inadequate experience and educational exposure of the largest sample that was included in this study. The majority of people with a Level 3 cognitive potential are however in Level 3 positions (rounded higher) and most of those with a Level 4 cognitive potential are in Level 3 and 4 positions (rounded higher).

Only 3% of this sample showed potential for Level 5 functioning whereas 36% showed potential for Level 4; 29% show capacity for Level 3; 26% for Level 2; and 3% for Level 1. This is not reflective of the SST level distributions of the normal work population, but more an indication of the samples that were selected for this study – which included a large managerial and executive component.

Table 24: Sample 1 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 1 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	CPP Potential LOW 5	Row Totals
3	1	11	3	0	15
4	1	6	10	4	21
All Grps	2	17	13	4	36

Gamma correlation = **0.71**, % classification accuracy = **58%**

A fair degree of overlap between the CPP levels (potential) of people and the CCM levels of positions (rounded higher) were found for this sample – although most positions reflected only levels 3 and 4 complexity.

Table 25: Sample 2 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 2 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	CPP Potential LOW 5	Row Totals
2	2	0	0	0	2
3	30	54	55	2	141
4	1	13	36	8	58
5	0	0	1	0	1
All Grps	33	67	92	10	202

Gamma correlation = **0.68**, % classification accuracy = **46%**

In this organisation most managerial and executive roles are of a Level 3 nature. A fair degree of overlap between the CPP profiles (potential) of people and the CCM levels of jobs (rounded higher) were found.

Table 26: Sample 3 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 3 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)					
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Potential LOW 1	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	Row Totals
2	0	1	0	0	1
3	1	34	41	59	135
4	0	1	3	45	49
All Grps	1	36	44	104	185

Gamma correlation = **0.68**, % classification accuracy = **47%**

In this organisation too, most managerial and executive roles were categorised at a Level 3 (rounded higher). A fair degree of overlap between the CPP profiles (potential) of people and the CCM levels of jobs (rounded higher) were found.

Table 27: Sample 4 - using CCM Rounded Higher Level of Work

Summary Frequency Table: Sample 4 Marked cells have counts > 10 (Marginal summaries are not marked)						
CCM Rounded Higher LOW	CPP Potential LOW 1	CPP Potential LOW 2	CPP Potential LOW 3	CPP Potential LOW 4	CPP Potential LOW 5	Row Totals
1	36	172	119	89	9	425
2	6	47	62	78	9	202
3	0	15	33	34	9	91
4	0	1	4	9	2	16
All Grps	42	235	218	210	29	734

Gamma correlation = **0.42**, % classification accuracy = **17%**

No rounding off of CCM levels were required for this sample as a four category job classification applied.

Conclusion

It was found that in the managerial and executive roles of the samples from the mining and manufacturing industries, which primarily represented SST Level 3 and Level 3 for 4 complexity, the job-incumbents largely showed current capability for SST Level 2, 3 and 4 and potential for Levels 3 and 4 as measured by the CPP. In the Retail sector where both operational and managerial positions were analysed, the work primarily entailed SST Level 1 and 2 operational involvement and the job incumbents mostly obtained Level 1 and 2 with potential for Level 3 complexity on the CPP. The gamma correlations between CPP and CCM levels ranged from .42 to .98 and the classification accuracy mostly from 35% to 50%. The majority of job incumbents who showed operational inclinations were thus employed in operational roles, whereas the majority of those who showed strategic orientations, were involved in strategic roles. It should, however, be kept in mind that a large proportion of the employees in the samples analysed, were not necessarily employed at the most suitable levels of complexity due to age- and experience-related, socio-political and educational factors. Selection and placement practices in general are also not necessarily ideal.

This study thus indicates a significant overlap between the SST job levels of positions and the CPP levels of job incumbents – especially at managerial and executive levels.