

Comparing and Contrasting Alternative Job Evaluation Methods: A Case of Castellion and Peromnes in Determining the Worth of Jobs

¹Stephen James, ²Dr. Judith Namabira, ³Hermas Dobogo

Institute of Rural Development Planning, Dodoma

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6599899>

Published Date: 31-May-202

Abstract: Castellion and Peromnes are alternative job evaluation methods established in Southern Africa. The two methods act as additional to the traditionally long established job evaluation methods in compensation management. Castellion and Peromnes can serve the same role of the old analytical and non-analytical job evaluation methods on determining the worth of jobs in business organizations. However, there is paucity of information which compares and contrasts Castellion and Peromnes as alternative job evaluation methods. The aim of this paper was to identify the similarities and differences between Castellion and Peromnes to promote understanding of the methods among job evaluation practitioners. The methodology of this paper was qualitative in which authors searched and retrieved online publications which analyzed Castellion and Peromnes separately. A thorough review of such publications was conducted to determine where Castellion and Peromnes methods have similarities and differences in their mechanisms for job evaluation undertaking. The major findings revealed that they have similarities in terms of blending the features of point rating with those of job grading method of job evaluation. The findings further revealed that to some extent both methods used similar job evaluation factors which included pressure of work, consequences of error, qualification and job experience. Both methods also recognized the importance of Job Evaluation Committees in evaluating management, technical and manual job categories. However, the sub-division of job evaluation factors by Castellion and job description usage avoidance by Peromnes were important findings on their differences during job evaluation. It was concluded that Castellion and Peromnes are potentially similar job evaluation methods in spite of the notable differences. The paper proposed further research to be conducted on comparative analysis between each of these respective methods and other alternative job evaluation methods particularly the Paterson Decision Band Method for extending knowledge and skills among practitioners.

Keywords: Job factors, points, grades, Castellion, Peromnes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Job evaluation started within compensation management to act as a fair and unbiased mechanism of determining the job worth in organizations (Korn Ferry HayGroup, n.d.). It has also been providing a framework within which pay decisions are made in organizations based on the job value rather than making decisions subjectively on an ad hoc basis (Armstrong & Baron, 2002). The establishment of job evaluation in the United States of America in the 1920s went alongside the so-called traditional methods of job evaluation which included the job ranking, paired comparison, job classification/grading, factor-comparison method, and point rating (Armstrong *et al.*, 2005). Although such traditional methods continue to gain popularity in job evaluation, they have been criticized leading to the establishment of alternative methods of job evaluation (Nagwan *et al.*, 2020).

Some of the criticisms raised by Dr. Edward Hay in the 1940s as an example were based on the fact that the point rating did not display regular intervals or uniform constant increment between successive levels of difficulty for each job factor (El-Hajji, 2015). Dr. Hay further believed that the point rating was too complex and could not evaluate high-level managerial and technical jobs because it lacked management thinking in its operationalization (El-Hajji, 2015). Further limitations such as the lack of formal defined job factors for comparing jobs in the non-analytical methods led to the establishment of The Hay Guide Chart-Profile Method, Castellion, Peromnes, Towers Watson Global Grading System (GGS), and Paterson Decision Band Method mainly in the period post 1940s (Botaris, 2012; Joffe, 1989; Paterson, n.d.).

Additionally, most of these alternative job evaluation methods are proprietary brands because they have been established by consultants and their associated companies. They may not be available for free to use them to evaluate the jobs in the organization. Apart from restrictions on free use of the alternative methods, most of them including the Hay Guide Chart-Profile Method, Towers Watson Global Grading, and Paterson also have been mostly used by companies in North America and Europe while Castellion and Peromnes have been mostly used by South African companies and partly in Zimbabwe (Mugadza, 2017). Technological transfer among organizations across the globe as argued by Maliki & Hattasingh (2013) attract their transfer by the organizations located in many parts of the developing world.

Furthermore, the literature published on job evaluation has dwelt on explaining procedures of the traditional methods of job evaluation. Little attention has been paid to the alternative methods of job evaluation which have influence on job evaluation practices of many organizations today (Bhavika, 2019; Kilgour, 2008; Masanja, 2019). For that matter, the aim of this paper was to identify the similarities and differences between Castellion and Peromnes methods of job evaluation to advance understanding on the nature of both systems among practitioners in compensation management.

2. METHODOLOGY

The paper adopted a qualitative methodology in obtaining information to identify similarities and differences between Castellion and Peromnes systems. A search of literature published online was undertaken. All kinds of literature which had been published on alternative methods of job evaluation were retrieved from Google and Google Scholar internet database. A total of 24 pieces of literature were obtained from the internet and stored on a personal computer for subsequent selection and review. Out of 24 literatures obtained from the internet only 7 were selected for review. They were reviewed because they had specific information regarding Castellion and Peromnes, unlike others which had information on other alternative methods that were not interested by this paper. The selected publications were reviewed thoroughly to understand the nature of Castellion and Peromnes system of job evaluation. Findings were presented by citing previous scholars who attempted to describe the mechanisms of Castellion and Peromnes job evaluation methods. A summary of information on similarities and differences was provided in Table 3 while appendix 1 and 2 displayed various themes which emerged from the pieces of literature reviewed on Castellion and Peromnes methods of job evaluation

3. FINDINGS ON CASTELLION AND PEROMNES BASED ON SECONDARY INFORMATION

3.1. The Castellion System

The Castellion system of job evaluation has not been much written but it was introduced out of research by Professor Biesheuvel and Dr. L. Cortis at South African Breweries Group and got its name from Castle and Lion lager brands in the 1950s (Joffe, 1989). Castellion job evaluation system is a point system that has been used to evaluate the jobs based on three factors being divided into two sub-factors which make-up a total of six job evaluation factors (Mugadza, 2017). Like many other methods in the traditional sense, the system emphasizes identification of the jobs to be evaluated and developing job descriptions by interviewing the job holder before engaging in point allocation and final grading of jobs (Perold, n.d.). The major Castellion factors that are used in job evaluation consist of Effort, Responsibility, and Competence with their associated sub-factors (Tapi, 2021). Further sub-factors of each of these factors have been elucidated by Perold (n.d.) as detailed below.

The first is the Effort factor which has two components which include: Decision Making and Pressure of Work. The pressure of Work is conceived as stress under which decisions have to be made in a job while Decision Making is viewed as a choice of judgment that an individual in a job is anticipated to make. The point scale is based on the level of complexity in judgments involved in a job. The second job factor is that of Responsibility which is sub-divided into Consequences of Errors and Controls and Checks in the job. Controls and Checks sub-factor measures the degree of direct

and indirect controls exercised over the job holder by the company management. Consequence of Error in the job measures the degree of loss as a result of wrong decisions on material and human resources inside and outside the organization. The third and last major factor in evaluating the job is Competence which measures the sub-factor of Qualification and Experience. These two sub-factors measure the required education and experience that is vital for performing the job under evaluation. If a job demands no formal education or the lowest levels of qualification and experience, then the job evaluation Committee must allocate the point for that factor based on the level of qualification and experience.

In using this method to evaluate the jobs, points usually are assigned to each factor. Then, points scored are summed-up to provide total point value for the job which indicate an approximate grade of the job (Perold, n.d.). The system normally has a range of points from 4 to 1248 points that are divided into 16 grades where Grade 1 = Top Executive being highest valuable grade while Grade 16 = the labourer which is the lowest job grade in value. The final grade for a job is obtained based on the Decision Making factor which becomes dominant with scales that ranges from simple decisions through pragmatic decisions to tactical and strategic decisions as illustrated below.

Table 1: The Castellion Final Grading Based on Decision Making Factor

Grades	Decision-Making Factor
16	Simple Decision Jobs (Unskilled/Labourer)
15	Pragmatic Decisions (Standard)
14	
13	
12	Tactical Decisions (Senior)
11	
10	
9	
8	
7	Coordination & Interpretive Decisions (Executive)
6	
5	
4	
3	Strategic Decisions (Top Executive)
2	
1	

Source: Adapted from Mande (2016) & Jordan *et al*, (1992)

Apart from reaching the final job grade based on decision making scale, Castellion system has been used by many organizations in manufacturing, commerce, and the public sector mainly in South Africa and Zimbabwe (Mande, 2016). Tapi (2021) argues that the Castellion system has merits and demerits whereby its merits include being user friendly and its mechanisms can be easily understood by knowledge workers. Castellion also addresses several job dimensions which are used to determine the value of jobs. Some of its demerits include the possibility of not being understood by employees whose jobs fall under the lower grades.

3.2. The Peromnes System

The Peromnes system was introduced by South African Management Consultants’ Company since the mid-1960s and has been widely used as a job evaluation method in Southern Africa (Joffe, 1989). Peromnes is a modified point rating method that does not require a job description in the process but evaluates the job based on eight factors as summarized by Perold (n.d). The first factor is Problem Solving which measures the complexity of problems encountered in a job and the level of decision-making necessary to solve the problem, taking into account of the information available and the accessibility of that information. The second is the Consequence of error judgment which measures the consequence of wrong decisions and their effects on the firm. The third factor is the Pressure of Work which evaluates the amount of

International Journal of Novel Research in Interdisciplinary Studies

Vol. 9, Issue 3, pp: (9-18), Month: May – June 2022, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

stress inherent in a job. For instance, stress such as deadlines to be met, the volume of work, and the regularity of decisions to be made are assessed in the job.

The fourth factor used in the method is Knowledge which assesses the knowledge essential to perform a job completely. The fifth is the Job Impact which evaluates the extent to which a job influences other activities both within and outside the firm. The Sixth is Comprehension which assesses the general level of understanding; written and spoken that is expected in the job. The seventh job evaluation factor is Education Qualification or intelligence level required for a job. This is the minimum essential requirement necessary for the job and not a job-holder’s qualifications. The last and eighth factor is Subsequent Training and Experience which assesses the time needed to achieve a level of competence in the job.

Each of these job evaluation factors above is divided into 9 progressive definitions being outlined in Peromnes job rating scale chart (Vice-Rector, 2011). The 9 progressive definitions are assigned with a numerical scale that ranges from 0 – 36 so that when a job is evaluated against each of the 8 factors a point value can be provided to the description which most satisfactorily describes the nature of the job on that particular factor (Perold, n.d.). The points scored on each of the factors are totaled to give the number of rated points and the job can now be graded according to Peromnes conversion scale, which assigns the job in any of 19 grades with 1 grade being the highest in value while 19 being the lowest in value (Mugadza, 2017). Table 2 below shows examples of the Peromnes Grading system during job evaluation.

Table 2: The Peromnes Grading System

Related Points	Grades	Example Levels
271 – 288	1++	Most Senior Executives
259 – 270	1+	And Specialists
249 - 258	1	nationally
231 – 248	2	Other Top Management and
216 - 230	3	Very Senior Specialists
201 – 215	4	Senior Management
187 - 200	5	High –Level
173 - 186	6	Specialists
158 – 172	7	Middle Management
143 – 157	8	Superintendents and
128 - 142	9	Low-Level Specialists
113 – 127	10	Supervisors, High Level
99 – 112	11	Skilled and
85 - 98	12	Clerical
77 – 84	13	Lower Level
61 – 72	14	Skilled
49 – 60	15	and
37 - 48	16	Clerical
27 – 36	17	Low –skilled
17 – 26	18	and
0 – 16	19	Unskilled

Source: Adapted from Perold (n.d.)

As already highlighted above, Peromnes was introduced by private management consultants and its registered trademark is owned by Deloitte Human Capital Corporation (Pty) Limited (Vice-Rector, 2011). The product and its related systems can only be used by licensed users in job evaluation (UFH, n.d.). It is not used free of charge because aspirants to use it are required to incur some cost to acquire permission from owners unlike the traditional methods just available free of charge. The system also requires high-level skilled personnel such as human resource management officers and Consultants to implement it with no easy access of information among ordinary employees (Joffe, 1989). However, its simplified weighting and addition of points help in deciding the value of the job in the organization (Raju, 1998). Table 3 displays a summary of information on similarities and differences between Castellion and Peromnes systems of job evaluation.

Table 3: A Summary of Information on Similarities and Differences between Castellion and Peromnes Systems

Similarities	Differences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both Castellion and Peromnes are modified point rating and job grading methods of job evaluation. In other words both blend features of point rating with those of job grading. Both contain similar job factors like Pressure of Work, Consequences of Error, Education Qualification, Training, and Experience that are used during the evaluation of jobs. Both Castellion and Peromnes recognize the importance of Job Evaluation Committee in job evaluation projects Both systems were introduced to evaluate all job categories which range from management, technical and manual jobs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-division of job evaluation factors by Castellion differentiates it from Peromnes which uses the major 8 job evaluation factors Castellion begins with job description while Peromnes has no use of job description in job evaluation projects. Some job evaluation factors like problem solving, job impact and comprehension in Peromnes do not appear among job evaluation factors used by Castellion Castellion has 16 job grades which range from 1 to 16 while Peromnes has 19 job grades making it a method with a wider variety of job evaluation factors.

4. DISCUSSION

Based on the reviewed literature and Table 3 above, the Castellion and Peromnes job evaluation methods are the modified point rating and classification or grading methods of job evaluation. The systems depend on job rating scales to assign points to the job factors and sum-up the points scored on job evaluation factors to determine the final job grade. For that matter, the mechanisms of Castellion and Peromnes blend the features of point rating and job grading methods.

A further similarity between Castellion and Peromnes systems is in terms of several job factors adopted by both as criteria in conducting job evaluation. It has been learned that job factors such as the Consequence of Error Judgement, Pressure of Work, Education Qualification, Training, and Experiences adopted by the Peromnes system are potentially a replica of similar factors that have been used by the Castellion job evaluation system. The similarity in the job evaluation factors reveals that Peromnes has been a modified or an extension of the Castellion system as suggested by Grobler et al (2013).

Both Castellion and Peromnes also emphasize on using the Job Evaluation Committee as teams which can undertake job evaluation projects. From that point of view, both systems recognize the importance of engaging managers, consultants, employees, and union representatives in job evaluation by sharing experiences and making consensus about the final points and grades of jobs. By recognizing the importance of Job Evaluation Committee in job evaluation, they opposed monolithic job evaluation like the traditional methods (Lewis & Stevens, 1990).

Furthermore, Castellion and Peromnes were established to use their designated factors to evaluate jobs of all clusters including management jobs, technical and manual jobs. This practice differentiates Castellion and Peromnes from the Hay Chart-Profile Method which uses mainly four factors of Know-How, Problem Solving, Accountability, Working Conditions, and their sub-factors to evaluate only clusters such as the management, professional and technical jobs while excluding the manual jobs in the organization (Skenes & Kleiner, 2003).

The Castellion and Peromnes systems began in South Africa in the same period characterized by racial segregation in employment relationship. Pay decisions for jobs were made based on racial segregation. Management consultants possibly introduced these two systems to make South African employers evaluate the jobs using the established methods to reach fair pay decisions.

But, apart from the two systems looking similar in job evaluation, the Castellion system sub-divides the job evaluation factors in which the three major factors are sub-divided into each having two sub-factors. Sub-division of job evaluation factors by Castellion differentiates it from Peromnes which uses a total of 8 major factors with each having 9 progressive definitions without sub-factoring. The Castellion system of sub-factors makes it a unique approach from the Peromnes system at that level.

International Journal of Novel Research in Interdisciplinary Studies

Vol. 9, Issue 3, pp: (9-18), Month: May – June 2022, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

The Castellion also differs from Peromnes in the sense that it develops job descriptions after identifying the jobs to be evaluated (Perold, n.d). Castellion for that matter establishes job evaluation factors and employee job description to provide aid to the process of point rating on basis of six sub-factors. The job description has never been a concern of job evaluators in the Peromnes system because the system believes that job description made out of the verbal account of the job content could result in inaccurate job grading.

Regardless of differences over the way they treat an issue of job description, Peromnes to some extent established several job evaluation factors which look different from the Castellion system as shown in Table 5 of Appendix 2. An example of such factors includes Problem Solving, Knowledge, Job Impact, and Comprehension which are not featured in the Castellion system (Mzingaizo, 2013). Another area where they differ is based on the fact that Castellion has a total of 16 job grades where jobs are slotted after summation of points while Peromnes has more consisting of a total of 19 job grades (UCT, 2015). In this case, Peromnes' scale of job grades is a little bit longer than Castellion though both consider grade 1 as comprising the most superior grade while at the far upper-scale consist of the lowest job grades.

5. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER RESEARCH

The Castellion and Peromnes have been popular systems of job evaluation in Southern Africa. They represent a quasi-innovation in compensation particularly in a function of job evaluation. The Castellion and Peromnes are potential similar job evaluation methods because of using the point rating slotting the jobs into their final grades. The job factors in both methods also were meant to evaluate a wide range of jobs from management, professional, technical, and manual labour. However, both methods displayed potential differences whereby Peromnes had a longer list of job evaluation factors and job grades than the Castellion system which only has a total of 6 job evaluation factors and 16 job grades. Even though both have been used in evaluating the jobs in Southern Africa, they remain proprietary brands which require employers to seek permission or licenses from founders when they want to use them in their job evaluation projects. Finally, the paper states that there is wider variety of alternative job evaluation methods. Another research paper can be authored on comparative analysis between each of the respective methods and other alternative job evaluation methods particularly the Paterson Decision Band Method for extending knowledge and skills among practitioners.

REFERENCES

- [1] Armstrong, M., & Baron, A. (2002). *The Job Evaluation Handbook*. https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Job_Evaluation_Handbook.html?id=y5FeP6nME8wC
- [2] Armstrong, M., Cummins, A., Hastings, C., & Wood, W. (2005). *Job evaluation: A guide to achieving equal pay*. Kogan Page.
- [3] Bhavika, H. (2019, April 26). Job Evaluation Methods | HRM. *Economics Discussion*. <https://www.economicsdiscussion.net/human-resource-management/job-evaluation/job-evaluation-methods-hrm/31453>
- [4] Botaris, E. G. (2012). *Towers Watson Job Evaluation Leveling.pdf*. Pdfcoffee.Com. <https://pdfcoffee.com/towers-watsonjob-evaluationlevelingpdf-pdf-free.html>
- [5] El-Hajji, M. A. (2015). *The Hay System of Job Evaluation: A Critical Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.15640/JHRMLS.V3N1A1>
- [6] Grobler, A., Singh, M., & van Niekerk, M. (2013). *Differentiation of remuneration within a salary band: An endeavour to establish fairness, transparency and equitable remuneration using a 270° approach by a single-rater group*. 37(2), 18.
- [7] Joffe, B. (1989). *The impact of job evaluation in a large local authority*. 322.
- [8] Kilgour, J. G. (2008). *Job Evaluation Revisited: The Point Factor Method: The point factor method of job evaluation consists of a large number of discretionary decisions that result in something that appears to be entirely objective and, even, scientific—John G. Kilgour, 2008*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0886368708320563?journalCode=cbrb>
- [9] Korn Ferry Hay Group. (n.d.). *Job Evaluation: Foundations and applications*.
- [10] Lewis, C. T., & Stevens, C. K. (1990). An Analysis of Job Evaluation Committee and Job Holder Gender Effects on Job Evaluation. *Public Personnel Management, 19*(3), 271–278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102609001900304>

International Journal of Novel Research in Interdisciplinary Studies

Vol. 9, Issue 3, pp: (9-18), Month: May – June 2022, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

[11] Malik, K., & Hattasingh, T. (2013). *International technology transfer human resource issues for the technology recipient*.

[12] Mande, N. (2016). *Job Evaluation Systems*. <https://www.slideshare.net/nash32/job-evaluation-systems>

[13] Masanja, N. (2019). *Job Evaluation Workbook: A Practical Guide to Job Evaluation*.

[14] Mugadza, B. (2017). *The Effectiveness of Job Evaluation in Determining Pay Levels of Employees. A Case Study of Strauss Logistics Zimbabwe*. 68.

[15] Mzingaizo, T. (2013, April 27). International Politics, Labour Studies and Sociology: 1. What is job evaluation? Explain the types of Job evaluation; Due Date 18/07/2012 (i) Patterson(ii) Castilian (iii) Hay.<http://tendaimazingaizo-tee.blogspot.com/2013/04/1-what-is-job-evaluation-explain-types.html>

[16] Nagwan, S., Kumar, A., & Chopra, R. (2020). *A Review on Job Evaluation in HR Management*. 6(1), 4.

[17] Paterson. (n.d.). *Job Evaluation: The Paterson System*.

[18] Perold, J. (n.d.). *The Historical and Contemporary Use of Job Evaluation in South Africa*. 21.

[19] Raju, R. (1998). *Peromnes job evaluation method and its application to a library environment*.

[20] Skenes, C., & Kleiner, B. H. (2003). The Hay System of compensation. *Management Research News*, 26(2/3/4), 109–115. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170310783826>

[21] Tapi, C. (2021, August 26). Everything you need to understand about job evaluation. *Business Times*. <https://businesstimes.co.zw/everything-you-need-to-understand-about-job-evaluation/>

[22] UCT. (2015). *Job_evaluation_guide.pdf*.

[23] UFH. (n.d.). *Job Evaluation Policy(1).pdf*.

[24] Vice-Rector. (2011). *Rules and Procedures regarding Job Evaluation*.

APPENDIX – A

Appendix 1: Summary of Themes on Castellion Job Evaluation Method as Obtained from Publications

Table 4: Castellion Job Evaluation Methods as Pioneered in South Africa

Author (s) and Year	Job Evaluation Method	Themes Emerging
Joffe (1989)	The Castellion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The system is a Point Method on three variables considered to be universal on differentiating elements between all jobs -Each variable is broken into two elements giving a total of six sub-factors -The method uses scales to measure these factors which indicates the points to be awarded for defined levels at which the factor can be observed to be operating. -By adding the sub-factor scores and products, the total point value for the job is obtained. -The point range from 4 – 1248 points and is divided into 16 grades from labourer to top executives -The job factors in the system include Effort sub-divided into decision making and pressure of work. Responsibility is sub-divided into controls and checks and consequences of error. Competence is divided into competence with qualification and experience sub-factors.

International Journal of Novel Research in Interdisciplinary Studies

 Vol. 9, Issue 3, pp: (9-18), Month: May – June 2022, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Jordan et al, (1992)	Do	<p>-The Castellion system, which was developed by Cortis for South African Breweries, is a point system according to six factors: decision making, the pressure of work, controls and checks, consequences of error, education, and experience</p> <p>-All six factors are rated and the final job rating is an aggregate of all six evaluations. The dominant factor is decision making</p> <p>-The decision-making scale ranges from simple decisions through pragmatic decisions to tactical and strategic decisions.</p>
Mugadza (2017)	Do	<p>-The Castellion job grading system</p> <p>-Like Peromnes grading system, it is a job evaluation system that emerged from South Africa and derived its name from a combination of Castle and Lion beer brands.</p> <p>-There are six factors used and include: decision making, the pressure of work, controls and checks, consequences of error, education, and experience</p>
Mande (2016)	Do	<p>-Presently used by many organizations industrial, commercial and parastatal in Zimbabwe.</p> <p>-Castellion is a point system that evaluates the job based on six factors: decision making, the pressure of work, controls and checks, consequences of error, education, experience</p> <p>-The Castellion grading system has 16 grades where grade 16 is for simple decisions, 15 for pragmatic decisions, 14 to 9 for tactical decisions, 8 to 5 coordination & interpretive decisions, 4 to 1 for strategic decisions</p>
Perold (n.d)	Do	<p>-The second stage in the use of job evaluation in South Africa began with the development of a job evaluation system locally in the mid-1960's -the Castellion system initially researched by Prof. S. Biesheuvel of the NIPR.</p> <p>-Together with Dr. L. Cortis, Biesheuvel developed and tested the system for the South African Breweries Group</p> <p>-The usual procedure for job evaluation using the Castellion goes as follows: Once a job has been identified a job description gets written up.</p> <p>-The next step is the grading of the job. Ideally, the most effective results are obtained through a grading committee who can discuss the job with each other.</p> <p>The job is systematically checked against each of the six factors so that points score can be allocated for each factor.</p> <p>-The total points scored will give value to the job. This point score will indicate the approximate grade that job will fall into, and not necessarily the final grading.</p>
Carl (2021)	Do	<p>-The Castellion Job Evaluation System was developed by SABMiller as an internal grading system but it has since become widely used across industries and sectors. The system is user friendly and easy to understand</p> <p>-The Castellion grading system is prone to grade distortions in instances where job descriptions are not properly described</p>

Appendix 2: Summary of Themes on Peromnes Job Evaluation Method as Obtained from Publications
Table 5: Peromnes Job Evaluation Method as Pioneered in South Africa

Author(s) & Year	Job Evaluation Method	Themes Emerging
Joffe (1989)	The Peromnes	-The Peromnes grew out of the Castellion and is currently marketed by South African firm of Management Consultants -The system is a point rating method based on 8 universal factors which revolve around the key element of decision-making -Its job evaluation factors are: problem-solving, consequences of error judgment, the pressure of work, knowledge, job impact, comprehension, educational qualification or intelligence level required and subsequent training/experience required
Mugadza (2017)	Do	-The Peromnes grading system is a job evaluation method that is widely used in South Africa. -The Peromnes uses a systematic method of giving scores to a job in terms of factors. These factors include: problem-solving, consequences of judgments, the pressure of work, knowledge, job impact, comprehension, educational qualifications, and further training and experiences with each factor getting scored out of 36. -The score is then converted to a P (Peromnes) grade which comprises 19 grades with 1 being the highest grade and 19 being the lowest grade.
Mande (2016)	Do	-Its job factors used in the evaluation are problem-solving, the consequence of judgments, the pressure of work, knowledge, comprehension, education, qualifications and further training/Experience -The Peromnes has 19 grades. 1 being the highest and 19 being the lowest which are standardized nationally to achieve direct comparability of jobs in different organizations.
Perold (n.d)	Do	-The Peromnes can be described as a modified point rating method based on 8 factors. -Each factor of Peromnes is divided into 9 progressive definitions, which are outlined in a Peromnes job rating scale ranging from 0 – 36 so that when a job is evaluated against each of the factors a point value can be given to the description which satisfactorily describes the nature of the job on that particular factor -The point scored on each factor are totaled to give the number of “rated points” and the job now can be graded according to the system -The Peromnes necessitates high-level skills and understanding to implement. -The Peromnes system has now 19 (or perhaps more accurately 21 grades) since 1982 revisions of the system.
Raju (1998)	Do	-Peromnes factors are: problem-solving, the consequence of error judgment, the pressure of work, knowledge, job impact, comprehension, educational qualifications, or intelligence level required -One of the strong points is that job evaluation is conducted by Committees.

International Journal of Novel Research in Interdisciplinary Studies

 Vol. 9, Issue 3, pp: (9-18), Month: May – June 2022, Available at: www.noveltyjournals.com

Vice Rector (2011)	Do	<p>-The Peromnes is a registered trademark belonging to Deloitte (Pty) Ltd and only licensed users may employ the product and related work systems</p> <p>-Each factor is scored using a standardized rating scale of 35 points. The sum of the scores for each of the factors gives a total score which is converted into a Peromnes grade by using the conversion table. There are 19 grades in the Peromnes system, 1 being the highest grade and 19 being the lowest grade.</p>
University of Forte Hare (n.d)	Do	<p>-Peromnes is a registered trademark belonging to Deloitte Human Capital Corporation (Pty)Ltd</p> <p>-Licensed users may make use of the product and related work systems.</p> <p>-Factors are: problem-solving, the consequence of error judgment, the pressure of work, knowledge, job impact (internally and externally), and comprehension</p>