

Job Evaluation and Workers' Control

Ray Collins

Institute for Workers' Control

1969

Job Evaluation and Workers' Control

INTRODUCTION

Job evaluation is a technique for reforming pay structure, especially the pay structure of a firm or plant. It goes with productivity deals, work-study-based incentive schemes and measured day work as part of a strategy to align payment systems with modern technology, and to check 'earnings drift' by bringing the various components of the pay packet under strict management control.

In the world-wide crisis in wage-payment methods most attention has hitherto been paid to overtime payments and payment-by-results schemes. Many productivity deals have had the removal of overtime - or 'excessive' overtime, at least - as one of their objectives, and there has been a stream of critical comment on the failure to reduce the actual as distinct from the standard working week. Likewise, payment-by-results schemes have been criticised on all sides and both the Donovan Commission and the Prices and Incomes Board have stressed the need for properly controlled systems based on work measurement. The increasing desire of managements to replace payment-by-results schemes by measured day work is perhaps the most publicised manifestation of the crisis referred to.

Attention is now shifting somewhat towards the basic structure of the payment system upon which payment-by-results schemes and other elements of the super-structure are built. In the Report of the Donovan Commission there are frequent references to the need for 'regulated factory pay structures' and the point is made that competing wage claims or 'leap-frogging' can occur even where time-work is the rule. The Report notes with evident regret that job evaluation has been applied only to a small minority of manual workers, though fairly common among white-collar workers.

In studying payment-by-results systems the Prices and Incomes Board also discovered fragmented bargaining and resulting pay 'anomalies' contributing to earnings increases beyond the rate of productivity growth in the country. The subsequent study by the P. I. B. of job evaluation was intended to consider to what extent the technique could contribute to the solution of these problems.

The criteria of the Incomes Policy as laid down in Command Paper 3590 ('Productivity, Prices and Incomes Policy in 1968 and 1969') apparently permit increases above the 'norm' for major overhauls in pay structure, which may open the way for job evaluation provided it can be shown to contribute to increased productivity and economic efficiency. Already job evaluation is tending to be introduced along with or as part of a productivity deal, in some cases the productivity increases apparently being intended to cover increases in the total pay-bill resulting from job evaluation.

The Prices Incomes Board has now issued three general reports on payment, as distinct from Reports on particular pay changes, and these reports together establish the guide lines and criteria which must be followed to anchor management-controlled pay systems to the national incomes policy. (See P. I. B. Report 36 'Productivity Agreements' Command 3311; Report 65, 'Payment by Results' Command 3627; and Report 83, 'Job Evaluation' Command 3772).

To assist managements a small stream of guides and hand-books has appeared on productivity deals, measured day work and other schemes and, now, on job evaluation.

Not surprisingly, with managements increasingly coming forward with proposals for job evaluation, there is an increasing demand from the workers' side for schools and courses on job evaluation.

The purpose of this booklet is, to extend that of Tony Topham's on 'Productivity Bargaining and Workers' Control' in offering guide lines and a counter strategy, with particular reference to job evaluation.

THE GROWTH OF JOB EVALUATION.

Job evaluation is by no means a recent invention. It originated in the U.S.A. and is usually said to have grown out of civil service classification, job analysis for time study and job description for personnel selection.

The International Labour Office definition of job evaluation reads as follows:

"... an attempt to determine and compare the demands which the normal performance of particular jobs makes on normal workers without taking into account the individual abilities or performance of the workers concerned."

The language is clearly that of 'scientific management' and job evaluation fits into the main stream of that movement. Systematic work study is used to develop the typically complex division of labour in modern bureaucratic organisations. Jobs are divided and sub-divided; methods and procedures are determined by work analysis and description; 'normal performance' is established by time-study or later refinements of work measurement; piece work and other bonus schemes are then based upon the norms established. The role of job evaluation in this process is to establish the 'rational' basic structure of job rates by systematic observation and analysis.

Trade unionism helped to simulate the growth of job evaluation in the U.S.A. Sometimes the technique was used, as with other procedures of 'scientific management', to keep out the unions and collective bargaining; at other times it was used to channel union pressure and bargaining tactics into 'rational' channels.

U.S. Government wage regulation during World War II had an important part in the spread of job evaluation; wage increases could often only be obtained through the introduction of job evaluation, and in cases brought to arbitration over wage anomalies the War Labour Board in effect frequently forced the introduction of job evaluation.

According to the British National Prices and Incomes Board about two thirds of all the employed labour force of the U.S.A. now work under job evaluation schemes, mostly on a plant or company basis but in some cases in industry-wide schemes.

By comparison the N.B.P. & I. estimated that about 25% of employees in Britain are working under job evaluation. The Board carried out a survey of some 6½ million workers and found 11% of craft workers; 27% of non-craft manual workers; 30% of 'staff' workers and 30% of 'managerial workers' to be covered by job evaluation.

In industrial terms, coal mining and tobacco manufacturing lead the way with 70% of employees covered, followed by oil and chemicals (50% covered), air transport (40% covered). At the bottom end of the scale are industries like shipbuilding and marine engineering; leather and fur; printing and publishing where craftsmen are numerous and there are deeply rooted traditional job relationships.

Large organisations with over 5,000 employees have an average coverage of 40% of employees; organisations with under 500 have an average coverage of 6% of all employees.

In Britain the same developments as in the U.S.A. have provided the stimulus to the growth of job evaluation, though evidently with some time-lag.

Technological change must be added to the causative influences; in its time it has contributed to the creation of new jobs and to the fragmentation of old ones; in turn the trend towards automation throws up new problems of defining job content. Job evaluation has seemed to offer a method of establishing pay structures in this situation. Furthermore, the trend towards automated types of production has had the effect of rendering payment-by-results schemes inappropriate since the worker no longer has much influence over output. Hence the growing attention to basic rate structures, promotion ladders and the like.

We have already noted how Government intervention affected the growth of job evaluation either through direct pressure by the Government for the 'rationalisation' of pay structures or as an escape from incomes policies; we may expect a similar effect in U.K.

THE TECHNIQUE OF JOB EVALUATION.

There are various types of job evaluation 'system' or 'plan' of which four are usually considered the main ones.

An account of the main types can be found in the T. U. C. publication 'Job Evaluation and Merit Rating'. The clerical and Administrative Workers Union has published its own guide for members entitled 'Guide to Grading of Clerical and Administrative Work'. For a detailed description of job evaluation readers should consult the I. L. O. publication 'Job Evaluation'.

All job evaluation 'plans' are concerned with the comparison of jobs not persons. They involve a) deciding on the criteria of comparison - what features of jobs should be the basis of comparison; b) drawing up some kind of description of the jobs to be compared - duties, tasks etc., comprising each job; c) the actual comparison of the jobs - the 'assessment' or 'rating'; d) the establishment of a rank order or hierarchy of jobs; e) the attachment of a pay scale to the rank order of jobs.

The four main types of job evaluation are usually classified as follows:

Non Analytical: a) Ranking

b) Classification.

- Analytical: a) Points rating
 b) Factor Comparison.

The P.I.B. Report gave statistics of the extend of the usage of these methods; in order of importance:

Points rating	47%	of all schemes).	but about the same
Grading	28%	")	number of employ-
		")	ees .
Ranking	20%	"	
Factor Comparison	5%	"	

The difference between 'non analytical' and 'analytical' methods is that the former compare jobs as a whole whilst the latter compare jobs in terms of 'elements' or 'factors'

Some comments about trends and practice may be drawn from the P.I.B. report and other sources as follows:

- i. There has been a trend towards 'analytical' methods, especially points rating, over the past 20 years.
- ii. It is rare, but not unknown, to find 'blue collar' and 'white collar' workers covered by the same scheme in a particular organisation.
- iii. 'Ranking' and 'classification' methods are more likely to be found in small firms, or in large firms where the division of labour is not very complex.
- iv. Clerical work is usually, but not always, graded by ranking or classification methods, especially classification.
- v. On the management side there seems to be no more or less satisfaction with one method than another. Managements using job evaluation appear on the whole to be satisfied with the results regardless of the particular system in use, though where satisfaction is less, companies are more likely to have been using the classification or factor comparison methods.

NON ANALYTICAL JOB EVALUATION.

'Ranking' is simply a matter of looking at a lot of jobs and putting them in order of difficulty or value to the firm, rather like shuffling cards. Jobs with about the same degree of

difficulty are then grouped together in a grade and a wage or salary level is fixed for each grade. Experts regard this as a simple, easily understood and operated method and therefore attractive to small firms lacking much specialised expertise. On the other hand it is considered rather superficial and lending itself to confusion between the present occupant of a job and the actual demands of the job.

'Classification' also treats each job as a whole but differs from ranking in that the system of grades and pay levels is fixed first. The process then consists of 'slotting' all jobs into the grades, using 'bench mark' jobs, for which job descriptions have been written, as guides to allocation.

One of the best known classification (or grading) schemes is that of the Institute of Office Management which classifies all office work into 6 grades ranging from the simplest routine tasks requiring no previous experience, up to jobs requiring the exercise of an extensive application of a professional technique.

Classification is usually considered rather more demanding than ranking in its administration, but the problems arising from bias due to lack of clarity about the basis of comparison, differing familiarity of raters with the various jobs etc. remain.

ANALYTICAL JOB EVALUATION.

'Points rating' and 'factor comparison' are alike in resting on the analysis of various elements or 'factors', such as 'skill', 'training', 'effort', 'responsibility', 'working conditions', which make up the job as a whole. In points rating a number of points are assigned to each factor - and sub-divisions of the factors. Each job is analysed in terms of the factors and sub-factors and the assessment process consists in awarding a 'score' of points for each factor. Thus, for example, a job may demand a great deal of training for its normal performance and it will therefore score high under that heading, whilst jobs requiring less training will score less. Dangerous, unpleasant working conditions will score higher points than safe, pleasant conditions.

Points for each factor are 'weighted'; that is to say the total number of points which can be awarded will not be the same for each factor. The different 'weightings' reflect the importance attached to the different features of all jobs under review. The British Institute of Management reported the range of weights in a number of schemes covering manual workers to be as follows:-

Skill required	45 - 60%	of total points.
Responsibility	12 - 20%	"
Effort required (i. e.)		
Mental & physical	15 - 20%	"
Working conditions	10 - 15%	"

With points rating all that is further needed in some formula to convert points scores into money. Jobs falling within a certain range of points may be grouped together in a grade, and a wage or salary, or range, attached to the grade. A separate rate could be attached to each individual total score of points but in practice grouping into grades is preferred.

Factor comparison, the least used of all job evaluation methods, differs from points rating in that the jobs are compared directly in terms of money. This is done by taking certain 'key jobs' and deciding what proportion of the existing rate of pay is paid for each of the factors. e.g. a key job with a rate of 400s per week might be allocated 180s for 'skill'; 100s for 'mental requirements'; 40s for 'physical requirements'; 60s for 'responsibility'; 20s for 'working conditions'. The other jobs are awarded sums of money for each factor by comparison with the key jobs.

The factor comparison method is usually considered complicated and difficult to explain to people.

It is pretty obvious that the 'analytical' methods require more expertise than the 'non analytical' methods. Full-time job analysts are often employed to draw up job descriptions and to make the analysis in terms of the factors in use. This preparatory information is then used by evaluating panels to make the final assessments. The analytical methods are growing in importance but are likely to be found in larger, or capital-intensive, or science-based industries in which the level of sophistication in management is highest. Smaller firms and those with less specialist expertise may find the simpler non-analytical methods give 'satisfactory' results at less cost.

TIME-SPAN ANALYSIS.

This is a method of evaluation which falls outside the conventional four-fold classification. It arose out of a long series of studies made by Elliott Jacques at the Glacier Metal Company in London. Jacques rejects the conventional job evaluation as 'subjective' and pseudo-scientific. Instead of a variety of factors Jacques uses only one, and that is the 'level

of responsibility ' in the job. According to Jacques all jobs have a 'prescribed content' and a 'discretionary content'. The prescribed content consists of rules, limitations, procedures etc. which the occupant of the job must perforce stick to. On the other hand the discretionary content requires the occupant of the job to exercise his own judgement. This exercise of judgement is what Jacques calls 'responsibility'. He claims that it can be measured in terms of the 'time-span of discretion', which crudely speaking is the maximum length of time the occupant of a job exercises his discretion before the outcome of so doing is subject to scrutiny by his boss.

Jacques method also differs from the other methods in another important respect, and that it that is applicable to all jobs from chief executive to floor-sweeper.

OTHER 'ACROSS THE BOARD' METHODS.

There are some other schemes of job evaluation in use which claim to be applicable to all grades of work. One of these, the 'decision-band' method, is similar to time-span analysis in that it is the type of decisions required by different jobs which is the basis for comparison. These decisions range from 'policy making' decisions at the top of the management hierarchy to decisions made with the most limited discretion.

Another system is the Doulton-Hay system devised on the basis of the experience at the B.B.C. and later elsewhere. The scheme was intended to cover a wide range of technical, administrative, supervisory and managerial jobs. The evaluation is based on three common steps in the broad group of jobs in question i.e selecting the best solution to a problem; taking the decision, involving judgement; implementing the decision. The mental activities associated with the basic steps are classed in six factors, such as application of knowledge and experience, reasoning powers, commitment and allocation of the resources of the organisation, dealing with people etc.

CHOICE OF A JOB EVALUATION PLAN.

Many organisations use consultants to advise them on the introduction of job evaluation. Job evaluation is increasingly joined with work study and incentives schemes as part of the package offered by consultants. Even where an organisation has its own experts in methods of payment recourse will often be had to a consultant usually on the grounds that it increases

confidence in the impartiality of the scheme.

Firms may also draw on the advice of the British Institute of Management, contained in its publication 'Job Evaluation - a Practical guide', or similar guides published by other organisations. Or there may be a period of 'shopping around', to see how other firms have fared with various types of scheme before devising one considered to be suitable and acceptable in the particular firm. The P.I.B. detected a tendency for firms to want to 'be different' and it was concerned that new anomalies and discontents (and by implication scope for bargaining by comparisons) might arise if firms in the same industry with similarly composed labour forces used different systems. The Board therefore called for industry-wide schemes available optionally to organisations wishing to use them.

The P.I.B. also recorded its view that the points-rating type of job evaluation was particularly suitable from the point of view of 'control', because of its separation of evaluation from decisions on pay. (Needless to say it is management control which the Board has in mind).

JOB EVALUATION AND WORKERS' CONTROL.

There can be no doubt that job evaluation is currently seen by Government and employers in the context of controlling wages costs and this is also seen to involve reducing the power of the shop steward. This brings us right into the centre of the control issue and the bearing of a particular system of payment not only on the financial position of the worker and his job security, but also on the system of bargaining, and the power balance at the place of work and in society.

a) KNOWLEDGE AND POWER.

What does the worker need to know in order to be powerful against or within job evaluation? The first thing is to note that few people now claim that job evaluation is scientific. As with all aspects of 'scientific management' the earlier exaggerated claims have now been abandoned and words like 'systematic', or 'logical approach' are used. There is still, it may be noted, an implication that job evaluation makes workers/unions behave in a more rational way. The following quotation from a recent guide for personnel managers makes this clear: "... to substitute a type of rationality for the more tradition-based and emotion-loaded approach favoured by the unions". Managements tend to argue that job evaluation can be useful in channeling feelings into an 'objective' discussion in times of strife.

Workers must reject outright the arrogant assumption that workers are irrational or non-rational whilst managers are rational. It is now admitted that job evaluation involves judgement and is therefore subjective, though this may be concealed by a spurious mathematical appearance especially in the so-called analytical methods. There is absolutely no need for modesty on the part of workers in dealing with job evaluation. Many managers do not understand it themselves anyway, and call in consultants to show them the way. Workers must not allow themselves to be impressed by jargon or even by the less exalted claims for 'objectivity'. In the field of relative pay for jobs there is no 'objective' ideal truth. Without job evaluation one still ends up with a set of pay differentials in the firm and in the economy and no one can 'prove' that those produced by job evaluation are any more 'valid' than others arrived at by other methods of pay determination.

'Acceptability' is quite a different kettle of fish and there is quite a bit of worrying in the P.I.B. report about whether what is acceptable to workers and management would in fact be very logical and likely to reduce 'earnings drift'.

But whilst workers must not be overawed by management jargon they should not on the other hand assume that there is nothing to be learned about job evaluation. The 'amateur' philosophy is a particular danger for the workers' control movement precisely because there is a surface conflict between 'expertise' and 'democracy'. The important questions are the degree of understanding of job evaluation required by the worker and his representatives, and this may be different for different people. Some, perhaps full-time officers, may need no more than an appreciation of the technique and its bearing on bargaining, job security and pay. Others may need a detailed knowledge. Back-room researchers should be equally as expert as managers and consultants.

Workers should try to use their own sources of advice and learning and not rely upon those of management. Consultants usually try to involve representatives of workers and even larger groups of workers in understanding what they are up to; this sounds a cheap way of gaining knowledge but it should be resisted.

In an ideal world the Unions would have sufficient research and consultancy services of their own to counsel particular groups of workplace bargainers, but the actual world of today is far removed from this state of affairs. And there is a more difficult point, which is that full-time officials and even shop stewards in studying a particular technique may swallow the management values with it, so that the edges of militancy are smoothed off. Furthermore in seeking advice one has to ask

what the advisers are looking for in vetting a job evaluation scheme. Unfortunately full-time union researchers are usually not looking for the effects of a scheme on the subtleties of control at the place of work.

It is very important for shop stewards and other bargainers to share their experiences of job evaluation with one another. To assist in this the Institute for Workers' Control has set up an Advisory Bureau to assist stewards and others faced with productivity deals and other manifestations of management activity; obviously job evaluation schemes would come within the purview of the Bureau.

b) JOB EVALUATION AND JOB SECURITY.

It is now quite common for job evaluation to come mixed up with a wider productivity deal and it may be difficult to isolate the particular effect of job evaluation on jobs. However it is obvious that the close study and job analysis required for analytical job evaluation methods provide management with a useful 'by-product' of knowledge about the division of labour and manning.

Surpluses of labour may well be revealed by job studies so the usual redundancy guarantees would be appropriate.

c) JOB EVALUATION AND THE DIVISION OF LABOUR.

Apart from such changes as are commonly envisaged in productivity deals, such as abolition of 'mates', craft interchangeability, mobility-in-plant etc., job evaluation proceeds on the assumption that the structure of jobs as it is, is right. Whatever jobs have been thrown up by technology, industrial engineering and administrative practice are to be taken as given, and job evaluation simply seeks to estimate their relative 'value' to the organisation. It is noteworthy that many managers argue that job evaluation is not appropriate above certain 'levels' of work because there the job is not clearly separable from the individual, which is another way of saying that some people are lucky enough not to be stuck into rigid boxes. Workers should use job evaluation as an opportunity to challenge the whole division of labour which is in many cases inhuman. One of the attractions of the time-span and 'decision band' approaches to job evaluation is that they draw attention to the 'humanness' of jobs by making it starkly obvious that there are some jobs with little or no freedom in them.

It is significant that in the 'decision band' system the lowest order of jobs are those involving only what are referred to as 'vegetative decisions'!

Control over the immediate environment is a crucial aspect of workers' control and this includes the maximisation of choice and discretion in the actual bundles of tasks making up any job.

The workers should ask; why is our job so limited in 'time-span'? Why is the boss given so much discretion? How can we equalise 'time-span', ?? etc.

d) JOB EVALUATION AND WAGES.

The P. I. B Report says that introducing job evaluation seems to raise costs by between 2% and 12%, though the returns on which these figures are based are not very adequate since many firms could not (or would not) provide cost data. Cost increases may in part be due to the administrative costs of running the job evaluation scheme; employment of job analysts and the like. What the workers need to know is whether job evaluation shifts the total wage bill upwards in the short run and in the long run.

The usual practice is to compare the job-evaluated rates for jobs with those actually being paid, with a view to bringing the two sets together eventually. Workers should refuse to accept any reduction in pay for an individual and management will usually concede or offer 'personal allowances' which means that when the job falls vacant the new incumbent will be paid the lower, evaluated rate. The P. I. B. accepts 'personal allowances' but insists that management must have an advance plan to reduce these gradually over a stated period. The long run result will of course be that the total pay bill will be lower than it otherwise would have been. However, the workers may be able to offset this by other means in the long run whilst obtaining the short run increases.

There are many aspects of the mechanics of job evaluation which have a bearing on the financial gains for workers. As an example, management often insists that no existing job shall receive the maximum total number of points available in the scheme, on the ground that new jobs may come into existence making demands higher than any existing job. If all the points were awarded to any existing job there would be no room in the scheme to pay a higher rate to the new job. The workers should resist this argument and insist on using the whole range of points. 'Sufficient unto the day, is the evil thereof'. If one of the hypothetical jobs appears on the scene, this would be the time for the workers to insist on the new job, (if it is agreed),

to score higher than the maximum point of the range, thus receiving a higher rate. If workers accept job evaluation or have it imposed upon them there is much they need to know about the mechanics of various schemes so that they may maximise financial gains.

The implication of job evaluation seems to be that job content is the only relevant factor in relative pay. This might have revolutionary implications if pressed to its logical conclusion since it would rule the labour market right out of the field of relative wages! However, in practice managements want to safeguard their option of paying over the job-evaluated rate, if they cannot recruit for a particular job at the evaluated rate. This causes problems, since the logic of job evaluation that the only pay changes should be those resulting from changes in job content. There are various management 'solutions' to these problems. One is to create special 'job allowances' over and above the evaluated rate, these allowances again being regarded as temporary. The strategy for the workers would of course be to demand that all other rates be brought into line according to the logic of job evaluation. At other times the workers and unions should not scruple to put forward claims for rate changes on grounds other than those of job evaluation, including the rate paid elsewhere for similar jobs.

This will possibly be castigated as 'irresponsible' but workers must not necessarily accept management's - or the Government's - definition of 'responsibility'. In any case workers will only be seeking the best of both worlds in the way which managements do when it suits their purposes.

Apart from using market comparisons, workers should accept the advice of the T.U.C. and resist attempts to determine in terms only of job content, and/or according to the requirements of a particular firm. Differences in promotion prospects, degree of security etc. etc. are just as valid as job content in comparisons of relative pay.

The P.I.B. urges managements not to be too quick to assume that they must alter any rate which appears out of line with what other local firms are paying for the same job. The Board argues that considerable disparities in pay for the same job in the same locality persists over time; if recruiting eventually does turn out to be difficult, employers are urged to look to the internal labour market, i.e. to promotion from within, to fill vacancies. Obviously the higher the general level of pay in a firm the less likely it is to have its job evaluated structure upset by labour market changes.

The introduction of job evaluation, like productivity deals, appears to offer an opportunity for unions and workers to obtain

increases over and above the current 'norm' or 'ceiling' of the incomes policy. The P.I.B. would prefer the introduction of job evaluation to be accompanied by a productivity deal which would offset the expected overall increase in the pay bill. However it does state that overhauls of pay structure as such may justify above - 'norm' increases even if they raise labour unit costs in the short run, since the overhaul may be expected to bring gains in productivity in the future e.g. better job hierarchies which reward skill and responsibility properly; a better basis for future control of wage-drift and inflation through 'leapfrogging claims'. To get job evaluation through in these circumstances will, we are told, require the passing of a particularly rigorous examination by the D.E.P.

e) JOB EVALUATION AND BARGAINING.

Unions resisted job evaluation so long as, along with other aspects of 'scientific management' it seemed to threaten the existence of collective bargaining. With the change to more modest claims it is accepted by some unions, as a basis for bargaining, and many modern exponents of job evaluation regard this as a positive advantage, since it provides the flexibility and acceptability which will allow a more 'logical' approach to wages - as they see it - to continue without provoking resistance. However, though bargaining is not ruled out it is definitely restricted where job evaluation operates, as intended by its practitioners. This is quite clear from numerous statements made by management representatives.

Bargaining, it is said, cannot be allowed over the actual rating of jobs but only, over the allocation of pay to the rank order arrived at. Stewards and other workplace bargainers thus operate in a strait jacket. And the limitations are even greater if claims on grounds other than a change in job content are also ruled out.

The intention is to reduce the level of day-to-day bargaining and with it the scope for workplace bargainers to obtain improvements for their members; this in turn is expected to weaken the power base of the bargainers on the workers' side. In productivity deals the removal of overtime, where its allocation was virtually in the hands of the shop stewards, had a similar aim. (The frequent failure of this strategy could be advanced as a reason for not fearing the effects of job evaluation, but obviously a lot depends on the level of consciousness of the bargainers and the workers).

In a sense job evaluation is seen as promising to do for the 'incomes policy' of the firm what productivity deals were

intended to do for the incomes policy of the nation, namely to cut out sectional bargaining. The broader intention was to lock the unions up in decentralised plant or company-wide bargaining with comparisons with other firms, localities, cost of living changes etc. ruled out. The response of unions such as D A T A has been to engage in 'pattern bargaining' or 'key bargaining' as the U S. unions traditionally do under their system of decentralised bargaining and as British unions once did.

The same line of reasoning may be applied to the 'internal labour market of the firm'. If job evaluation seeks to reduce the criteria of bargaining and cut out sectional 'leapfrogging' why should the unions and workers not resist it in the interests of obtaining more for all members by a series of 'leapfrogging' advances? One counter-argument from the workers' side is that this involves ill-feeling and lack of solidarity between different unions or groups of workers within the same union, but this need not necessarily happen provided the attack is always on the management.

Apart from restricting bargaining, job evaluation may lead to emasculation by involvement. Stewards may become wrapped up in continuing programme of joint evaluating exercises with management representatives. This may be seen as an expression of mutuality but there is a difference between mutuality in the sense of bargaining over rates, norms etc and the 'problem solving' approach of continuous involvement within a framework which, as mentioned, in any case inhibits bargaining.

Of course it is difficult to be certain in every possible case, what the result of such involvement would be. Possibly it could increase militancy, e.g. where company-imposed salary grades are now made into job-evaluated gradings. Or again militancy could find different expressions under job evaluation. The moral here might be that where unions are strong, active and militant, they can exploit the possibilities for monetary gain without losing any controls; or they might sacrifice some controls to gain other more important ones ('one step backwards, two steps forward'). Job evaluation might provide the platform for counter-claims and an attacking stance, as suggested by Tony Topham in relation to productivity deals. The demand to 'open the books' could be applied to wage bill and labour cost information. Workers might get on the side of the angels by demanding that management reveal full costing information to the Prices and Incomes Board, and at the same time to the workers!

As job evaluation probes into jobs and pay of workers the counter claim could be that similar information is made

available to workers about all salaries and fringe benefits of all 'workers' in the enterprise from the chief executive down. Workers should not accept secrecy for some but not for all. Whilst it may not be politic to demand that the same scheme of job evaluation, if any, be applied to all jobs, it is unlikely that the total payments to higher management, compared to those of the lowest paid workers, could be justified by any job evaluation scheme.

Apart from the consciousness of the particular workers, there is also the attitude and approach of management. 'Progressive' managements increasingly seek to involve their workers representatives in continuous bargaining but many, perhaps the majority, prefer to keep them at arms length. The former approach is in many ways more difficult to deal with than the latter.

Some managements may wish to restrict union representatives to particular stages of job evaluation e.g. to bargaining about pay, or restrict certain types of information, e.g. job descriptions.

Not all managements favour job evaluation anyway, since it threatens to place restrictions on their freedom of action and in non-union situations job evaluation may in a sense 'invite' the intrusion of unions.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.

A number of strategies are possible in the field of job evaluation:

- a) reject job evaluation outright. It may not be possible to stop management evaluating jobs and using the evaluations as a basis for negotiating rate changes. Yet insofar as the analytical methods require job studies it might be possible for strongly organised groups to prevent management carrying out job evaluation unilaterally, but this option is only open to craft workers and similarly strongly entrenched groups.
- b) 'Playing it cool'; i.e. noting managements desire to use job evaluation but neither trying to block this nor getting involved in it. As in the steel industry up to the present time, this allows the workers to use job evaluation arguments when it suits them or other arguments if these promise better results, without being accused of 'irresponsibility' and the like.
- c) Collaboration in all or part of the process; this may be a matter of accepting the invitation to join in and/or it may involve

demanding joint decision-making in situations when management wants to reserve certain positions.

- d) Demanding job evaluation as an attacking strategy .

The choice of strategy depends on the various factors already mentioned, such as the level of consciousness of the workers, the possibility of making gains without net loss of control, or with a net gain in workplace controls, the attitude, strategy skills etc. of the particular management, the current phase of incomes policy, and so forth. Some general points may be made for interpretation in particular cases:

- a) Workers should inform themselves about job evaluation from their own sources - workers educational classes; their unions' research departments; the Institute of Workers' Control Advisory Bureau.

Courses, 'briefings' etc. run by consultants should be avoided.

- b) Financial gains should be maximised through skilled use of knowledge of job evaluation techniques or, if the circumstances are suitable, by avoiding job evaluation and engaging in conventional bargaining with associated tactics.

- c) Job content should not be accepted as the sole criteria for rate determination; workers should refuse to pay for job evaluation with productivity deals but should insist on a separate deal.

- d) Safeguards against redundancy should be obtained.

- e) The existing division of labour should be challenged if job evaluation is suggested.

- f) If job evaluation is suggested, counter-claims should be made demanding the 'opening of the books' and an end to all secrecy about payments of all kinds to all grades of worker and management.

- g) The pay structure of the organisation should be included in the type of 'control bargain' suggested by Tony Topham*.

Workers might work out their preferred pay structure by job evaluation methods.

* See Productivity Bargaining and workers' control I.W.C. pamphlet No. 2.