Utilization of Non-Analytical Methods in Job Evaluation Projects: A Case of Work Organizations from Diverse Sectoral Specialization

[1]Stephen James; [2]Geofrey Lusanjala &[3]Tafuteni Chusi
Institute of Rural Development Planning, P.O. BOX 138, Dodoma

Abstract: Job evaluation projects take place in organizations to evaluate the jobs for an ultimate fair decision on pay. There is scanty empirical evidence on the utilization of non-analytical techniques in job evaluation projects. The objective of this paper was to determine the typical non-analytical methods mostly utilized in work organizations from diverse sectoral specialization. Qualitative methodology was adopted by reviewing organizations' information on job evaluation methods utilized to evaluate jobs. It was found that the majority of organizations were using Job Classification/Grading from among the non-analytical methods of job evaluation. There were two potential factors which impelled the use of this method among Job Evaluation Committees. The first was its capability to evaluate multiple jobs in modern organizations while the second was the alignment between Job Classification/Grading and pay structure which attaches the job grades to pay ranges after completion of job evaluation assignment. Based on the findings, the paper provided recommendation on using Job Classification/Grading successively.
Keywords: Job Ranking, Classification, Grading, Job Matching

1.0. Introduction

Job evaluation projects in this paper include formal sessions in which the management of the organization appoints members to sit as a Committee to assess the relative worth of jobs based on a set of job factors (Olugbemi, n.d.). Job evaluation projects inside a company would create transparency regarding the value of jobs, support management in making informed decisions on rewards, and realize internal pay equity(Mercer LLC, 2015). However, job evaluation also comprises limitations such as taking much time to impart the necessary skills among technical personnel; and job evaluation by itself may be incapable of moving by the pace of job factors change due to technological and information change in organizations (Chourasia *et al.,* 2018).

Regardless of its limitations, Committee members are expected to engage in numerous job evaluation processes when they undertake job evaluation project (ICN, 2010). ERI (2021) highlights some of these job evaluation processes which include defining the jobs by conducting job analysis, selection of job evaluation methods, decision-making on factors that are most relevant for an organization, assess the jobs using the selected factors, formulate the job hierarchy and use that hierarchy to develop a pay program. The context of this paper is not to articulate in detail about each of these processes of job evaluation but rather it is interested in determining non-analytical job evaluation methods that are normally utilized by organizations in job evaluation projects.

Thus, there have been several non-analytical methods that should be used during job evaluation projects apart from the analytical methods (IGNOU, 2018). Non-analytical methods compare the whole jobs against others based on factors like Skills, Responsibility, and Judgment without depth analysis of their constituent elements since their inception in the United States of America in the 1920s (Okuma, 2003). Non-analytical methods that may be chosen during job evaluation projects as argued by Bender & Pigeyre (2014) include the Job Ranking methods, Job Matching, and Job Classification/ Grading whose operationalization steps have been attached to this paper on the list of Appendices. This paper intends to determine typical non-analytical methods mostly utilized during job evaluation projects and make consideration of the factors which impel the use of such methods among the Job Evaluation Committees.

2.0. Methodology

This paper adopted a qualitative methodology by searching literature that had information on non-analytical job evaluation methods preferred by organizations. A total of 14 pieces of literature were obtained from Google and Google scholar internet database. The pieces of literature were online published documents seeking consultancy services from consultants capable to facilitate job evaluation projects. Terms of reference included in the documents published online were thoroughly reviewed to determine the kind of non-analytical job evaluation method required to be used by individual consultants in facilitating job evaluation projects.

Findings were categorized in Table 1 which summarized organizations' information and their sectoral specialization as displayed in the list of Appendices. Table 1 also presented a summary of information on the job evaluation methods preferred by organizations and including terms of reference advertised for consultancy services procurement on job evaluation as displayed on the Appendices.

3.0. Findings and Discussion

3.1. Organizations' Sectors

Many of the organizations were specializing in the public sector as displayed in Table 1 on the list of appendices. It was further found that such organizations were established in several functional areas like Higher Education Services, Inter-governmental Cooperation, Public Personnel Remuneration Services, Information and Communication Technology, Water Resources Conservation as further shown in Table 1 on the Appendices. A few of the organizations were specializing in Non-Governmental Organization sector in issues related to Climate Change, Charity Services while others specialized in Agri-business activities and power supply. These findings suggested that job evaluation was practiced by different sorts of organizations which operated in diverse social and economic sectors (El Balshy & Ismael, 2021). They conducted job evaluation because management of such organization recognized its significance in helping managers to reach at fair decision on pay rates based on the job value.

3.2. Non-Analytical Job Evaluation Methods Utilized

Apart from having organizations which conducted job evaluation in different sorts of sectors, it was found that a non-analytical job evaluation method being utilized by many work organizations during the implementation of job evaluation project was the Job Classification/Grading method. These findings were in tandem with Teran (2010) who also had found that the Job Classification/Grading method was the most applicable out of all other non-analytical job evaluation methods in modern huge organizations. Other non-analytical methods like the Job Ranking and the Job Matching were less or not used by respective work organizations.

The potential factors which were influencing work organizations' choice of Job Classification /Grading constituted the capacity of the method in evaluating multiple jobs in modern organizations unlike the other non-analytical methods (Chand, 2014). Alignment between Job Classification/Grading system and pay structure which attaches the job grades to pay ranges after completion of job evaluation assignment was another factor which attracted its use (Grade & Pay Structures, n.d.). The pay structure just extended pay ranges from the job grades already established by the method. Job Classification/Grading for that matter was an efficient method of job evaluation compared to Job Ranking and Job Matching methods not inclined to the preparation of grades for attachment to the pay structure.

4.0. Conclusion and Recommendation

Non-analytical methods of job evaluation are among the dominant job evaluation methods in compensation management processes. Usually non-analytical job evaluation methods help an organization in reaching an objective decision about the value of each job internally. They also maximize fairness in pay because pay decisions for jobs normally depend on the worth of jobs determined during job evaluation rather than looking at gender and race of the job holder. The paper found that the non-analytical method that was mostly utilized in job evaluation projects among many work organizations was Job Classification/Grading. Job Classification/Grading was the most used because it had ability to evaluate multiple jobs in modern organizations. The job grades formulated by Job Classification increased alignment between job evaluation and the pay structure which attaches grades to pay ranges. Job Evaluation Committees could proceed using this method because it was efficient in modern work organizations while available without incurring financial expense. The paper recommends training for Job Evaluation Committee members to increase skills for its appropriate use.

References

[1]. Africa Enterprise Challenge. (2019). *Consultancy to undertake job evaluation grading and salary scale review.pdf*.

[2]. Andendorff, S. M. (2006). *(41) (PDF) Job evaluation: Understanding the grading and remuneration strategies of architectural firms in Cape Town | Shaun M Adendorff—Academia.edu*. https://www.academia.edu/2251976/Job_evaluation_understanding_the_grading_and_remuneration_ strategies_of_architectural_firms_in_Cape_Town

[3]. AU. (2016). *Consultancy Services Job Evaluation and Development of Job Descriptions for African Union.*

[4]. Bender, A.-F., & Pigeyre, F. (2014). *Job evaluation and pay equity: Stakes and methods*. 31.

[5]. BESA. (n.d.). *Job Evaluation/ Grading Scheme*.

[6]. Carleton University. (2014). *Terms of Reference Regarding Job Evaluation*.

[7]. Chand, S. (2014, February 15). Job Evaluation Methods: 1.Non-Quantitative and 2.Quantitative. *Your Article Library*. https://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/employee-management/job-evaluation-methods-1-non-quantitative-and-2-quantitative/25987

[8]. Chourasia, S., Bhandari, A., Badgujar, P., Thakar, Dr. G. D., & Gupta, Dr. R. C. (2018). *Job_Evaluation_in_a_PVC_PIPE_Manufacturing_Company(1).pdf*. industrial engineering JOURNAL,Vol. XI& Issue No. 1.

[9]. Economic Research Institute. (n.d.). *How to Conduct a Job Evaluation*.

[10]. El Balshy, S. A. E. M., & Ismael, M. (2021). Job evaluation as a mechanism for achieving the fairness of a wage structure in the administrative system: Theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/JHASS-02-2021-0038

[11]. ERI. (2021). *Job Evaluation Committee | Online business definitions glossary*. ERI Economic Research Institute. https://www.erieri.com

[12]. Grade & Pay Structures. (n.d.). *49—Grade and Pay Structures (1).pdf*.

[13]. Green Climate Fund. (2017). *Provision of Job Evaluation and Salary Survey Consultancy Services*. 30.

[14]. ICN. (2010). *Job evaluation guidelines*. International Council of Nurses. http://www.icn.ch/images/stories/documents/publications/free_publications/Job_Evaluation_eng.pdf

[15]. IGNOU. (2018). *Job Evaluation Methods*.

[16]. Interim SADC Aviation Safety Organisation. (2018). *Request_for_Proposals_rfp_SASO_job_grading.pdf*.

[17]. Jamaica Civil Aviation Authority. (2017). *RFP-2017-JCAA-11-Job-Evaluation-Exercise.pdf*.

[18]. Kaur, H. (n.d.).*Job Evaluation*.

[19]. KenGen Defined Benefits (DB) Scheme. (2019). *KenGen SRBS Job Evaluation Tender.pdf*.

[20]. Mercer LLC. (2015). *Maximizing the Value of Job Evaluation*.

[21]. MICTSETA. (2021). *Provision for Job Evaluation which includes Profiling, Grading and Salary Benchmarking Services.*

[22]. Nile Basin Initiative. (2016). *[PDF] Terms of Reference for carrying out a Comprehensive Job Evaluation Exercise for Nile Basin Initiative (NBI)—Free Download PDF*. https://silo.tips/download/terms-of-reference-for-carrying-out-a-comprehensive-job-evaluation-exercise-for

[23]. Okuma, F. F. A. (2003). *A Comparative Study Of Job Evaluation Practices in Private and Public Companies A Survey of Some Selected Firms in Port Harcourt*. 128.

[24]. Olugbemi, O. (n.d.). *Job Evaluation Project*. Retrieved 20 December 2021, from https://www.academia.edu/34167390/JOB_EVALUATION_PROJECT

[25]. Plan International. (n.d.). *Salary and Job Grading Review Service*.

[26]. Salary and Remuneration Commission. (2020). *Guidelines-on-Conducting-Job-Evaluations-for-Public-Service.pdf*.

[27]. Samaritan's Purse. (n.d.). *Terms of Reference for Job Evaluation and Development of a Job Grading/Classification structure*.

[28]. Technology Innovation Agency. (2017). *Request for Proposal*. 41.

[29]. Teran, O. (2010). *Job Evaluation & Grading*. https://www.slideshare.net/omarterani/job-evaluation-amp-grading

[30]. Zambia Airports Corporation Limited. (2018). *RFP_-_Consultancy_Services_Job_Evaluation_(1).pdf*.

Appendices

Appendix. 1: Table on Work Organizations' Sectors and Non-Analytical Methods Utilized in Job by Evaluation Projects

Work Organization	Sector	Job Evaluation Method Sought for Project	Summary of Consultancy Terms of Reference Published Online	Region/Country of Operations
Carleton University (2014)	Community/Public Higher Education (Public sector)	Job Classification/ Grading	University works with a consultant to finalize and evaluate job classes and provide its proposed job classes and their ratings	Canada
African Union (2016)	Continental African Cooperation (Public sector)	Job Grading	Scope of the Assignment: To provide mechanisms for the exercise of the job grading system	Addis-Ababa, Ethiopia
Africa Enterprise Challenge (2019)	Agri-business (Private sector)	Salary Grading	The consultancy is expected to assign a team composed of one (1) team leader with more than seven years of expertise in the creation of Job Evaluation methodologies and salary grading structures	Sub-Saharan Africa
Salary & Remuneration Commission (2020)	Public Sector	Job Grading	The outcome of the Job Evaluation will be used in developing job grading structures. The Commission will also carry out a salary survey to collect data which, together with the Job Evaluation grading results, will inform the salary structures for the 2021/22-2024/25 remuneration review cycle.	Kenya
MICTSETA (2021)	ICT Skill Development Authority (Public sector)	Not within traditional Job Grading	Do a comparison across at least three (3) grading systems for presentation; e.g. Patterson, Hay, and Peromnes grading.	South Africa
KenGen Staff Retirement Benefits Scheme (2019)	Electricity (Company)	Not specified	Conducting job evaluation exercises using credible tools and systems.	Kenya

Nile Basin Initiative (2016)	Water resources (Public sector)	Job Classification/ Grading	Agreement on benchmark job classifications within the NBI organization structure	Entebbe, Uganda
Technology Innovation Agency(2017)	Technology Innovation (Public sector)	Grading	Job Evaluation and Grading of new and existing positions	Pretoria, South Africa
Interim SADC Aviation Safety (2018)	Aviation (Public sector)	Grading Consultancy	qualified consultants conduct a comprehensive functional analysis and job evaluation exercise that will review the organizational structure for the SADC Aviation Safety Organisation (SASO)	Mbabane, Swaziland
Zambia Airports Corporation Limited (2018)	Air transport (Public sector)	The Hay Job Evaluation system or similar system	Review the current job grading and pay structure	Zambia
Green Climate Fund(2017)	Climate Change (Non-Governmental Organization Sector)	Job Grading	Ensure fairness and equality, in terms of job grading, between staff members currently employed, and in comparison with newly recruited staff members	Songdo, Incheon, Republic of Korea
Jamaica Civil Aviation (2017)	Aviation (Public sector)	Not Non-analytical methods	Scores for the evaluated positions/jobs,	Jamaica
Samaritan's Purse(n.d.)	Charity (Non-Governmental sector)	Job Grading/Classification structure	The current job grading/classification structure does not specify criteria for determining the specific job level	Juba, South Sudan
Plan International (n.d.)	Charity (Sector of Non-Governmental Organization)	Review job grading and job matching by Birches Salary Survey	Salary and Job Grading Review Service	Nepal

(1). Job Ranking Methods of Job Evaluation
- Simplest method
- List the jobs in order from highest to lowest worthy in the organization
- Jobs are not split up into components parts
- Comparison is made based on the whole jobs possibly based on level of difficult
- Ranking Methods of Job Evaluation consists of the following:

(a). Utilizing Job Descriptions (Kaur, n.d)
- Evaluates and analyzes job descriptions
- Differences in jobs are noted with respect to Duties, Skills, Responsibilities, etc
- Each job is ranked as per the relative significance
- Each rater ranks the job independently
- The final rank is calculated based on majority vote or average

Table 2: Ranked Jobs by Committee Members

Job	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4	Average
Specialist	5	3	4	3	3.75
Manager, Payroll	4	5	2	5	4
Admisntrator	2	1	3	1	1.75
Clerk	6	6	5	6	5.75
Manager, Finance	3	4	2	4	3.25
Director	1	2	1	2	1.5

Adapted from Kaur (n.d.)
- **Utilizing job descriptions**
  - The rater is required to keep in mind all the jobs being ranked
  - Not possible when the number of jobs is large
  - Rater may overlook the significant difference
  - Largely subjective

(b). Paired Comparison (Kaur, n.d)
- Each job is paired with every other job in the series.
- More difficult jobs in each pair are identified
- Rank is assigned based on the number of times a job is rated more difficult
- For example Job A is more difficult than job B = Assign 2 points to a job
- Job B is less difficult than Job A = Assign 0 to Job B
- Job A is equivalent to Job B = Assign 1 point to both jobs

Table 3: Paired Comparison of Jobs

Reference	Director, Finance	Manager, Finance	Manager, Audit	Secretary, Finance	Total Points
Director, Finance	-	2	2	2	6
Manager, Finance	0	-	1	2	3
Manager, Audit	0	1	-	2	3
Secretary, Finance	0	0	0	-	0

Extracted from Kaur (n.d.)

(2). Job Matching Method(Teran, 2010)
- This is an internal benchmarking
- It compares the job under review with any internal job which is believed to be properly graded and paid and place the job under consideration into the same grade as that job
- Comparison is often made on the whole job basis without analyzing the jobs factor by factor

(3). Job Classification/Grading
Example A.
Job grading or classification establishes job classes or grades. Job classes or grades are a group of jobs that are similar in terms of their tasks, duties, and responsibilities (Andendorff, 2006). Usually, job grades have a definition of each grade known as broad descriptions and in most cases, this method is used in government jobs or public sector undertaking. An example of creating Job Classification or Grading is that formulated by Kaur (n.d) as shown in Table below on Administrative Job

Table 4: Administrative Job Grades Descriptions

Grades	Description
A-1	Engages in special projects without supervision, provides personal administrative assistance to management level personnel, and may have supervisory responsibilities over A-2 and A-3 personnel.
A-2	Clerical work with no supervision and may be assigned simple special projects. The job typically requires an associate-level or vocational degree and requires the same knowledge as A-3 as well as intermediate knowledge of word processing
A-3	Clerical work under close supervision. The job typically requires a high school diploma and general knowledge of office procedures, equipment, etiquette, and the ability to follow instructions. There are no supervisory responsibilities.

Adapted from Kaur (n.d)

Example B:
BESA (n.d.)elaborates an example on conducting Job Grading or Job Classification. BESA argues that Job Grading should be done following important procedures as described below.
  i. A compensation Committee or possibly some few managers should be appointed to conduct Job Grading
 ii. Job description by analyzing content and specification of every job in the organization through a conventional methodology should be done by the Compensation Committee. The job description is advisable to match with the compensable factor that will be used in grading jobs.
iii. Identify the jobs to be graded after preparation of job description. Only a few jobs can be identified while others get slotted into various grades being formulated during the grading. Some few examples said to be benchmarked for grading may include the Commercial jobs which may consist of Senior Quantity Surveyor and Estimator, Planning jobs which may comprise Senior planner and Planning Engineer, Designer jobs which may include jobs of Senior Design Engineer, Operations jobs which may consists of Senior Contract Engineer and Assistant Project Engineer as well as the Administrative and Secretarial jobs which comprise Secretary and Receptionist job.
iv. Some guiding notes on Job Grading also should be available to assist the process of grading. These guiding notes will identify job evaluation/compensable factors possibly including five such as responsibility for results, job knowledge, problem-solving, decision making, planning and organizing, communication and influencing depending on their relevance in the organization. Each of these factors will have to be briefly described to show what they assess based on the demands and values of the industry. An example on how to describe each of the factors on what it assesses is given only for the responsibility of results in the following ways:
✝Impact of the role on the business (direct and indirect)
✝The requirement to accept responsibility for the consequences of action
✝The requirement to understand customer needs and translate them into actions

Each factor adopted will have to be briefly described. After describing each of the job evaluation factors, the Job Grading Notes will have to state the Broadband Factor Level Definitions for all job evaluation factors in terms of functional and managerial aspects as shown in the chart below. These factor levels will be used during grading taking into consideration of the job descriptions how they relate with the factor levels definitions. See an example of Broadband Factor Level Definitions of Responsibility for results and Job Knowledge factor levels as important examples for you.

Table 5: Broadband Factor Level Definitions: (Responsibility for End Results)

Potential Job Grades	Functional	Managerial
A	Completes straightforward stand-alone tasks or repetitive process activities.	-No managerial responsibilities
B	Completes a mix of routine and no routine tasks or process activities.	-No managerial responsibilities
C	Provides advanced administrative or straightforward technical services requiring an understanding of customer needs, where the work undertaken impacts people in immediately related areas	-May lead the work of a small team directly. -Decisions have some short-term consequences within and outside the immediate confines of the job.
D	Provides basic professional/technical level input across a business area or to customers based on a good understanding of the principles that underpin the discipline.	-Supervises people, sometimes through team leaders, within defined procedures and has a clear operational focus. -Decisions have important short-term effects and some long-term effects across the company.
E	Provides complex professional/technical input across a business area or to customers based on a thorough knowledge of the underlying concepts gained either academically or through long experience of the work undertaken.	-Maybe a lead or supporting professionals depending on the size of the business. -Manages work, sometimes through supervisors or team leaders, where it may be a mix of activities and limited integration with other functions is required to meet customers' needs. - Decisions may have long-term consequences on the company's business.
F	Operates as a function head or a lead professional depending on the size of the business, demonstrating a sound appreciation of wider business principles.	-Integrates related business activities through other levels of management where the impact is primarily internal to the business unit within which the role operates. -Decisions invariably have long-term consequences on the company's business.

Adapted from BESA (n.d)

Table. 6: Broadband Factor Level Definitions: (Job Knowledge)

Potential Job Grades	Functional	Managerial
A	-Demonstrates knowledge of routine and repetitive work practices requiring straightforward knowledge of the work of own section. - Most activities undertaken are transaction-based and short cycle. -Requires limited instruction to become competent in the range of activities undertaken – no previous experience required.	-No managerial responsibilities
B	-Demonstrates familiarity with a range of basic activities and processes often through on-the-job experience and structured training. -Is competent to undertake multiple routine tasks within the field.	-No managerial responsibilities

International Journal of Latest Engineering and Management Research (IJLEMR)
ISSN: 2455-4847
www.ijlemr.com || Volume 07 - Issue 04 || April 2022 || PP. 35-44

	-Is required to absorb and apply new role-related information as required.	
C	-Performs a limited range of advanced administrative or straightforward Technical/professional activities in a narrow range of contexts. -Applies company policies and procedures and appreciates the external rules that impact the role, e.g. legislation, codes of practice, or regulatory requirements. -Has technical understanding relevant to the role, e.g. understands basic relevant technical, administrative, organizational, or information management principles.	-Demonstrates knowledge of work including some non-routine activities in order to lead the work of a small team. -Has acquired basic work organizational skills.
D	-Performs a range of technical or professional activities in well-defined contexts. -Demonstrates developing knowledge of the theory and principles underlying the discipline. -May be working towards accreditation by a professional body.	-Understands work programmes short to medium term supported by the team. -Has a good working knowledge of company management systems. -Demonstrates effective leadership and resource management skills. -General knowledge of legislation relevant to managing the team.
E	-Performs a complex range of technical or professional activities in a wide variety of contexts. -Appreciates the wider business activities related to the area of specialism. -Demonstrates knowledge of the concepts underlying the discipline. -Has detailed knowledge of software and reporting tools applicable to the role. - Acts as a source of technical information and advice on own work area. -Applies awareness of relevant legislative, regulations, and emerging issues. -May qualify for membership of a professional body.	-Develops work programmes short to medium term supported by the team. -Has detailed knowledge of company management systems relevant to the role and applies a good knowledge of legislation relevant to the team. -Demonstrates technical proficiency in work and is recognized as the leader in that activity, e.g. in a small business unit.
F	-Applies technical knowledge to resolving problems throughout the business and identifies innovative approaches and solutions. -Acts as the leading technical expert and as the primary day-to-day decision-making point within the discipline. -Identifies business risks of actions undertaken where these could have a significant impact and ensures that these are properly understood and managed.	-Identifies conflicting demands and priorities and balances a range of variables to deliver business results and meet customers' expectations. -Establishes ways to improve efficiency and minimize cost. -Resolves people management issues within the area of responsibility. -Manages the knock-on effects of decisions made on other areas and advises others of decisions as required. -Managerial decisions can often require a high level of creative thinking.

Adapted from BESA (n.d).

BESA (n.d) further suggests that the guiding notes on Job Grading in addition to Broadband Factor Level Definitions will state the Overall Outcome Grade Level. The grade will be determined by reference to the factor level with the majority number of evaluations. See   an example 2 = Grade D, Example 5 = Grade E and

Example 8 = Grade E. In case the initial evaluation is confirmed and no single factor has a majority number of evaluations, the grade will be determined by reference to the "line of best fit" (the middle factor level on evaluation with three levels or so. For example 9 = D, Example 10 = D, Example 11   = Grade D

Table .7: Evaluations Spread Over Two Levels

Example 1	Example 2		Example 3		Example 4		Example 5	
E	D	E	D	E	D	E	D	E
x	x		x		x		x	
x	x			x	x		x	
x	x			x	x		x	
x	x					x		x
x	x			x	x		x	

Source: Adapted from BESA (n.d)

Table. 8: Examples of Evaluations Spread Over Three Levels

Example 6			Example 7			Example 8			Example 9			Example 10			Example 11		
C	D	E	C	D	E	C	D	E	C	D	E	C	D	E	C	D	E
x			x			x			x			x			x		
x			x				x		x			x				x	
x			x					x		x			x			x	
	x		x					x		x			x				x
		x		x				x			x			x			x

v.   We use the Job Evaluation Matrix (Marking Sheet) which grades various factor levels and overall outcome of Job Grade as indicated by the illustration below.