

Some Recent Trends in Writing Job Description for the Purpose of Job Evaluation: A Reflective View

Muhammad Ali EL-Hajji, PhD

Former Lecturer of Liverpool John Moores University

&

Liverpool Community College

Abstract

*In order for the organizations to have a fair, acceptable and reliable job evaluation, the need for having a **professionally completed job description** is inevitable, particularly when the organization concerned is **NOT** small in size. This paper focuses on job description for the purpose of holding job evaluation. Though management exercises and the literature show that job description has many usages such as recruitment and selection, training and development needs, performance appraisal and other organizational goals and activities, nonetheless these are **NOT** the areas or scope of this paper and thus they are not addressed here. Instead, this paper focuses mainly upon the job description, for job evaluation purposes, in the light of different approaches and views used in performing job description – from the traditional or standard methods **to more recent ones where job definition, as a result of changes and technological progress, have to be frequently modified to prevent both it, and the job itself, from becoming outdated.** In any event, job descriptions, generally, need to be regularly checked and reviewed in the light of on-going developments and the related concepts that affect the job content, job demands and job requirements. This is necessary in order to re-determine the rating of the job worth (job relativities). It is important to recognise that in this paper we describe the work itself, not the worker. We look at the work and its content (based upon accurate job description) regardless of such factors as gender, age, ethnicity, creed or levels of health. Otherwise, it means we yield to the unacceptable (and largely unlawful) doctrine that jobs should be systematically discriminatory.*

Key Words: Job analysis, Job demands and construction, Job dynamism, Job evaluation, Methodologies / Approaches, Standard view V Resent views, related concepts.

1.0 Introduction

In this paper we shall deal, **briefly**, with:

- (a) job analysis with particular **focus upon...**
- (b) job description for the purpose of job evaluation the process - as prerequisites.

In so doing, the reader will have a logical flow of the subject matter, which in turn leads to capture an appropriate picture and understanding of the basic requirements, contents and dimensions of job description and the inevitable need for it, strictly, for the purpose of job evaluation. At this point the reader is smoothly taken to the different approaches employed for writing job descriptions with their dimensions and reasons that justify their style.

2.0 Job analysis

Job analysis is the yardstick for pay differentials.

“On the basis of job differences (that is job analysis results) and firm priorities, managers establish pay differentials for virtually all positions with the company.” J. J. Martocchio (1998: 14).

Job analysis as a term is a punctilious and concisely written statement of the outcomes of systematically breaking down a job into its component parts or elements. It is a technical procedure that demands pre-scrutiny of specific tasks and responsibilities or duties for a particular job, its conditions, rates and levels of payment and the personal qualities or characteristics required for carrying out that job (i.e. the job’s demands). Thus, one may assume, job analysis is not an easy task if it is to be carried out successfully.

2.1 Job analysis is the key element needed for job evaluation

Job analysis is an analytical process providing the organization with the relevant and necessary data and information **that aids:**

- (a) The application of job comparison through which similarities and differences among jobs are identified, and
- (b) The decisions required to measure the relative value of jobs, which in turn helps to determine the monetary value of the jobs covered.

Thus, an accurate and concise job analysis is perhaps the single most important tool in the process of the job evaluation programme. However, the process of job analysis and job evaluation reveals the essential differences between jobs, so that decisions can be made about their relative worth either quantitatively or qualitatively. Thus, job analysis can be considered a cornerstone in the job evaluation process, and evaluation is a vital application to job analysis. Therefore, differential wages may be paid to jobs of different worth. In short, job analysis is a device to identify similarities and dissimilarities among the tasks assigned to jobs and the responsibilities in a working organization for collecting data and evaluating information from which job description, job specification and job performance standards are generated or developed. Hence, in order to hold a proper detailed and precise job analysis, **there are a number of methodologies or strategies that may be used for this purpose**. These include observations, interviews, questionnaires, and (in Mitchell and Larson, 1987) consulting job related training manuals, reports, records, and (in Taylor, S., 1998) installing video cameras at a discreet distance from the observer's office. Importantly, however, a job analyst, even before starting his / her work, needs to have a very clear idea about the type and nature of the jobs wanted to be covered or included in job analysis. This will definitely not only help in but also determine the type of information sought, which in turn will be the key to decide the appropriate method to be used in job analysis.

2.2 Job analysis differs from job dilution and system analysis

However, it may be pertinent to observe that job analysis distinctly differs from **job dilution**. **The latter** is an approach to dividing or breaking down the tasks of a job into parts or levels with higher or lower skills. Accordingly, skilled employees undertake parts requiring higher skills while relatively unskilled employees (who will require a lower level of training) carry out the remaining tasks. It may also be relevant to mention that job analysis is not the same as **systems analysis**. **The latter**, put simply, is the analysis of any business activity in order to strictly decide what must be accomplished and how to achieve it.

2.3 Job evaluation is a way of distributing certain amount of the payroll systematically

A job evaluation based upon a professionally completed job analysis is therefore to be seen as a systematic way of distributing a certain amount of the payroll so that each job gets its fair share. It sets out to determine what basic rate should be paid for a job by systematically analysing the demands that the job makes upon the operator. It is also a technique that can help to avoid many of the anomalies in wages and salaries that can invariably lead to so much trouble. Thus, competent job evaluation demands a broad perspective and a keen insight into the management process and into the nature of a wide variety of jobs in any work organization. A part of its nature is to rely upon job content, and this **must** remain part of its definition. **To sum up**, there will be no real understanding of the job's nature, features and requirements without having a genuine job analysis. Appropriate job analysis and job description are essential in setting up, on a firm footing, a wages and salaries scheme in any organization. **While job description is the basic document of job analysis, the latter, in turn, is the basic document or factual foundation for job evaluation** (i.e. job analysis is a technique for determining the basic elements of a job).

Job evaluation is the vital foundation upon which the structure of wages and salaries rest. Wage and salary structures are an essential instrument developed to translate and/or reflect the organization's remuneration policy into a formal hierarchy of given grades and levels. **However, all three terms (job analysis, job description and job evaluation) refer to practical works of study for existing jobs**. At the same time they are, to a certain degree, subject to the job evaluation committee members' personal judgments. Consequently, the role of the job evaluation committee, in this context, is not an easy task. However, practically speaking, the dynamism of job analysis (and therefore job description) requires the analyst to observe what the introduction of technology provides in relation to job content and design. **All in all**, job analysis is an investigation into the job requirements to identify a job's intrinsic characteristics; thus it is the first procedure to be used to help ensure a sound understanding of the work in question. Simply put, it is an analysis of job tasks for the purpose of establishing the skills and knowledge needed (for that job) and the subsequent provision of an appropriate job description that reflects those skills and knowledge.

3.0 Comment

It is relevant and salutary to mention here that job analysis is a more analytical (factual) process than job evaluation with the latter being more of a judgemental process (see Pritchard and Murlis, 1992). In broader terms, both job analysis and job evaluation share these two features (the factual and the judgemental) though with different emphasis (i.e simply for the inference factor between the two processes where the factual one is seen as a precession procedure). Pritchard and Murlis see that with traditional job evaluation, job analysis is often carried out by the evaluators themselves. Both writers, thus tend to have job analysis prepared and performed by different people from the evaluators. This may not be only to make sure, as far as is possible, that job analysis - which typically leads to job description - is destitute of any personal effect / halo effect / or horn error; but importantly it also helps to keep the two processes (analytical and judgement) separate from each other (although, it must be stressed, not in absolute terms).

In the same context, **for the sake of having an appropriate / professional job description**, the job analyst should make sure that the sources of information collected are sound. His /her interpretation of this information must be based upon facts and truths rather than upon guesses or cognitions (this in order not to be described as having been biased or inaccurate in his/her approach). Thus the job analyst should feel free from any kind of pressure of time or work. Simultaneously, there should not be a lack of interest on the part of management, supervisors and jobholders (see Torrington & Hall, 1991). All these are negative factors that distract from the provision of an appropriate and professional job description.

4.0 Job description

A job description is an output of job analysis while job analysis is an input for job evaluation.

The quality and soundness of job description reflects the quality and soundness of job analysis. That is because the former is the brief of the latter, i.e. job description is an output, outcome or a product of job analysis. The latter, in turn, forms a prerequisite for job evaluation. A job description, however, primarily embraces the physical and mental dexterities required of it, the personal achievements considered necessary for and specific to the job, the full range of vertical and horizontal communication channels that need to be maintained on a reciprocal basis, the job's environmental circumstances or working conditions, the necessary materials and equipments required for the job and, last but not least, its identified performance **criteria**.

However, job description, by definition, is a written, accurate **statement of the job's**:-

- Title
- Purpose (or its overall objectives)
- Location
- Conditions
- Special knowledge, skills and qualifications required
- Tasks and duties
- Authority
- Responsibility
- Upward and downward relationship within the hierarchy, and
- The performance standards that the jobholder needs to meet.

4.1 Standard job description is to describe jobs as they exist presently

Since jobs vary from one organization to the next, there is no agreed specific or absolute **standard-format (or style) for writing job descriptions**. They tend to be different even for the same jobs in different establishments. It is worth emphasizing the importance of written job descriptions. They serve the purpose of reflecting a **precise record and summary of the current and valid job facts**; not what the job *ought* to be or *must* be in an ideal world, nor what it *used* to entail. Otherwise, job evaluation **cannot act** as a mirror to the job's values as they stand now. It has been said (Edward Lawler, 1986) that job evaluation was originally developed to be supportive of traditional bureaucratic management and the starting point in this respect lies in that the job description requires the job's occupier to be tied to the description of the job rather than to do what is right in the situation.

In the same context Alan Price (2004: 536) sees that “*traditional job evaluation is focused on unchanging job descriptions and requirements, encouraging staff to take rigid attitude to their work*”. Consequently, job content needs to be looked at in its wider terms. Within the scope of the traditional approach, some organizations may ask the job holder to keep records of the activities or tasks that s/he performs on a daily basis (i.e in the form of a daily working sheet) upon which the job occupier draws up a job description for the work exercised. Meanwhile, other organizations let the first line manager (supervisor) or the head of the section / department undertake the responsibility of writing the job description of the employee. This standard (structured) view would make the information collected more accessible or open (i.e. transparent) for any inquiry or investigation- if needed. In so doing, it will (in Foot & Hook, 1999) facilitate the audit process through a statistics-friendly coding system if the data is recorded electronically.

However, regardless of the approach of writing the job description, hiring specialist(s) or expert(s) is always an open option for the organization concerned, if needed. Thus a job description primarily embraces the physical and mental dexterity required of the job itself, the personal achievements considered necessary for and specific to that job, the full range of vertical and horizontal communication channels that need to be maintained on a reciprocal basis, the job’s environmental circumstances or working conditions, the necessary materials and equipment required for the job and, last but not least, its identified performance **criteria**.

4.2 The recent view of job description is to cover the present AND the future organization’s needs as to job’s content and demands (job description)

Nonetheless, the above view, **for some**, represents a standard (traditional) way of holding a job description through focusing *only* on the description of the current job content. **To them**, this view is little more than a reflection upon the past. Since we live in a dynamic world of rapid, continuous change, some therefore claim that it is more appropriate for the job description expert or specialist to look at the job content in a way that fulfils the need of constructing the job according to the organization’s projected objectives (as opposed to merely determining outcomes based upon what the job has comprised of up until now).

In broader terms, the dynamic environment has, largely, influenced and coloured all of life’s aspects, including work organizations. As a result, the organizations should be more responsive and flexible to the new changes or innovations and their demands that affect not only the size and content of jobs but also type of jobs, work performance techniques and the skills required. These changes need to be professionally analysed, described and evaluated so that their utilization may be maximised. Therefore, on this assumption [see Pritchard, D. and Murlis, H. (op cit.)] evaluating job content based upon the standard job description would be ineffective, for it would be devoid of supporting organizational change. Moreover, it may not only fail to support but may also restrict future organizational change. This is because such change requires the job description to be reviewed **afresh** by the organization concerned.

It appears that, to date, a definitive view has yet to be reached regarding these two opposing approaches in defining specific job descriptions. It is thus evident that yet further investigation and study is necessary if the merits and defects of each are to be fully determined. Until such time, and for the reasons given in 4.3 below, we will tend to err in favour of the traditional approach whilst recognizing that the modern approach may have value in specific circumstances.

4.3 Different approaches in providing job descriptions

These two different views or approaches – whether job description is to define or specify current job content, as it exists now **or** whether it must also consider the future needs of the organization – are indeed a controversial issue where each approach has its own arguments. For us, the future-needs refer to future changes and (near) future expectations which, nonetheless, are still not always easy to accurately guess or predict, let alone define. Even where such attempts are made, it is likely that the job description itself would lack the precision to provide any clarity of meaning. This is reinforced by the fact that regardless of how much the job analyst or job evaluator and / or management are sure of the type, nature and specifications of these future needs, still no-one can define these needs exactly. This leads both job analyst and job evaluator to estimate these needs and then for the evaluator to assign the scores and weightings accordingly. For these reasons, plus the fact that neither the analyst nor the evaluator is either a futurist or a fortune-teller **we tend to be, on this particular point**, more generally supportive of the standard view (or approach) of job description provision.

4.4 A further new trend in writing job descriptions

Furthermore, a new trend in this context has surfaced in recent years. It stands indifferent between the above two views. That is, **too detailed** a job description has been rightly criticized for “freezing the job, leading claims for regarding upon even small additions” (Connock, S., 1991: 70). Connock maintains that **focusing upon the main responsibilities** of the job can reduce this particular difficulty. However, although the elements of responsibility and accountability should be the predominant features of the job description (with the Hay system being a case in point – see Hay and Purves, 1954; Hay, 1958) it would be a mistake to assume these will be its **only** features.

Otherwise, we shall not have a clear picture of the job content and its construction. In addition, albeit removed from the managerial levels, some jobs are featured with a very low or limited responsibility for they are mainly of a physical or manual nature in their application. In such cases, the job description would show the wrong picture if it were to **focus on job responsibilities - as described in the above statement and example**. If this is correct, job description **should then** cover all chosen job factors to the same depth and width. The degree of importance and worth of specific job factors may need to be derived from a different process which should be left for the evaluator to decide upon at a later time. A factor’s score and weighting are thus to be allocated based upon the extent and depth to which type and approach of job description has been performed.

In conclusion, this third approach of writing a less detailed and more flexible job description has value but should be confined to jobs that are likely to evolve both quickly and frequently. The above three approaches or statements, which represent the recent and traditional views of preparing and performing job description, qualify for a broad and appropriate definition of the job.

5.0 The involvement of the jobholder and the use of information technology as a means of improving the quality of job description

Although a **successful job evaluation scheme** would **involve** the job occupier **in writing** his/her job descriptions, it can also be done in circumstances prior to recruitment – especially when the job analyst is well skilled and experienced. Introducing computer analysis into the job description process may improve the process, maintenance, quality and equality in general. A rapidly changing world demands that the scope, content and design of jobs will evolve accordingly. Therefore, unless subjected to periodic review, a job definition is likely to be overtaken by events and become outdated. It follows that if a job’s definition becomes outdated, so does the job itself. Consequently, **job descriptions** should be regularly reviewed and updated, for they **are dynamic documents** that affect the rating of what the job is worth. Otherwise job-factor weightings and values will not reflect reality. Thus, in order for a job description **not** to be described as outdated or inflexible, it needs constantly to follow any drift in job content and technological changes related to the job’s nature and demands. **In short, job description is a detailed written statement of what the job occupier does and how and why s/he does it.**

6.0 Who else may participate in writing job descriptions?

Ideally, however, job description, **in the context of job evaluation**, should be focused on the selected job factors (compensable factors) and their sub-divisions, with the presence of representatives of all parties concerned. That is to say, representatives are to be drawn from both the management and the staff-side union. Specifically, this will be with the included participation of the job analyst, and under the supervision of the job evaluation expert. Add to them, the participation of the supervisor and the job performer, as they will have indispensable, first-hand knowledge of the job. They can thus provide direct input into the content of the job description on the basis of the actual tasks and duties being performed which is invaluable for the job analyst responsible for preparing the formal job description (Canadian Union of Public employees ‘CUPE’ (2007). Consequently, the presence of the supervisor and the job occupier is **important** to verify the job’s information enlisted where their endorsement of the job description document, in relation to its parts, will make it more creditable and authentic (see Elizur, 1980). Yet sometimes, as mentioned earlier, it may be the case that the position has yet to be filled (or perhaps the incumbent is on leave etc) at the time of the study of the job description in question is to be undertaken. In such circumstances the process of job description will and should go ahead – perhaps with the help of the supervisor.

7.0 The industrial tribunal, in the case of an equal pay claim, requires proper Job description

However, a **professionally done** job description is also necessary for the industrial tribunal in the case of an equal pay claim (see also the UK’s **Equal Value Amendment (Regulations) of 1983**).

This, in turn, emphasizes the need for a job description to be (see G. Lemos): **transparent, accurate and objective**. The purpose of this is to restrict the negative influence of distorted outcomes which may occur when an individual's conceptions, gut feelings, or personal bias get in the way. The professionally completed job description must therefore be objective in its approach using **consistent, measurable, justifiable, defensible answerable** benchmarks as the keystone of its methodology. In broader terms, unless it is a lawful requirement, the terms of a job description should not be seen to favour the recruitment of one person over another simply on grounds of distinction such as gender, age, race, creed, or health etc..

8.0 Comment: In certain cases a too detailed job description MAY NOT be necessary

It would appear evident, at least on occasion, that the more skilled and experienced the job evaluator is, the less requirement there is for the job description itself to be highly detailed. This is **particularly** so when the organization concerned is relatively small in size. This is because the evaluator's wide experience and knowledge can enrich his/her professional vision with respect to the nature and demands of the job concerned, thus enabling him / her to make reliable and sound judgements. However, although such instances undeniably occur (and with good effect) it is **important to emphasize that this can NEVER be the NORM and that such practice carries with it considerable risk**. (Primarily, the success of this approach is dependent upon an accurate assessment of the individual's skills and experience having been made in the first instance. This, to a greater or lesser degree will always involve an element of subjectivity which risks taking the process away from the keystone benchmarks referred to in 7.0 above).

9.0 Job description and regularly used and related concepts and terms:

9.1 Job content: This refers to job activities. It embodies the factors that define the overall nature of a job, from activities of the mind to hand and body applications. In this context, a popular method of job analysis, called the Function of Job Analysis (FJA) is more detailed than average and describes jobs in terms of defining a job's activities, relations, applied procedures, materials, equipments and tools etc (see Matteson, I., 2002). Thus, job content refers to conditions that relate **directly** to the job itself rather than to the conditions relating to external environment factors (see Newstrom & Davis, 1993). However, sometimes the term 'job description' is used to cover the 'job content' in term of conditions, tasks and responsibilities - as with the British Institute of Management -BIM (1961/1967 - Appendix).

9.2 Job requirements: These refer to certain features that are required from the job's doer when performing the job. They include factors that contribute to on-the-job education, experience, skills, training, knowledge, license etc. In short, these requirements refer to **certain** equalities or attributes that the job **places** on its holder. They are the demands of the job that the job evaluation is concerned with when measuring them.

9.3 Job context: This refers to the conditions in the surrounding environment of the job. It is about the nature, scope, type, degree or level of the physical demands and work conditions of the job responsibility and supervision required. It must also consider the consequences of error (**when** performing the job). In short, job context describes the work environment – which is related to and influenced by a wide range of intrinsic factors that are considered to be factors related to the essential nature of a job.

9.4 Job specification: From job analysis and job description, the organization can get reliable information of the **job specification**- which is a carefully written description of a specific job's tasks, duties, required skills and knowledge, which in turn represent the essential qualifications required for performing that job satisfactorily. It is, to describe in detail, the physical and mental tasks or activities included in the job. Practically speaking it becomes apparent that, the terms of job description and job specification both overlap in their meanings. Thus we find (for example) that the BIM (ibid) **generally** considers these two terms to be interchangeable. However, this is not strictly the case and it should be recognised that there is a distinction between the two, in that, primarily, **job description focuses on describing the job itself (job components)**, whilst **the job specification identifies or specifies the job requisites**. Job specification is also particularly useful for training purposes.

Note: Similarly, it may also be useful to mention here that from job analysis and job description, the organization can gather a good extract or abstract picture (profile) of the **person specifications** (individual worker characteristics). Thus, person specifications are a reflection of the job specifications in term of the type and equality of the suitable candidate for the job. That is to say, the better the quality of job description the more precise the person specification will be.

In this way, once job description has been properly prepared and established, it can also act as a blueprint for the person specification. **Person specifications, then, are the prerequisites for employing an appropriate or ideal type of person for the job (Obviously, the job specification will not identify a particular person but will, instead, identify a range of characteristics necessary for filling the post in question).** It must always be kept in mind that **the person specification is totally different from the job content (the latter being the subject matter of job evaluation)** despite the fact that the two are necessarily inter-related. **All in all,** job description (job content); job specification (job requirements); job grading (classifying jobs into groups); and job evaluation (job importance / job worth), stem from and are based upon job analysis (this is what links and inter-relates them). Consequently, it follows that job description, job specifications and person specifications are all the product of a proper job analysis.

9.5 Job Enrichment And Job Enlargement: Enriching jobs, in this context and in simple terms, means changing a job's essentials in an attempt to improve task efficiency, satisfaction and employee empowerment. **However, by contrast, job enlargement** refers to the increase and widening of the scope of a job or job area (job tasks). **Both job enrichment and job enlargement refer to vertical job expansion (depth) and horizontal job extension (breadth) respectively** (see Armstrong, M., 1996; Lucey, T., 1994; Tiernan, et al., 1996; Pinder, 1998; DeCenzo and Robbins, 1999; Robbins and Coulter, 1999; Stafford, 1990/1992; Milkovich and Boudreau, 1988; Quible, 2001; Bohlander, et al., 2001; Krajewski and Ritzman, 1999; Kreitner, 2001; Certo, 2003; Fearn, 1992; Huczynski and Buchanan, 1991; Ian Marcour, et al., 1999/2005) Both techniques of enrichment and enlargement are essential procedures for change, job design and redesign (see for further details, Hodgetts, 1990). Hence, any sizeable, essential (or even relatively essential) job expansion or job change, regardless of the reasons behind it, will lead to (or require) a new job description if management wants to produce revised job evaluation results considered to be fair and acceptable by all parties concerned.

9.6 Job design and technology: Job design is a process for shaping and forming the content of the job in a certain formula through an integrated operation of the tasks, duties and responsibilities, as well as the knowledge and skills required for doing the job. Therefore, with the job design, there will be operations of addition, reduction, separation or the splitting off and merging of tasks. Some tasks will be easier or simpler; others will be more complex and difficult. One effect or result of this is rightsizing, which **often** is interchangeable with such terms as reorganizing, rationalizing or restructuring. All are used to describe organizational change that also may include downsizing [Tyson, (ed.), 1997; Robbins and Coulter, (op cit)]. As science and technology are progressing, jobs will go through continuous fluctuation. **In all cases,** job design has to describe the job holder's position within the hierarchy – taking into consideration the most recent changes. Both job design and job content or job demands are not only interrelated but also intertwined.

However, it is important to bear in mind that all changes that affect job content (in terms of skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions) can only be considered for the purpose of job evaluation, when or after these changes have physically occurred and have been quoted in the job description. This is because (with the noted exceptions identified in 4.2 above) the purpose of job evaluation is to evaluate (revise) the actual or present job (i.e. the job as it is now - not as it will be in the future).

10.0 Summary

In order to perform an appropriate job evaluation, there must be, prior to this, a professionally completed job analysis from which job description (as an output) represents the core upon which the conducting of job evaluation is based upon, particularly where quantitative / analytical methods are employed. **The focus then, concentrates on the job content (components / compositions), job circumstances and the milieu that the job is performed in – but only in relation to and for the use of job evaluation.**

Job description must not be static, rigid or inflexible. We live in an age of fast on-going development and technological change which job content, job demands and job requirements are bound to follow. This may call for job description, particularly at the top management level, to be more flexible and to show considerable freedom for the people at that level in mapping out their work scope. The purpose of this would be to provide those people with resources to make necessary decisions and to use their initiative. To this end, the standard or traditional view in writing job description is neither quite sufficient nor responsive enough to meet the new changes and requirements of the job. Thus some new trends have surfaced as a consequence.

In some cases a sizeable focus has been placed upon the introduction of a *responsibility / accountability* element, whilst in others, new trends call for a more flexible job description (with the Hay system being a case in point). **This recalls us to many modern management approaches, especially those work organizations that adopt or apply the Japanese Kaizen culture** (commitment of organizations to continuous development). Here the workers on the production line are considered to be the real experts since they do the job day-in, day-out. Consequently, they are trained to trouble-shoot any maintenance (of, for example, machinery) themselves, rather than lose time waiting for a **qualified**, expert engineer to come and fix the defect. Obviously, this requires the worker to know more about the causes of problems and their solutions – **and accordingly workers are encouraged to be creative or innovative.** (see Marcouse, I., et al., 2005; Imai, M., 1986). **In such cases, job description needs to be more flexible and be commensurate with the nature and demands of the work in hand. This is necessary in order to accommodate some new job demands and requirements without the need for a complete revision of that job description (in relation to the jobs affected by changes).**

11.0 References

- [1] Armstrong, M. (1996/1998) A Handbook of Personnel Management Practice, 6th ed., London: Kogan Page.
- [2] Bohlander, G., Snell, S. & Sherman, A. (2001) Managing Human Resources, USA.: South-Western College Publishing.
- [3] British Institute of Management (BIM), (1961/1967) Job Evaluation: A Practical Guide, Southampton: The Millbrook Press Ltd., (revised edition).
- [4] Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) (2007), Introduction to Job Evaluation, April 24. On Line <http://cupe.ca/job-evaluation/Introduction>
- [5] Certo, S.C. (2003) Modern Management, 9th ed., New Jersey, U.S.A.: Prentice Hall.
- [6] Connock, S. (1991) HR Vision: Managing a Quality Workforce, London: Institute of Personnel Management.
- [7] DeCenzo, D. & Robbins, S.P. (1999) Human Resource Management, 6th ed., U.S.A.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- [8] Elizur, V. (1980) Job Evaluation: A Systematic Approach, Britain: Gower Publishing Company Limited
- [9] Fearn, P. (1992) Business Studies, 4th ed., Great Britain: Hodder & Stoughton Limited
- [10] Foot, M. & Hook, C. (1999) Introducing Human Resource, 2nd ed. Britain, Pearson Education Limited.
- [11] Hay, E. N. 'Setting Salary Standards For Executive Jobs', Personnel, American Management Association, Vol. 34, No. 4, Jan.-Feb., 1958.
- [12] Hay, E. N. and Purves, D. A New Method of Job Evaluation: The Guide – Profile Method, Personnel, American Management Association, Vol. 31, No. 1, July, 1954.
- [13] Hodgetts, R.M. (1990) Modern Human Relations at Work, 4th ed., U.S.A.: The Dryden Press, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- [14] Huczynski, A. and Buchanan, D. (1991) Organizational Behaviour An Introductory text, 2nd ed., Britain: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- [15] Imai, M (1986) Kaizen (Ky'zen) The Key to Japan's Competitive Success, New York, McGraw-Hill Publishing Company
- [16] Krajewski, L. J. & Ritzman, L.P. (1999) Operations Management Strategy and Analysis, U.S.A.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- [17] Kreitner, R. (2001) Management, 8th ed., New York, USA: Houghton Mifflin Company
- [18] Lawler, E. E. (1986) What's Wrong With Point – Factor Job Evaluation, Compensation & Benefits Review, Vol. 18, Issue No.2, U.S.A.
- [19] Lemos, G. (1994) Fair Recruitment And Selection, London, Lemos Associates
- [20] Lucey, T. (1994) Business Administration, London: DP Publications Ltd.
- [21] Marcouse, I.; Gillespie, A.; Martain, B. ; Surrige. M., Wall, N. (1999 / 2005) Business Studies, London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- [22] Martocchio, J. J. (1998) A Human Resource Management Approach , New Jersey , USA: Prentice-Hall .
- [23] Matteson, I. (2002) Organizational Behavior and Management, 6th ed., USA: McGraw-Hill Higher Education

- [24] Milkovich, G. T. & Boudreau, J.W. (1988) Personnel/Human Resource Management –A Diagnostic Approach, 5th ed., U.S.A.: Business Publications, Inc.
- [25] Mitchell, T. R, and Larson, J. R. Jr. (1987) People in Organizations An Introduction to Organizational Behavior, 3rd ed., Singapore: McGraw – Hill Book Company – International Edition.
- [26] Newstrom, J. W. and Davis K. (1993) Organizational Behavior – Human Behavior at Work, 9th ed., USA: McGraw – Hill, Inc.
- [27] Pinder, C.C. (1998) Motivation in Organizational Behaviour, New Jersey, U.S.A.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- [28] Price, A. (2004) Human Resource Management in a Business Context, 2nd ed., London: Thomson Learning.
- [29] Pritchard, D. and Murlis, H. (1992) Job, Roles And People, London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing Limited.
- [30] Quible, Z. K. (2001) Administrative Office Management. An Introduction, 7th ed., New Jersey, U.S.A.: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- [31] Robbins, S. P. & Coulter, M. (1999) Management, 6th ed., International Edition, U.S.A.: Prentice Hall International.
- [32] Stafford, C. E. (1990) People in Business Organizations, Cambridge, Britain: Cambridge University Press, reprinted 1992.
- [33] Tiernan, S. D., Morley, M. & Foley, E. (1996) Modern Management Theory and Practice for Irish Students, Dublin: Gill & Macmillan Ltd.
- [34] Tyson, S, (ed.) (1997) The practice of Human Resource Strategy , England, U.K : Pearson Education Limited
- [35] Taylor, S. (1998) Employee Resourcing, Great Britain, Institute of Personnel And Development
- [36] Torrington, D. and Hall, L. (1991)) Personnel Management A New Approach, 2nd ed., Britain: Prentice-Hall International (UK) ltd.