

for new positions he desires authorized, and the continuance or revision of rates of existing positions, without much regard to uniformity throughout the service or coordination with any general plan, for none exists.

It is well known that in any large organization the salary paid in individual sections is very often conditioned by the attitude of the superior. In one unit the person in charge feels that only the professional people are important and they, therefore, should be highly paid to the disadvantage of the necessary and important clerical workers. In another unit, the reverse may be true. In still another situation the supervisor may feel that public funds should be conserved and that State employees should be paid as small a salary as possible. In another unit, the supervisor may feel that the more money one can pay his employees, the more likely he is to get the best of the crop. As a result, envious comparisons arise between the employees of the respective units. . . . With the introduction of a sound classification plan, personal considerations do not condition the classification. To the contrary, there is a uniformity of compensation developed. The result is that not only is there a better attitude on the part of the workers, but there is much less moving about of workers not only between units of the same agency but between agencies, since the only financial inducement that can be offered is that which can appropriately be advanced with the increase of responsibility in the new position.

Except in those relatively few instances where he is able to secure more comprehensive information, the legislator must be governed largely by the undefined titles of positions used by different departments or units in their individual recommendations. In the absence of the uniform, official terminology provided by a position-classifica-

tion plan, nothing is more unreliable than to conclude that positions deserve the same pay scale because they are called by the same name, or that a position called by a title that sounds important is really an important position. The whole pay-fixing process is further confused by pressure for special pay increases on the part of individuals or groups. For example, dignified titles could be used as a smoke screen to legislative inquiries. Thus a "building superintendent" could under job analysis, be found to be a "clerk", a "chief clerk" a "clerk typist" or a "statistician" a "tabulating machine operator." None of the people with those high-sounding titles doing the work those titles called for. The titles could be devised to get the salary.

The result is that positions involving the same work are paid at widely varying rates; the pay structure of the jurisdiction lacks rhyme or reason; there is both overpayment and underpayment; public funds are wasted; injustices and discrimination exist and are continually created; and the effectiveness of the public service is diminished.

In contrast with such methods, the use of a position-classification plan as a base for a pay plan contemplates the development and formulation of a definite salary policy; the expression of this policy in terms of scales of pay and operating regulations; the definite association of scales of pay with the classes of the position-classification plan; and the determination of the scale of pay for each individual position through the process, controlled by a central classifying agency, of determining the precise class in which the position falls, on the basis of its duties, responsibilities, and qualification standards.

In this situation when a department head wishes a new position, he asks for it under the specific title of the class

(Continued on Page 20)