Chapter 3

Phase Three: Collecting Job Information

Key points made in this chapter

The collection of job information:

- is an essential component in any job evaluation system
- must carefully consider the language used as that can have a tremendous impact on the images of value created
- can be accomplished through different types of job-information-gathering tools and possibly multiple tools
- may be from a single source for each job or multiple sources
- may need to be screened, particularly if information is to be collected from more than one source so that it can be integrated to represent one job or determined to represent more than one job
- must avoid gender bias

Introduction

The importance of accurate, complete, up-to-date and gender-neutral job information cannot be emphasized enough. Job information is used as the basis of job evaluation decisions. If the information is insufficient, inaccurate or out-of-date, the job evaluation process will likely lead to inappropriate results.

There are many methods for gathering job information. Some organizations may choose to use several different methods and possibly collect the information from more than one source. These options are explained more fully further on. However, regardless of how it is gathered, job information must be accurate, complete, up-to-date and unbiased to ensure fair results.

Because it is often what is missing from job information that causes the most problems, particular attention must be paid to the format, complexity and completeness of any information collection tool. As well, safeguards must be put in place to ensure all of the information is collected in a consistent and neutral manner. (See suggestions for safeguards in the sections that follow.)

Job Information Language

The language used in, and the images created by, the job information can have a tremendous impact on the job evaluation results. Words must be chosen carefully and consistently to ensure equitable and bias-free results. The two examples that follow illustrate the influence of words on the job information that is presented.

a) **Level of language: complexity versus simplicity**

For example, one employee might describe her job as requiring:

- clerical and administrative skills; computer skills for word processing and spreadsheets in order to compose, edit and produce correspondence, memos, tables and reports; interpersonal skills to enable sharing of work load, to screen calls, to type letters, to deal with the needs of customers including dealing with complaints; organizational skills to provide secretarial service to two managers with diverse and potentially conflicting requirements.

A second might describe hers as:

- typing, filing and answering the phone.

These two descriptions create very different images, yet both might describe the same work. The impact on the job evaluation process would be dramatically different depending on which answer is available to evaluators. Employees need guidance as to what level of detail to give.

b) **Type of verb: active versus passive**

Again, evaluators will view a job differently depending on whether the employee uses active or passive language to describe the tasks. For example, one employee describes a job in the following way:

- directs and manages the logistical work of the branch to ensure orders are processed and filled efficiently and effectively.

Another describes the job as:

- providing support and direction to aid in the flow of work in the branch and to increase efficiency and effectiveness.

While these might be describing the same job, in the first description, using active language has greater impact.

Employees should be trained on how to provide job information, and the collection instrument should provide instructions and examples so that everyone reports job requirements in a similar style.

Different Information-gathering Tools

The pay equity job evaluation process requires accurate job information in order to yield good results. Many organizations already have job descriptions. Some may want to use these as the source job information for job evaluation purposes. But often these descriptions do not answer the questions asked in the job evaluation process. They may not be written consistently and may not address the same issues for all jobs. It is best to gather information specifically for pay equity job evaluations, in a consistent, thorough and formal way.

A variety of tools is available to gather this information: job questionnaires, job descriptions, and interviews. Pilot testing of the tools for understandability, completeness and inclusivity is valuable. Pilot testing involves using the material on a sample of jobs to explore how it works. This step is necessary to detect any problems and eliminate them before the tools are used throughout the organization.

1. Job Questionnaires

A number of styles for questionnaires are possible. An organization may use open-ended or closed questions, or a combination of the two.

Open-ended questions ask employees to describe their duties, the equipment used, the amount of effort involved, and so on, without giving them a specific list from which to choose. Employees write what they believe best fits the question being asked. They may be given guidance in the form of examples to prompt their thoughts.

With closed questions, employees are given a list of the tasks, machinery used, the number of times a day a certain action is performed, or another relevant topic, and are asked to select the answer or answers that apply to their job. They are generally not asked to go beyond the lists provided.

Each type of question has advantages and disadvantages:

a) Open-ended Questions

Advantages

- Employees tend to write more information and to describe circumstances more than is possible in most closed questions.
- Potential bias is reduced by eliminating the situation — caused by some closed questions — of covering some jobs fully in the lists provided, but failing to include others.
- Open-ended questions are much easier to write because their creators do not need to anticipate all possibilities, which would be particularly difficult in large, diversified workforces.

Disadvantages

- Open-ended questions can be difficult to evaluate as employees give inconsistent answers for a number of reasons:
  - An expert in pay equity and gender bias pointed out that in open-ended questionnaires, "... the responses are as much a function of an incumbent's ability to answer open-ended questions as a function of job content."
  - Employees may have different levels of language proficiency or use language differently. Some may play up or play down what they do.
  - The time and attention each employee can give to the questionnaire can affect the information they provide.
  - Perceived importance of the exercise will vary. Some employees will see this as an opportunity for their work to be recognized; others might see it as a potential threat; some might see it as a waste of time.
  - An individual's sense of self-worth or security will affect what he or she writes. Women are more likely than men to under-describe their jobs, either because they do not feel their work is important or because they are socialized not to "brag."
  - Some jobs are routine and predictable; others are fluid and changing. This may affect the kind of information employees give, because fluid jobs are more difficult to describe, and employees leave out duties they don't perform every day.

Given that open-ended questionnaires are susceptible to inconsistent responses from employees, it is usually appropriate to supplement questionnaires with interviews. Interviews allow clarification of terms used in the questionnaire and permit the interviewer to ensure that similar aspects of jobs are described similarly, and that all aspects of work have been made visible through the questionnaire.

Providing examples with the questions will help increase employees' understanding of what a particular question is looking for and how one might go about answering. However, to be truly fair and unbiased, examples must be representative and broad enough to reflect work, and enable employees to identify their own work through the examples.

Although employees are the experts on their jobs, they may be too close to the detail to start from a blank page — getting consistent quality of answers is thus a problem. The following exercise demonstrates how difficult it usually is to describe something that is second nature.

If you were asked to describe what is required to get dressed in the morning and provided with a blank sheet of paper, how would you respond? This is a familiar activity and should be similar for most people. The answer, however, will vary quite dramatically. In addition, people usually leave out many of the skills that they take for granted because they were learned long ago, such as: tying laces; buttoning up buttons; zipping zippers; and making knots. Then there are the tasks that are not considered because they are done only occasionally and seem only indirectly connected (so they typically are not considered relevant) — doing laundry, mending clothes, repairing shoes, buying clothes, etc. These significant responsibilities are overlooked. Other skills may include listening to the weather report to ensure proper attire for the day's climate, knowing the day's activities to determine the proper outfit, or choosing matching accessories. As tasks become second nature, we forget at first that we needed to develop skills. When asked the appropriate and specific questions, it becomes obvious what the evaluator needs to know.

Examples or lists of items to consider might help compensate for some of these problems with open-ended questionnaires.

Safeguards

- Providing examples with the questions will help employees understand how to answer a particular question. To be truly fair and unbiased, examples should be representative and broad enough to give guidance to employees in all jobs.
- Employees can be taught to complete questionnaires properly, and they can be given a way to get answers to their queries.
- Follow-up interviews can help get more consistent results from open-ended questionnaires. Employees can be asked to clarify any confusing terms they have used, and the interviewer can ensure that similar aspects of different jobs have been described similarly and that all aspects of work have been made visible through the questionnaire.
- Similarly, other internal review and follow-up (for example, by knowledgeable supervisors or staff) can be useful.

b) Closed Questions

Advantages

- The expert in pay equity and gender bias referred to above stressed that the importance of checklists. Like examples, checklists in closed-ended questionnaires increase the likelihood of capturing job information and, thus, the reliability of the questionnaire.[1]

1 Ontario Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal Decision, Ontario Nurses Association versus Women's College Hospital , 4 August 1992, page 39, paragraph 199.

An effective way to provide a checklist is to give employees lists of possible examples of specific aspects of work (e.g., tools) from which to select, with space to add items not on the list.

- Closed questions tend to reduce the problems caused by employees under-describing their jobs.
- Depending on the level of language used to write them, closed questions also reduce the impact of language differences; many people are likely to know the right answer when they see it, even if they do not have the writing ability to describe the requirements themselves.
- Closed questions are also easier to evaluate, because a job evaluation rating committee is not required to interpret meaning as often, read as much difficult hand-writing, or avoid being influenced by employees' writing styles.

Disadvantages

- It may be difficult to ensure that questions cover all possible features of work in the organization. The ease with which an employee can check off an option may not bring that person to think carefully about his or her work.
- Abstract questions will be more relevant to the organization's jobs in general, but may be more difficult to apply to individual situations.
- Everything must be included on the list, as items will have little chance of being added by employees.

Safeguards

- Design the questionnaire carefully. Does it ask the appropriate questions? Does it ask all the necessary questions? Paying attention to these points will help ensure that the questionnaire does what it is meant to do.
- Make sure the questions elicit the necessary information. Questions about the percentage of time spent on a task or the frequency with which it is performed do not take into account that in many jobs, the tasks that are done only occasionally may require the most skill or be the most important. A question that asks employees to rank tasks according to importance or difficulty (the former if it is responsibility that is being looked at, the latter if it is skill) would likely be more helpful than asking for the percentage of time spent on an activity or how often it is done.
- To ensure that employees understand what was asked, training and a review of questionnaires are needed.
- All statements in a questionnaire must lend themselves to being used consistently by people no matter what their level of language, interest in working at the exercise, and perceived stake in the end result.

c) Suggestions for Questionnaires

The following suggestions, in conjunction with the safeguards noted above, may guide organizations in avoiding gender bias and getting the most out of their job information tools:

- When writing questions to obtain job information from employees, ask for neutral facts. Don't ask employees to evaluate or value their jobs. The information is being gathered so that a job evaluation rating committee will know as much as possible about jobs and can evaluate them.

- Asks questions as simply as possible. People cannot answer a question that they do not understand or which lends itself to a variety of interpretations. If language is too complex or difficult it will only be accessible to some employees, while others might miss the opportunity to give information about their jobs. Misunderstanding on the part of the employees can result in missing and inconsistent information. Gender bias can therefore be perpetuated as raters do not bear in mind a full range of job information. Job evaluation should be about determining the value of jobs, not the varying levels of employees' language or their ability to answer questionnaires.

- Break questions down into small enough parts so that employees are not trying to answer things that do not apply to them. If too many things are grouped together, employees may be forced to choose an answer even though part of it does not apply to their jobs.

Example:

"Does your job require reading and writing skills? ❑ Yes ❑ No Explain."

This question should be broken down into its two components, at least.

"Does your job require reading skills? ❑ Yes ❑ No
If "yes", give examples."

"Does your job require writing skills? ❑ Yes ❑ No
If "yes", give examples."

- Give direction about the type of answer expected in a section. This can be accomplished by providing lists of possible answers or example phrases, and by telling employees the lists are not meant to be exhaustive but to illustrate the type of responses sought. Open-ended questions that ask for information, followed by a blank space, can be very difficult for employees and will not result in consistent responses without further explanation. People with fluid duties or seasonal demands will be at a disadvantage because they will have to draw on facts that are more removed in time from the day they are actually completing the job questionnaire.

A Note on Frequency

One Pay Equity Tribunal cited the following concern about frequency: The 'frequency' aspect of the question ignores the critical nature of the activities or procedures carried out.[1]

For example, a pilot may go through an entire career and never have to make a "wheels up" landing, but if the time ever arrives when this would be necessary, the skill must be available. A flight attendant must also have knowledge regarding emergency procedures — how to prepare for emergency landing and evacuation of the aircraft — as well as emergency care if anybody gets injured. While these skills may never get used, they must always be available.

Frequency and *percentage of time spent* do make sense when measuring effort and working conditions, because they are used to measure the strain, exertion, or negative impact on employees: for example, the amount of time spent lifting heavy objects has an impact on how much strain the employee experiences.

But consider whether questions about the frequency or percentage of time spent on an activity are appropriate when measuring skill or responsibility factors. It is very difficult in jobs that are fluid (changing all the time), as opposed to static (always the same tasks), to pinpoint the percentage of time spent on any particular aspect of a job. It is very much like asking, when measuring the skill involved in getting dressed, what percent of time is spent buying clothes, getting them cleaned, or picking which ones to wear. All of these are important to the task of getting dressed, but may change for any given month or year. For example, it would be difficult to calculate "percentage of time spent shopping" for a person who has not bought clothes for two years, goes on a diet and suddenly needs a new wardrobe.

If a skill is necessary to a job, it does not matter how often it is done or what percentage of time is spent on it. If a responsibility is being measured, it is more helpful to know the importance of the various responsibilities than the frequency or percentage of time spent on them.

Most skills that are required must be available at all times. It is worth noting while frequency is not relevant, depth of knowledge often is. In the case of some knowledge, employees may need to know how to do something at a moment's notice. In other cases employees may only need to know where to find information that will indicate how to proceed.

---

1 Ontario Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal Decision, Ontario Nurses Association versus Women's College Hospital , 4 August 1992, page 30, paragraph 145.

- Screen questions and examples for gender or job biases, and make sure examples include a balance of female and male jobs, as well as jobs at various levels of hierarchy. If employees do not find a question relevant to their job, they may not record pertinent job information, with possibly inappropriate or biased results.

- For closed questions, write questions and examples broadly, to be inclusive, even if they cannot be exhaustive. This helps employees to see how their work is relevant to the question at hand.

- For questions relating to a particular factor, remember to ask questions about each of the variables in the factor. For example, if the *physical effort* factor in *"Makings of a System"* uses frequency and heaviness, questions should gather facts about weight lifted and the frequency of physical work, but not about how breakable or damageable the items are. It is also not necessary to ask about unrelated issues (i.e., aspects of work which are not being measured).

- Ask for information on all the degrees you want to include in each factor. For example, if a factor has three degrees — occasionally, frequently and continuously — the questions must include all three. An inclusive question may be "how frequent?" Some organizations leave out one or more degrees when developing questions.

2. Job Descriptions

These can be written specifically to fit the content and format of the factors in the job evaluation system, or more generally, as long as each description provides insight about the job in relation to all of the system's factors. The advantages and disadvantages of job descriptions resemble those of open-ended questionnaires. If job descriptions or job fact sheets are to be the only information document, they should be written according to the factors. This will help to ensure that all the relevant information is collected for each job on each factor. If job descriptions are to be used along with other information sources, such as job questionnaires, the description may only need to summarize the main duties and responsibilities.

Job descriptions can serve as an excellent summary document to reinforce the main purpose of each job and the major duties required. Job descriptions may help to provide an overall perspective, when necessary, on any particular factor. This may help if information appears ambiguous in the specific factor. Writing job descriptions requires skill; whoever is asked to participate should be given proper training, and a consistent format should be determined.

3. Interviews

Structured interviews may be used as a primary information source. Structuring the interview requires care similar to that used in developing questionnaires, to ensure evaluators will understand the features and range of work. Preparation of interviews, employees and supervisors is helpful.

Structured interviews help ensure consistency because all employees are asked the same questions.

As noted above, unstructured interviews may be used as follow-up to augment information gathered through another source.

4. Using Multiple Tools

Several of the above tools may be used at one time. In fact, it will probably be necessary, and wisest, to use a combination of tools. The quality of the information collected will be improved if it is collected in a variety of ways.

5. Suggestions for Job Descriptions

- Ensure job descriptions relate to job requirements and not to performance of employee.
- Use he or she, not I or you.
- Make sure job information covers all four criteria and, more specifically, all factors being evaluated.
- Avoid inconsistent language, and sex-stereotyping language, such as referring to men as directing, managing or supervising, and women as coordinating or arranging when both jobs really do the same thing.

To sum up:

- The most difficult problems to see are those that involve missing information. Job information gathering tools need to capture all aspects of work.
- The best questionnaires guide employees by providing examples and suggesting things to think about, while allowing them to offer their insights. The authors of the questions will not always know all the possible answers, so space for employee input is important.
- If job information is gender-biased, the evaluation results will also be gender-biased. Similarly, if the information is incomplete, the picture of the job will be incomplete.

Multiple Sources

In the same way that using multiple tools to collect information makes the data more reliable, information collected from several sources may be stronger than information collected from a single source.

People already doing a job are the best source of accurate job information. But supervisors and human resources personnel can also provide valuable information, either by adding to employees' documents or by completing separate documents.

How many employees should be involved and which ones? There are several options:

1. Option 1, 2 and 3

- Survey or collect information from all of the employees whose jobs are to be evaluated.
- Survey or collect information from a number of employees in each job.
- Survey a random sample of employees.

Where many employees are thought to perform the same work or job, validate whether they really are doing so. Make sure the resulting information is correct and complete, then synthesize it into one survey document for each job.

When combining positions into one job, it is important to ensure the positions are truly the same (or at least very similar). If combined positions are not similar, valuable information may be lost to generalities. This can lead to gender bias if the jobbing results in female jobs being artificially grouped and differences lost, while male jobs are not treated that way.

a) Benefits

- Using as many employees as possible will increase everyone's understanding of the process and can be part of a communications strategy that involves employees. This approach will probably generate more employee feelings of ownership of the process and its results.
- The information collected actually reflects the work people do.
- The organization is more likely to get all the right answers for jobs.
- For information to be used most effectively, it must appear in the proper place. If job information is discussed under one factor but really belongs under another, it should be moved. The more sources of information, the more likely it is that all the information will be provided, even if it must be rearranged.

b) Trade-offs

- The large number of responses will need more work to synthesize the documents and determine the job requirements.

2. Option 4

- Where several employees perform the same job, one employee may be able to represent them all.

a) Benefits

- Minimal investment of resources is required.
- The least amount of response and analysis time are involved.

b) Trade-offs

- For option 4, it can be hard to choose one person; other employees may feel left out or may trust the process less; and the job information may not be correct or complete. One way to improve this approach would be to have one employee complete the questionnaire and send the document around for others to review and confirm. Note that this review may suggest that work in the job is in fact not identical, and broader sampling may be needed.

3. Option 5

- A group of employees in one job can be encouraged to complete the document together.

a) Benefits

- Resources are used efficiently.
- Group work is generally faster than working with larger samples.

b) Trade-offs

- Answers may be confused.
- Answers from only the most dominating employee may prevail.

4. Options 6 and 7

- Supervisors can complete a separate document, which can be synthesized with the other responses, as described in options 1, 2 and 3.
- Supervisors can review and verify employees' questionnaires and discuss any problems with employees.

a) Benefits

- Supervisors can either fill in missing information, or verify employees' answers. Disagreements between supervisor and employee may be more easily resolved because they become more apparent. Supervisors are able to buy into the process.

b) Trade-offs

- Increased resources are required because the exercise now involves supervisory time.
- If employees know that supervisors will be reviewing the answers, and if the organization suffers from lack of trust between the employees and the supervisors, the "trust gap" could widen. In some organizations, this may lead a union to want to prevent supervisory review.

The Review Process

Regardless of the method used to collect job information or the number of sources, a review process is still necessary. Job information is produced by human beings, who are fallible, so imperfections, inconsistencies, omissions, and exaggerations will be unavoidable. A review process will help eliminate or at least minimize these problems. Screening is very important for ensuring that the information is clear, precise and appears in all the right places in the questionnaire or job description so that it can be effectively evaluated on a factor-by-factor basis. Those who do this review, sometimes called "screeners", should be trained in job evaluation, the particular job information collection tool, recognizing signs of gender bias and effective job description terminology.

Screeners should be encouraged to be curious and probing if they do not understand questions or if they feel aspects of their work are missing or inconsistent, For example, if jobs that involve work in a warehouse do not mention dirt and dust, or if telephone operators do not mention requirements for extended concentration, screeners may need to interview employees and supervisors to clarify job requirements.

The screening process may be time-consuming, but it will greatly add to the job evaluation committee's ability to use the information effectively (the committee's role will be discussed in the next chapter). If this review is not done, the information that proceeds to the evaluation stage may not be accurate and complete and may be gender-biased.

As mentioned in chapter 1, under “Avoiding Gender Bias in Logistics”, job information should be approached in a probing fashion. Assumptions should be questioned. Those collecting job information should insist on specific examples and explanations. Employees should be helped to use language that creates images, and to use active rather than passive verbs.

This information-gathering stage is meant to go beyond historical biases and to build better understanding of the work requirements for all jobs. But doing so may require new descriptive and analytical skills. Employees need to take a new look at their work to ensure they do not overlook tasks or requirements. Interviewers, employees and those who create information-gathering tools need training that will sensitize them to gender bias and teach them to provide useful information.

Job Information Checklist

This checklist directs the attention of those involved in evaluating jobs to items that should be dealt with as part of the process. Essentially these “tips” will help to ensure the validity and effectiveness of the job-evaluation process.

1. Co-ordinators or Designers of Tools for Collecting Job Information

- ❍ Have questionnaire designers, interviewers and employees been trained regarding gender bias and how to avoid it?
- ❍ Have employees been instructed to note any job requirements that are not addressed anywhere in the information collection tool? If job information does not get recorded, the job cannot be valued.

2. Screeners

- ❍ Have all job requirements been taken into account, and is the information collected inclusive and complete?
- ❍ Are language and level of detail across completed questionnaires consistent? (an element of quality control)
- ❍ Is language neutral and equitable in questionnaires and job information?
- ❍ Does the questionnaire avoid vague language such as “may perform” or “other duties as required”?
- ❍ Does the questionnaire avoid language that exaggerates, under-describes or devalues the work requirements?

- If more than one position has been placed or included in a job occupational group, have all aspects been properly and completely represented in the generic description or questionnaire? This will require a thorough analysis of the various documents from the employees that provided job information. Be aware that this stage may indicate that employees who were previously considered to be performing the same job, may be seen to be performing different work as a result of their job information. Therefore, the jobs will need to be evaluated as separate jobs.

3. Job Information Sources:

- Are job titles accurate and non-sexist?
- Have all job requirements been recorded without referring to individual or employee capabilities?

4. Some Practical Questions to Ask about the Information-collection Tool and the Process in General

- Are the questions understandable?
- Are the questions clear and precise?
- Do questions have multiple parts, but only one spot for a response?
- Do the questions focus on eliciting information and facts, or do they ask for ratings and evaluations of facts?
- Do the questions provide prompting or examples of the degree of detail required?
- If the questions are closed, are the possibilities exhaustive, or are they merely illustrative or random?
- Do the instructions clearly state what to do if the available choices do not represent a particular job?
- Are the response choices differentiated finely enough? Some may not lend themselves to a "yes" or "no" response, but rather to a "rarely, occasionally, or frequently" scale.
- Do the questions bring out the traditionally overlooked features of female work?
- If the questions are open-ended, is enough guidance provided about how to answer them?
- Have employees received any training in responding to the information collection tool, and was it likely to be sufficient to allow them to provide quality responses?
- Did employees receive any training in providing information, e.g., using active versus passive verbs to describe their work?
- Were incumbents' answers to questionnaires synthesized or meshed with particular jobs? Did the synthesis suppress differentiating information that should be captured?
- Are the questions asked in a way that will elicit all relevant information for the particular issue?
- Are the examples provided gender-biased, or do they create gender-biased images?

- ❍ Are the questions too directive and traditionally loaded, i.e., are they likely to elicit only traditional (and possibly gender-biased) responses?
- ❍ Are the questions designed to capture relevant, specific and useable information?
- ❍ Do the questions and the responses directly and specifically relate to the factor?

Avoiding Gender Bias in the Collection of Job Information

Again, gender bias is often caused by what is left out rather than what is included. Incomplete information, rather than wrong information, is most characteristic of this stage.

Four suggestions to help meet the challenge of minimizing gender bias at the job information collection stage:

1. Make sure to capture the range of work being performed in the establishment.

2. Make sure that the job evaluation system makes the work done in this workplace, particularly women's work, visible.

3. Ensure the information being collected accurately captures the skill, effort and responsibility normally required in the work, and the conditions under which it is usually performed, for both the female job classes in the plan and the male job classes used for comparison.

4. Make sure the information is collected accurately and consistently for all jobs. (Refer to the list of questions above.)[1]

The words used to describe jobs create images, which may be full of wrong assumptions. Because most jobs have a gender pattern, the images created are usually gender-oriented. In order to properly achieve pay equity, many of these images need to be taken apart and questioned very carefully so that only the right information will be used and all appropriate information will be captured.

Quite often employees do not see aspects of jobs they have been close to for a long time until questioned about them. Employees need to be prompted to think about all the requirements of their jobs. Even people who have done a job for many years need to step back and be open to all the aspects they have forgotten or have simply assumed are not important enough to include in the job analysis stage. For example, warehouse workers often neglect to document the dirt and dust in their working environment because they are used to it. Clerical workers often do not record that they must do a number of offices duties, and do

Avoiding Gender Bias in the Collection of Job Information (continued)

them simultaneously: answer the phone, take messages, reroute callers, type letters, collate material, direct visitors, and remind a boss of an appointment. Job questionnaires rarely ask about simultaneous timing requirements.

It has been said by one Tribunal that:

The importance of an appropriate job content collection instrument cannot be underestimated. It is this instrument which determines whether the range of skill, effort, responsibility and the working conditions found in a job are captured. It allows you to make visible what is often invisible. In order to make work content visible, the questions and how they are asked is critical. This includes the wording used, the extent and range of questions asked, how much they take into account the specific aspects of women's work and the fact that these aspects have often been undervalued or invisible.[2]

---

1. Ontario Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal Decision, Ontario Nurses Association versus Municipality of Haldimand-Norfolk, 29 May 1991, page 10, paragraph 26.
2. Ontario Pay Equity Hearings Tribunal Decision, Ontario Nurses Association versus Women's College Hospital, 4 August 1992, page 28, paragraph 132