

AGAINST GENDER DISCRIMINATION IN PAY STRUCTURES: EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL VALUE AND JOB EVALUATION

Corominas, A.¹; Coves, A.-M.¹; Lusa, A.¹; Martínez, C.²; Ortega, M.A.¹

¹ Departamento de Organización de Empresas e Instituto de Organización y Control de Sistemas Industriales / ETSEIB (*The Department of Company Organisation and Control of Industrial Systems*)

Universidad Politécnica de Cataluña

² Departamento de Organización de Empresas / ETSEIB (*The Department of Company Organisation*)

Universidad Politécnica de Cataluña

1. INTRODUCTION

The economic, technological, social and cultural changes that are taking place in the business world and within companies themselves entail significant consequences for management, and in particular for human resources management.

Today, it has become imperative to design organisational structures that provide a company with the flexibility that it needs in order to adapt to constant change. New management approaches allowing the introduction of organisational change are also required. In order to achieve this it is essential to recognise the importance of the role that people play in organisational development.

These new organisational models tend to be based on the design of more decentralised and less hierarchical structures, based on jobs that are broader in scope and richer in content, with greater emphasis on information and communication technology. These 'new' posts require adaptation of evaluation systems, to enable present characteristics to be taken into account. Therefore we cannot continue to use evaluation manuals written fifty years ago, which were designed for evaluating jobs that were very different to those of today.

In addition to this general motive for adapting evaluation systems, there is the need to consider the greater participation of certain groups, particularly women, in the labour market.

Organisational structures and management styles affect the behaviour of those who work within them. The behaviour of both individuals and groups are significantly influenced by the jobs that they perform. Job content provides powerful stimuli for individual behaviour. Therefore the job evaluation system used by management will be an instrument for the transmission of certain cultural values, and will have direct consequences on personal behaviour.

On 27 November 1991 Martine Aubry, the French Minister for Work, Employment and Vocational Training at that time, presented a report to the Council of Ministers containing a critique of what has been called 'Post-Taylorism', which she views as

incapable of facing up to these new challenges. Aubry considers that 'competitiveness requires an evaluation of staff abilities', and that such staff 'also want correct legislation and fair remuneration in keeping with their qualifications.' Situations involving discrimination, which previously either passed unnoticed or were considered natural or inevitable, are increasingly rejected these days.

In this chapter methods and mechanisms for job evaluation are presented which guarantee the neutrality of the process. The starting point is the principle of equal pay for jobs of equal value, and the proposal is to use a quantitative evaluation method that classifies jobs by means of a points system, with different factors determining the final evaluation. These factors will be chosen and considered in such a way as to ensure that no indirect gender discrimination is in operation. With the exception of minor details, the same approach could be applied for detecting and combating discrimination in other groups.

The rest of the chapter is organised in the following way: in section 2, the question of how far the principle of "equal pay for equal value" reaches is evaluated, the concept of the value of work is discussed, and a synthesis of job evaluation procedures is presented; section 3 discusses the relationship between job evaluation and pay discrimination against women; section 4 includes guidelines for the establishment of an evaluation process that does not discriminate on the grounds of gender; section 5 indicates how discriminatory elements in an evaluation procedure can be detected, and finally section 6 contains the conclusions drawn.

2. THE "EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL VALUE" PRINCIPLE AND JOB EVALUATION PROCESSES

Legislation guarantees the "equal pay for equal value" principle, obliging employers to pay the same salary or wage for the same work¹.

In practice it is clear that non-compliance with this principle is frequent: the same job corresponds to different remuneration in different firms, and even within some companies, equal jobs - involving identical tasks and functions - are paid at rates that are determined by denomination.

However, the most usual form of wage discrimination is concealed behind other cases that are more difficult to control and to demonstrate. In order to avoid such discrimination, the most recent legislation enshrines the principle of "equal pay for equal value," which we will abbreviate to EPEV², according to which employers are required to offer the same remuneration for work of equal value.

Both principles are vitally important with respect to wage discrimination against women, a factor which has been widely studied and which has many causes, one of which is non-compliance with the previously mentioned principles. In the case of the same jobs, discrimination is easy to detect, but discrimination often arises when people

¹ Article 119 of the Treaty of Rome, 1957

² Directive 75/117 Community ruling 1975 on equal pay. And article 28 of the Workers' Statute in the case of Spain

who are doing two jobs that are different but still equivalent or comparable, receive different salaries, as certain aspects of work that are predominantly performed by women are omitted and/or undervalued.

The acceptance of the EPEV principle, which encompasses the notion of "equal pay for equal value" is fundamental for fighting wage discrimination against women, but the greatest difficulty in the application of this principle lies in the lack of general agreement regarding precisely what is to be understood by the "value of work," and how it can be quantified.

2.1 The value of work

The difficulty in defining the value of work, and in quantifying the value of a particular job stems from various factors. On the one hand the production processes of goods and services are collective, and determining the precise contribution of each group member is a complex and contested task. On the other hand, price (salary) cannot be used as a measure of value (if this were so, then by definition discrimination would not exist): the salaries paid at the present time are the result of a complex process in which supply and demand, the negotiating capacity of each party and the prestige attributed to each job and to its characteristics all play a part.

Even if we renounce a definition of the value of work and address the more modest aim of defining what is understood by jobs of equal value, difficulties still arise that are difficult to overcome. Article 140-2 of the French *Code du Travail* establishes that "jobs that require from workers similar professional knowledge accredited by a qualification, a diploma or professional practice, skills acquired through experience, responsibilities and physical and emotional input are considered as of equal value", but note that there is no precise definition of the term "similar" in this context. Nonetheless, the fact that a law actually includes a definition of jobs of equal value must be seen in a very positive light.

Along the same lines as the indication in French law, but in greater detail, it could be said that two jobs are of equal value if they include similar ("equivalent" could be substituted for "similar" here, which would make the definition clearer and more precise) requirements with regard to:

- Skills (knowledge, aptitudes and initiative)
- Effort (physical, mental and emotional)
- Responsibilities (management or supervision of staff, the security of material resources and information and peoples' safety and well-being)
- Working conditions

This approach lays the foundations for determining equal value, or more broadly speaking, the relative value of two or more jobs. A job is evaluated in relation to the requirements of the task performed and its nature³.

³ The European Commission. Memorandum on equal pay for jobs of equal value. Brussels, 23 August 1994.

Although there is no legal measure defining what is to be understood by jobs of equal value in Spain, in other countries the law provides the right to receive a salary (remuneration) which is the same as that paid for a job that is classified as equivalent according to a job evaluation procedure⁴.

In Portugal the decree law 392/79 of 20th September determines in article 2 that it is understood that "jobs of equal value are those undertaken for the same employer if the tasks performed are considered equal in terms of objective job evaluation criteria, even if they are different in nature."

Therefore job evaluation processes, despite noting the criticisms that can be made of them, are the only mechanism that in a general, practical way allows the determination of the relative value of jobs within an organisation, and the establishment of equal value between two different jobs.

However, it should be taken into account that the equal value of two jobs may also be established without recourse to evaluation procedures if equality is established by a firm judicial sentence (which implies that legal proceedings have previously been taken). In fact, sentences have been passed in this sense that are not based on a formal evaluation of the jobs in question (and it may be the case that the job that was initially undervalued and subsequently declared to be of the same value as the one with which it was being compared, is in fact found to have the greater value if evaluation procedures are used). Evaluation procedures are also unnecessary in cases settled by an intermediary accepted by both sides, or agreed through a process of negotiation acceptable to all those involved.

In any case, the practical implementation of EPEV, in a generalised way, not limited to specific cases, demands the use of evaluation procedures.

2.2 Job evaluation

The evaluation of tasks as a technique was associated with "scientific management," advocated primarily by FW Taylor⁵.

Job evaluation procedures have fundamentally been criticised by those who deny the scientific nature of Taylorist "scientific management." Certainly the claim that Taylorism is of a scientific character in general does not hold up at all, and for this reason many of these criticisms are fully justified (see for example Vergara, 1971).

In spite of this, the use of job evaluation as a way of allocating salaries does significantly reduce subjectivity, although it cannot eliminate it completely. However, the procedure is limited to placing each job on a usually discreet classificatory scale containing a limited number of values (levels or categories). Through the correspondence of this scale with monetary values (which may or may not be proportional), remuneration (or a part of it) is fixed. However, the method of establishing correspondence between job categories and monetary values depends on

⁴ For example the 1970 equal pay law in the United Kingdom (known as the EQPA) and the 1983 ruling on equal value that amended it.

⁵ See OIT (1986). Task evaluation (OIT, pp10-11)

the wage policy of the firm concerned, and lies outside the sphere of job evaluation procedures.

Specific job evaluation procedures are many and varied, as is to be expected in the case of techniques with such a long tradition. Some have been developed by consultants, and others by companies themselves or by trade associations in particular sectors. The idea here is not to describe them in detail, but to present a synthesis⁶. In order to do so, we are basing the classification on qualitative and quantitative procedures.

Qualitative procedures evaluate jobs from a global perspective with the aim of ranking them in order (hierarchical structuring systems), or situating them at one of the levels previously established (classification systems). Thus it is possible to appreciate the importance of each job within the organisation, but not the differences in value between them.

Quantitative or analytical procedures evaluate jobs according to different criteria, called factors, previously selected and clearly defined. These can, in turn, be classified as procedures involving the comparison of different factors on the one hand, and the allocation of points to each factor on the other. The use of a quantitative method allows the determination of a numerical value for each job, and thus the quantification of the differences in value between jobs.

There is broad agreement that the procedures of allocating points per factor are the most suitable, both in generic terms and also with regard to avoiding wage discrimination against women.

Let us briefly note the form that such procedures take. A relationship is established between *factors* (such as knowledge, initiative, intellectual effort, responsibility for materials etc.) with varying degrees of detail, in addition to an evaluation scale for each factor (with a certain number of levels or grades). The magnitude of the scale (the number of grades) may or may not be the same for all factors (if it is not, the difference in magnitude acts as an implicit weighting of the factors, as a way of attributing greater or lesser importance to each one).

The set of factors must be comprehensive - it needs to cover all the relevant characteristics of the job. On the other hand, the factors must be independent, because if a particular characteristic is assessed by more than one factor, it is implicitly being given greater importance.

It is in any case necessary to define the demands corresponding to each grade for each factor (for example, if one factor is training, then a certificate of basic education, vocational training, a university diploma etc. would be used). Using either the job description or practical observation as a basis, a level or grade is allocated to each factor, and finally these points are totalled to give an overall numerical result for the job in question. The addition is usually carried out by weighting - a positive coefficient (weight) is allocated to each factor, and the points obtained in the case of each factor are totalled.

⁶ For a detailed description, see Corominas et al., 1999b.

It is clear that the choice of factors, the definition of levels for each factor, job description and the weighting of the factors are, at least in part, subjective, and are socially conditioned. However, as we see it, this does not mean that these procedures should be rejected; on the one hand due to the lack of alternatives, and on the other because they define a structured framework for the development of a discussion about the wage structure within an organisation and require an analysis of each job - in other words, of the functions involved and of the conditions under which they are performed.

3. JOB EVALUATION AND WAGE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

The general principle of the prohibition of all forms of discrimination is a constitutional law that applies in all branches of law, and specifically in labour legislation in article 31.1 of the Constitution. It is also included in the Workers' Statute in articles 4.2c, 17, 24.2 and 28.

The Constitutional sentence 198/1996 declares that "the specific prohibition of sex discrimination set out in article 14 of the Spanish Constitution covers not only direct discrimination, that is to say differential and unfavourable juridical treatment of a person due to their sex, but also indirect forms of discrimination, that is to say treatment that is neutral or non-discriminatory in formal terms, but which, due to differences in real conditions between workers of each sex, has an adverse impact on the members of one sex [...] the measure that produces the adverse effect must lack justification, not be founded on objective, indispensable requirements involved in the performance of the job in question, or not be suitable for the task to be performed."

The Community order in the Council of Europe directive 97/80/CE of 15th December includes the mechanism for the reversal of the burden of proof. Thus in the legislation of Member States (such as Spain, Italy and Portugal), this mechanism also applies. This means that in the case where there indications exist of discrimination for reasons of sex, it is the employer who must present objective, reasonable justification for the measures adopted and their proportionality (the defendant must prove that the motives for the decision taken are legitimate and reasonably distanced from any motive that could be considered harmful to the fundamental rights of the person affected).

Job evaluation procedures are not only mechanisms for detecting discrimination, but also for combating it. The fact that their objective is to evaluate jobs, and not people, is in itself an important anti-discriminatory factor.

However, even if the implementation of evaluation procedures can be considered almost a necessary condition for combating discrimination, it is not sufficient to eliminate it, as the procedure itself must also be *gender neutral*. In other words, an evaluation procedure may present discriminatory characteristics due either to what is included within it, or to what is omitted (this would be a case of indirect discrimination).

This occurs when certain factors (for example an aptitude for communication or emotional effort) that should be taken into account as requirements for particular jobs are omitted, or when excessively high values (weights) are allocated to factors in which men have an overall advantage over women (as is the case with physical effort).

However, in general, evaluation is based on observation or on job description, and if this observation or description is biased, discrimination could take place even if the set of factors to be considered and their weighting are correctly defined. It is certain that one of the most significant causes of discrimination is the omission of job characteristics related to skills or abilities that are supposedly innate or "natural" in women (it is interesting to note that equivalent omissions do not usually occur in relation with typically "masculine" jobs), or because certain difficult working conditions such as those involved in nursing or cleaning work are deemed acceptable to women, whereas on the other hand it is accepted that they would be rejected by men.

From what has been said, it follows that the relationship between job evaluation and wage discrimination against women is more complex than it may at first appear.

Within the framework of two research projects carried out under the auspices of the *Instituto de la Mujer* (an organisation concerned with women's rights), the subject has been studied by the team at the *Universidad Politécnica de Catalunya* (UPC), which has written this chapter.

In the first of these projects (carried out by research teams at the *Universidad Pompeu Fabre* and at UPC in 1997 and 1998) certain legal and economic aspects of wage discrimination against women were dealt with in addition to, as has already been indicated, the relationship that such discrimination has with job evaluation.

In more specific terms, the part of the project undertaken by the team at UPC involved the elaboration of a descriptive and critical synthesis of the most widespread evaluation procedures, a discussion of the discriminatory elements that may be implicit in such procedures, a study of the possible quantification of gender differences, criteria for the establishment of neutral procedures, a questionnaire for the detection of discriminatory elements in evaluation procedures and a mathematical model and a computer program for the calculation of the weighting of each factor in such a way that the values of specific jobs are equalled, and the resultant weightings are as close as possible to certain given values. The project also included the translation, some adaptation and a critique of the document "Equity at Work," produced in New Zealand, which is generally considered to be one of the most successful attempts at defining a reasonably detailed framework for the elaboration of a manual on neutral evaluation. Finally, a great deal of documentation on the subject was compiled during the course of the research. The results of the project have been published as internal documents by the *Instituto de Organización y Control* (IOC) at UPC (Corominas et al. 199 a-h).

The second project, which had a somewhat international feel to it, was carried out during 1998-99. Five countries participated: Belgium, France, Portugal, the United Kingdom and of course Spain - the promoter of the project being the Spanish *Instituto de la Mujer*.

Within the project framework, a questionnaire was elaborated relating to different aspects of pay discrimination against women, and which was completed by the participating countries (*Instituto de la Mujer*, 1999a). The analysis of the responses given allowed a diagnosis of the situation to be put forward, and, taking this into account, a good practice guide was produced (*Instituto de la Mujer*, 1999b).

In terms of the questionnaire, from the responses obtained and from other available information, it can be deduced that the situations in the participating countries are not homogenous. In some of them legislation exists that favours the use of job evaluation procedures. However, it cannot be said that the state of affairs in any of the countries is satisfactory. In short, from the responses to the questionnaire it follows that a legislative framework should be established, which:

- 1) Includes a definition of what should be understood as jobs of equal value, one that is at least as precise as that included in French legislation.
- 2) Encourages the use of analytical job evaluation procedures.
- 3) Incorporates mechanisms for the elimination of the discriminatory elements implicit in some evaluation procedures.
- 4) Makes it obligatory to carry out job evaluations in cases in which indications of discrimination have been noted. In addition, action should be taken to train and to modify the attitudes of those involved, for example through the elaboration and circulation of publications on the conditions that must be met in an evaluation procedure if neutrality is to be guaranteed, and a check list for facilitating the examination of the extent to which these conditions are being met.

These conclusions indicate what "good practice" should be in terms of job evaluation in relation to wage discrimination against women.

A general conclusion that can be drawn from these studies is that job evaluation, without losing sight of its shortcomings, does allow pay discrimination in general, and in particular, with regard to women, to be detected and challenged. Although discriminatory elements may persist if certain precautions are not taken in an evaluation procedure, the mechanisms are available for offering a reasonable guarantee that the procedure is gender neutral.

If an organisation does not have a job evaluation procedure and wishes to introduce one, then it must design and implement that procedure ensuring that certain principles and conditions are respected. This is referred to in section 4, which contains observations and guidelines with regard to defining and implementing the procedure.

In cases where the organisation already uses an evaluation procedure, the objective must be the detection of any discriminatory elements that may lie within it, with the aim of correcting or eliminating them. This is dealt with in section 5.

4. GUIDE FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A GENDER NEUTRAL JOB EVALUATION METHOD

Once management has taken the decision to introduce a job evaluation scheme in the company, as a tool for guaranteeing the principle of equal wages for jobs of equal value, the possible alternatives must be studied with a view to selecting the most appropriate one. An already existing procedure may be chosen, for example one from a particular consultancy, or a specific made-to-measure procedure may be designed for the organisation in question (either by setting up an internal committee, or by contracting external experts).

As is also the case with other management techniques introduced into a company for the first time, the implementation of a job evaluation system is a process that must be correctly planned, and planning can be broken down into several phases. During each phase, a series of steps should be followed to ensure that discrimination does not occur at any time.

The following is a summary of criteria to be taken into account in the design and implementation of a quantitative job evaluation procedure that works through the allocation of points to different factors and which is "neutral."

a) **Preparation of the process**

- Establish the responsibilities and the role that should be taken by each of the participants (management, workers' representatives, analysts, employees etc.)
- Creation of committees. The evaluation committee (and the appeals committee) must be representative of all the jobs to be evaluated, and include female representatives (in proportion to their numbers within the company - if there are few women, there should be at least one woman on each committee).
- Establish the principles upon which the process will be based, and guarantees of neutrality.
- Select an analytical evaluation system based on the allocation of points per factor.
- Communicate information regarding the process to all members of the organisation in question.
- Train all those participating in the process with regards to job evaluation techniques, in particular with regards to the type of procedure that has been selected and wage discrimination.
- Publish the objective of the evaluation scheme: to achieve equal pay for jobs of equal value.

b) **Analysis of the organisational structure and job inventory**

- Produce an inventory of all functions.
- Name all jobs (using neutral denominations that do not imply either the gender of the worker or the past status of the job).
- Ensure that different names are given to jobs that involve the performance of different tasks.

c) **Job description**

- The necessary information will be obtained using a mixed method involving a questionnaire and an interview with the employee.
- The questionnaire must include examples and explanations of each factor. Analysts must be available to offer expert help in cases where assistance is needed in completing the questionnaire.
- The analyst will interview employees in order to eliminate undervaluing and to complement the information given.
- The job descriptions must have a standard format.
- Each job description must be objective and complete, ensuring that no information is omitted.
- The employee must sign the job description once it has been written by the analyst, noting whether or not s/he is in agreement (in the case of disagreement, reasons should be noted).

d) Coverage

A standard system must be applied to all jobs within the organisation. In large, complex organisations the same factors will be used, but comprising different sub-factors, where different job groups need to be evaluated, for example: production jobs, technical jobs, administrative jobs etc.

e) Consultancy models

If a consultancy firm has been contracted to carry out the evaluation, it will be necessary to check that their procedure has been correctly adapted to the jobs in question, and to the characteristics of the organisation.

f) Benchmarks (key jobs or jobs that can be used as reference points)

Key jobs with different characteristics must be included: jobs that are representative of the organisation, of the different departments, groups and positions within the hierarchy, jobs that are predominantly done by men/ women, etc., that will serve as a benchmark and an example for the evaluation of the other positions.

g) Factor plan development

- Selection of factors ensuring that all significant aspects of all jobs are covered (avoiding omissions).
- Avoidance of redundancy; make sure that a single aspect or requirement involved in the job is not taken into consideration by more than one factor (as this would attribute more value to this factor than to others).
- Ensure that each factor evaluates one, and only one aspect of the job (do not include more than one aspect in a single factor).
- The procedure must be presented clearly in terms of which aspects or job requirements are being evaluated by each factor (with documentation).
- Use of the same factors for all jobs.

h) Scales and points to be allocated to the factors chosen

- Choose the most suitable evaluation scale for each factor (number of levels or grades).
- The grades or levels for each factor must be based on real job requirements.
- The feasibility of using a standard scale for each factor must be analysed. If the number of grades is not fixed, there will be implicit weighting of factors (factors allocated more grades will have greater weighting on the total number of points).
- A clear, detailed definition must be given for each level (by means of examples, quantifying the corresponding requirements).

i) Weighting of factors and allocation of points

- The weight allocated to each factor, either explicitly or implicitly, must reflect (be coherent with) the value system within the organisation.
- The weighting system must be transparent and justified.
- The weighting of factors must not favour any particular group or characteristics (male or female).
- The points obtained for the jobs should correspond to the requirements involved in each one.

- The points allocated to each factor, and also the total number of points allocated to the job must be clearly and convincingly justified.
- j) **Correspondence between points and salaries**
- Group jobs together in categories (according to their point value). Check to see whether or not the jobs form "clusters" in a natural way. If not, negotiate the number of categories, and the boundaries and scope of each one.
 - Publish the results of the evaluation process: jobs, points and categories.
 - Negotiate the remuneration corresponding to each category or group.
 - Check compliance with the EPEV principle, and ensure that there is no wage discrimination in the correspondence of points with remuneration.
- k) **Maintenance and appeal**
- Ensure that claims mechanisms exist.
 - Establish a permanent appeals or revision committee within the company.
 - Periodically revise and modify the evaluation method (every 1 or 2 years). This permits the evaluation and classification of new jobs, jobs that have been modified, and allows possible claims to be processed.

5. CHECKLIST FOR THE DETECTION OF SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE PROCESS OF JOB EVALUATION

When attempting to detect discriminatory elements that may be included in an existing evaluation procedure with the aim of correcting or eliminating them, the principles and conditions that must be respected are of course the same as those referred to in the previous section.

In this situation, the fundamental question is whether the existing procedure respects each of the principles and conditions stated. A questionnaire would be a suitable instrument for systematically carrying out this process, which could be called a Cartesian critique of the procedures; the questions would refer to each of the possible discriminatory elements, and would be formulated in such a way that the corrective action that should be taken can be deduced from the question itself. A questionnaire of this type is more or less a negative version of the guide for the design and implementation of a neutral evaluation procedure.

Some of these questionnaires have been circulated in a variety of formats, the most complete, to our knowledge, being the one to be found in Corominas et al. 1999f, also published with minor modifications by the *Instituto de la Mujer* 1999c and 1999d. The most recent version of this questionnaire can be accessed at <http://www.ioc.upc.es/ivis>, where answers to the questions can be entered on the web page itself, resulting in a numerical indicator of the degree of discriminatory character of the procedure in question.

One extremely important aspect, and one that is not always recognised in publications on the subject, is the establishing of weighting of the factors in such a way that they do not imply discrimination. Given that for various reasons that will not be discussed here it is very difficult to rigorously quantify, in a generally acceptable way, advantages that each gender may have in relation to one factor or another, the approach we have chosen

for solving the problem of establishing weighting of factors is summarised in the following paragraph.

Let us suppose that there are pairs of jobs that have been deemed to be of equal value (either by agreement or by due process of law). Let us also suppose that there are reference values for weighting (which are those considered a priori by the organisation to be correct), and that equal value is not satisfied in these weightings. New values must then be determined for the weightings in such a way that they give the same value for each of the two equal jobs. However, this condition of equity is not usually sufficient to determine the new weightings, because if the number of pairs of equal jobs is small in comparison with the number of factors, there is generally a multitude of solutions that could satisfy said condition. For this reason, we can add the additional objective that the new values should be as close as possible to the reference values. This allows the determination of the new weighting, and is in line with the supposition that the reference values express the importance that the organisation gives to each factor in a fairly precise way (the reference values are modified only in terms of what is essential in order to satisfy the condition of equal value in the pairs of equal jobs). Technically, the problem has been approached as a quadratic programme (Corominas et al. 1999g), for which a computer program has been developed (the EPEV programme). This can be run on a PC and is simple to use, as the user only needs to introduce a small amount of data. This programme can be obtained at <http://www.ioc.upc.es/ivis>.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In many countries (such as those of the European Union, the USA, Canada and New Zealand, among others) there are indications of increased awareness, both in society in general and in the employment world, with regards to the problem of pay discrimination against women. Increased access to information on the subject plays a fundamental role, as does the specific training of the agents involved.

Despite the advances that are being made in legislation and jurisprudence, both at Community level and in each of the individual Member States, much still remains to be done that could without doubt contribute to the elimination of pay discrimination against women.

Job evaluation procedures are necessary in order to detect and to combat pay discrimination against women.

Of all the possible evaluation methods, quantitative systems that allocate points per factor are the most consistent and advisable.

Although discriminatory elements may persist in the definition and application of such procedures, there are mechanisms for their detection and subsequent correction that allow the compilation of a gender neutral evaluation manual.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

European Commission, 1994, *Memorandum on equal pay for equal work*, Brussels.

European Commission, 1996. *Code of practice on equal pay*, Brussels.

Corominas, A., Coves, A.-M., Lusa, A., Martínez, M. C., Ortega, M. A., 1999a, *La discriminación salarial de la mujer y la valoración de puestos de trabajo: Introducción*, IOC-DT-C-1999-01.

Corominas, A., Coves, A.-M., Lusa, A., Martínez, M. C., Ortega, M. A., 1999b, *Los procedimientos de valoración de puestos de trabajo*, IOC-DT-C-1999-02.

Corominas, A., Coves, A.-M., Lusa, A., Martínez, M. C., Ortega, M. A., 1999c, *La discriminación salarial de la mujer y su relación con la valoración de puestos de trabajo*, IOC-DT-C-1999-03.

Corominas, A., Coves, A.-M., Lusa, A., Martínez, M. C., Ortega, M. A., 1999d, *Las diferencias entre géneros*, IOC-DT-C-1999-04.

Corominas, A., Coves, A.-M., Lusa, A., Martínez, M. C., Ortega, M. A., 1999e, *Criterios para diseñar y poner en práctica un método de valoración de puestos de trabajo libre de discriminación por razón de sexo*, IOC-DT-C-1999-05.

Corominas, A., Coves, A.-M., Lusa, A., Martínez, M. C., Ortega, M. A., 1999f, *Cómo detectar la discriminación por razón de sexo en el proceso de valoración de puestos de trabajo: lista de control*, IOC-DT-C-1999-06.

Corominas, A., Coves, A.-M., Lusa, A., Martínez, M. C., Ortega, M. A., 1999g, *Modelo y programa IVIS para el cálculo de pesos en un procedimiento de valoración por ponderación de factores*, IOC-DT-C-1999-07.

Corominas, A., Coves, A.-M., Lusa, A., Martínez, M. C., Ortega, M. A., 1999h, *Documentación sobre la valoración de puestos de trabajo y la discriminación salarial de la mujer*, IOC-DT-C-1999-08.

Hastings, Sue, 1987, *Identifying discrimination in job evaluation methods*, Technical note 108, The Trade Union Research Unit, Oxford.

Hastings, Sue, 1991, *Developing a less discriminatory job evaluation scheme*, Technical note 109, The Trade Union Research Unit, Oxford.

Instituto de la Mujer, 1998, *Hacia la Igualdad Laboral entre mujeres y hombres*, Madrid.

Instituto de la Mujer, 1999a, *Herramientas para eliminar la discriminación retributiva* (working document for internal use).

Instituto de la Mujer, 1999b, *Guía de buenas prácticas para garantizar la igualdad retributiva*, Madrid.

OIT, 1986, *Evaluación de tareas*, OIT, Geneva.

Smet, Miet, 1996, *Pour une rémunération correcte de votre fonction. Un manuel pour l'égalité des chances et l'évaluation des fonctions*, Ministère de l'Emploi et du Travail, Brussels.

Van Meensel, Rian, 1993, *Equal treatment of men and women. Sex discrimination and job classification*, paper presented at the seminar “Equal Pay, 36 years later: in search of excellence?!, Brussels.

Vegara, J. M., 1971, *La organización científica del trabajo. ¿Ciencia o ideología?*, Fontanella, Barcelona.

<http://www.ioc.upc.es/ivis/>