

THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Manuscript Theses

Unpublished theses submitted for the Master's degree and Doctor's degree and deposited in The American University Library are open for inspection, but are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors. Bibliographical references may be noted, but passages may be copied only with permission of the author, and proper credit must be given in subsequent written or published work.

This thesis by _____ has been used by the following persons, whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above restrictions.

A library borrowing this thesis for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signatures of the users.

NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE
<i>Gene E. Hutson</i>	<i>3-10-53</i>
<i>Bernard E. Shultz 537 Peabody St. N.W.</i>	<i>May 7, '53</i>
<i>Pauline Foster - Federal Communications Commission</i>	<i>Aug. 12, 1953</i>
<i>Youssef Abdel Wahab CIO I.C.A.</i>	<i>Feb. 21, 1956</i>
<i>William A. Cuyler Dept. - 124</i>	<i>May 7, 1957</i>
<i>Charles R. Keener Nevada State Personnel Dept.</i>	<i>19 May 1960</i>

A SURVEY OF
THE FEDERAL POSITION CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM
AS A TOOL OF MANAGEMENT : USES AND OPERATION

by
Monroe F. Day

A THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
American University in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

The American University
Washington, D. C.
1952

VITA

The writer has been engaged in position classification work in the Federal service for approximately ten years. Experience has been obtained at both the departmental and bureau levels. He has worked in the Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, in Washington, D. C., and now is Assistant Chief, Classification Branch, Bureau of Reclamation, in the same city. Prior to the assignment in the Bureau he was in charge of the position classification program for the Office of the Secretary in Chicago, Illinois during 1943-1945 which included the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Parks Service. The Chicago assignment also involved a classification training program conducted by the writer which in part resulted in delegation by the Department to the bureaus of authority to allocate positions and appoint employees through the GS-11 grade level (P-4 and CAF-11 at that time). Collaboration with other staff officers, especially with organization and methods examiners, as well as experience gained through temporary details as acting personnel officer, have provided an opportunity for a broad understanding of management's problems.

The writer received a B. S. degree from East Tennessee State College, and subsequently attended the Birmingham Law School, George Washington University, and American University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the problem	1
Probable importance of the study	4
Availability, and types, of material used	6
Definition of terms employed	12
Organization of the remainder of the thesis	15
Summary	15
II. THE FEDERAL POSITION CLASSIFICATION PLAN	17
Basic authority	17
Distinct from other plans in the Act	17
Objectives	21
Essentials of Federal classification plan	22
Responsibility for administration	24
Organizational location of position classification	29
Summary	30
III. USES OF POSITION CLASSIFICATION	32
Uses in general administration	33
Uses in fiscal administration	48
Uses in budget administration	57

Uses in personnel administration	63
Uses in organization and methods work	88
Summary of uses	101
IV. A QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY	103
Purposes of the study	103
Types of questionnaires and recipients	106
The compilation, transmittal, and return of questionnaires	108
Replies of general administrators	110
Replies of budget officers	124
Replies of personnel officers	133
Replies of organization and methods analysts	146
Replies of position classifiers	158
Replies of all respondent groups to the cross-section question	170
Summary	174
Positive.	174
Negative.	183
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	191
Conclusions on the uses of position classification	191
Suggestions for increasing utilization	196
Conclusions on the operation of the position classification system	202

Suggestions for improvement of operation.	208
Suggestions for further study	211
Summary	213
BIBLIOGRAPHY	215
APPENDIX	224

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

By way of introduction an effort has been made to present, in a logical order, a statement of the problem, its probable significance, a discussion of source materials, definition of various terms, and a preview of the remaining chapters.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In what respects has the position classification system had an impact on various phases of management in the Federal government? The term "impact," as used here, includes the concept of influence on management through (1) the by-product utilization and (2) the direct operation of the position classification plan.

The above question, as applied generally to all public institutions including the Federal government from the standpoint of published writings, and more specifically to the Washington, D. C. offices of five United States agencies from the standpoint of a questionnaire survey, constituted the core of the study at hand. In particular, the study or problem consisted of two parts. First, it involved a search of the literature to document the uses and values claimed for the position

classification system. Second, it involved conducting a questionnaire survey, with anonymous replies, combining fact and opinion concerning the degree to which a number of these uses, and the operating success, of the position classification system are actually recognized now as valid in Federal agencies by line and staff employees.

The entire study included the viewpoints taken from numerous sources, although, where the literature included repetitions of opinions, usually only one source has been cited. Some of these viewpoints were based on actual operating conditions, and some on projected conjecture. No attempt was made to determine on which of these bases the viewpoints were expressed in the literature. In the questionnaire study affecting the five agencies, however, the viewpoints were expressed primarily on the basis of operating conditions. A subordinate objective, but an important one, related to the major theme, involved documentation, in so far as was deemed practicable, of the official and unofficial source materials dealing with the uses and operation of the position classification system.

The study covered a period in United States history of about thirty years. Those thirty years included a very critical period in which the Federal merit system some-

times struggled for its very life. The major interest of the study lay in the five years' time precedent, and the two years subsequent, to the enactment of the Classification Act of 1949. Some consideration, however, was given to events and opinions pertinent to the period beginning from a few years immediately prior to the passage of the Classification Act of 1923 and extending to the present.

No particular consideration has been given to a detailed treatment of the substantive work-relationships --the minute "how it functions" aspects--of position classification to other areas of management. Some general consideration has been given to the substantive work-relationships, but it should be regarded as supplemental to the major purposes of identification, and determination of the extent to which there has been found through survey a recognition of some of the uses, criticisms, and operating success of the position classification system.

A consideration of the core, or major theme, of the thesis included such challenging and practical questions as : In what ways may position classification serve as a tool of management? Is position classification a good or harmful thing for management? Or, does it have two opposite characteristics, thus rendering it incompat-

ible, irreconcilable, and confusing? Where does responsibility lie for initiating, operating, and controlling the position classification system? Does management support position classifiers? Are position classifiers reasonably sympathetic toward management? Are position classifiers forced to operate outside their field in order to get their job done, due to management's failures? What is the impact of management on position classification? To what extent is the program, judged from a questionnaire study of five major agencies, meeting success in achieving the objectives of the position classification plan? These, and many other questions, are dealt with in the study.

II. PROBABLE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

On March 27, 1950, at the dinner meeting of the Society for Personnel Administration in Washington, D. C., Mr. Ismar Baruch, Chief of the Personnel Classification Division of the United States Civil Service Commission, was awarded the Warner W. Stockberger Award of 1949 for his outstanding contribution to personnel administration.¹ During his address and speech of acceptance, Mr. Baruch stated that no one could tell what position classification

¹ "Ismar Baruch Awarded Second Stockberger Medal" (editorial), Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (March, 1950) pp. 1-2.

will be in 1960; and that all we can do is learn as we go along.² It is hoped that this thesis will make some contribution toward what position classification should be in 1960, and in the following years; i. e., a positive tool in the attainment of good management objectives.

It is hoped that the study will result in a worthwhile contribution--though it may be a small one--to the now all-too-scarce literature on the validity of position classification as a tool of management. This lack of information, applicable not only to position classification but also to other techniques of personnel administration, has been briefly but significantly pointed out in recent publications.³ It is also hoped, although this study on position classification as a tool of management is not intended to be as detailed as a "blueprint of operations" would be on the subject, that in many instances it will provide more useful specific information in its contents or through referenced material than what appears available to the public in any single current publication.

It is fundamental that position classification is a real and living thing, important not only to the happiness of the approximately two million or more Federal

² Recorded in notes of writer who attended the meeting.

³ Society for Personnel Administration, Newsletter, II, February 1, 1951, p. 2; see also Charles S. Hyneman, Bureaucracy In A Democracy (New York : Harper and Brothers, 1950) p. 416.

employees whose salaries are now based upon it, but also to their families. Economic and, to some extent, social status are closely tied to the careers experienced by these workers as they move up or down the pyramidal structure of The Classification Act grades.

In a time when personnel offices are still on trial in their role as a staff arm of management, weighty consideration is directed toward two major factors which justify either their continuation or abolishment. These two factors are the utility and economy realized. The utilization of position classification as a tool of management, and its subsequent contribution toward an economically sound administration, might well be the corner stones upon which the decision of its survival could rest.

III. AVAILABILITY AND TYPES OF MATERIALS USED

Published literature, found in widely-separated physical locations in the Washington, D. C., area, and not too enlightening usually because of its general rather than specific nature, was freely consulted for expressions of opinion and fact. This material has been classified as either official or unofficial. The official source material includes United States Government publications such as various Acts of Congress, Congressional hearings, joint resolutions, bills, Presidential issuances, Con-

gressional reports, Comptroller General's decisions, Hoover Commission reports, and pamphlets or correspondence and reports of the United States Civil Service Commission, Bureau of the Budget, and other Federal agencies. The unofficial source material includes magazines such as Personnel Administration, Public Personnel Review, American Political Science Review, Personnel Journal, etc., and other personnel and management magazines relating historical facts, personal experiences, and opinions; and books or other written material by individual leaders and institutions interested in the field of public administration, particularly the personnel aspects.

The writer made a search for published literature on position classification in the following libraries in the Washington, D. C. area : Library of Congress; Civil Service Commission; Department of the Interior; Bureau of the Budget; American University; George Washington University; and the Clarendon, Glencarlyn and Westover branches in Arlington County, Virginia. The investigation disclosed the following about position classification literature : (1) that from the standpoint of the techniques of the system, it has been rather scarce except for what has been largely repetitive; (2) that from an over-all standpoint of policy and operation, it has begun to grow but is still largely repetitive and limited; and (3) that

from the particular standpoint of covering position classification as a tool of management it is very brief, general, and mostly repetitive. Practically all the authors made their statements on the uses of classification in a tone of finality without giving proof or elaborating on "how" or "why" it is useful.

The results of the questionnaire study conducted by the writer have been presented in Chapter IV. The questionnaire techniques employed also have been discussed.

The findings of others somewhat substantiate the viewpoint expressed above that the published materials dealing with the thesis topic are rather few in number that are not repetitive, and all are lacking in providing detailed explanations. For example, nine years ago the Assistant Chief of the Classification Section, Office of Emergency Management, in discussing the training program of about 100 position classifiers which began in April, 1941, stated:⁴

The third and most important part of the supplementary training is the consideration of a positive approach to management from the standpoint of personnel administration as a whole, and particularly from the standpoint of position classification. Here are explored the various contributions which position classification and personnel administration can make to over-all administration, and the techniques by which it can be done, including not only classification but organizational and procedural surveys.

⁴ E. Charles Woods, "Training Classification Analysts," Personnel Administration, Vol. 5 (March, 1943) pp. 14-15.

As a result of suggestions of members of the training classes, a training manual was developed, which includes a bibliography of the entire required and suggested readings in various fields, plus brief, written materials on the classification system and classification techniques, materials not otherwise available in written form. Although brief and sketchy, this manual has proved helpful.⁵

In March, 1949 the Assistant Librarian of the United States Civil Service Commission, in discussing the materials of personnel administration, stated:⁶

In the personnel field, this body of knowledge is relatively new, having developed to a great extent during the past decade . . . Even more striking is the number of specialized and general personnel books appearing just in the last year⁷ . . . It is possible to make a numerical comparison illustrating both the newness of the field and its expansion by comparing the number of items in the most comprehensive bibliography published to date with the number in a more recent one compiled in the Library of the United States Civil Service Commission.

One year later--in 1950--Mr. Hyneman, who had served five years in the Federal service in top administrative posts, in pointing to position classification as comprising the third of major complaints against Federal employment administration, stated:⁸

I set down my adverse report on classification

⁵ Italics not in the original.

⁶ Elaine Lindholm, "The Personnel Library," Personnel Administration, Vol. 11 (March, 1949) p. 27.

⁷ Italics not in the original.

⁸ Hyneman, op. cit., p. 416.

policies and practices with special caution, because the literature relating to the Civil Service Commission and civil service administration scarcely acknowledges the existence of the problems about which I write . . .

Several months after Mr. Hyneman's publication, there appeared on the market a revised edition of the book, Public Personnel Administration, in which William E. Mosher and J. Donald Kingsley were joined in authorship by O. Glenn Stahl.⁹ A review of this book by an authority¹⁰ in personnel administration pointed out that it seemed to be too detailed for those interested in a general review of the subject--such as students taking courses in public administration--and not detailed enough for those interested in a full technical discussion of the various aspects of personnel management. The book, therefore, it was felt by the reviewer hits a middle ground between those who desire the generalist and the specialist approaches to personnel administration. The book reviewer commented very briefly on position classification, pointing out that its operating administration is now an agency responsibility, subject to standards and post-audit of the Civil Service Commission, and that although the authors present an excellent discussion of

⁹ William E. Mosher, J. Donald Kingsley, and O. Glenn Stahl, Public Personnel Administration, (3d ed.; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950).

¹⁰ Milton W. Mandell, "The Current Status of Personnel Administration," Public Administration Review, XI (Winter, 1951) pp. 57-61.

the problems in establishing pay policy, they do not bring in the influence of pay on job satisfaction. The impression received by the writer was that although the book in general is excellent, the treatment by the authors of the utilization of position classification in various phases of management is very brief, broad and conclusive rather than specifically explanatory. The authors do impress upon the reader, however, that position classification is important to management.

For about eight months during the emergency war period of 1942-1943, the writer had the good fortune to accept an opportunity to attend a course of instruction in position classification at the United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C. The classes at first were held usually twice, and later once, a week and lasted generally from one to two hours. Mr. Ismar Baruch, Chief of the Personnel Classification Division at the Commission, served as instructor. Although supplementary materials were used generally in the form of problems or illustrative examples, it was felt that the best source of written information was contained in the report¹¹ by a committee of the Civil Service Assembly, under the chairmanship of Mr. Baruch. In view of this training,

¹¹ Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, Position Classification in the Public Service, A Report submitted to the Civil Service Assembly (Chicago: Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, 1941).

plus subsequent on-the-job experience, inquiry at institutions of learning, and contact with literature in the field, there is full agreement with the authors of the third edition of Public Personnel Administration that the Baruch Committee Report work is "the most complete and authoritative" on the subject.¹²

IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS EMPLOYED

Thesis and survey. Interchangeable terms to denote the entire study of the problem, comprising all chapters to form the whole work.

Questionnaire survey and questionnaire study. Interchangeable terms to denote only the study set forth in Chapter IV.

Position classification. The classification of positions to a schedule, title, class series, and grade on the basis of duties, responsibilities and qualifications required to perform the work.¹³

Tool. This term has been used intentionally in the title to stress the concept of use whereby the position classification plan should aid in solving the important and intricate operations of management.

¹² Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 201, footnote 4.

¹³ For a further discussion on the meaning of position classification, see Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 3-5.

Management. The term is not susceptible to precise definition,¹⁴ but the total job of management can be broken down into a number of tasks, or processes.¹⁵ Mooney and Reiley¹⁶ referred to management as "the vital spark which actuates, directs and controls the plan and procedure of organization." As used generally in the thesis, the term is applicable to those who have the authority and responsibility to direct others toward the achievement of management's tasks and objectives.

The Classification Act of 1949. An Act of Congress approved October 28, 1949 as Public Law 429--81st Congress, 1st session, and later incorporated in the Statutes at Large as: 63 U. S. Stat. at L. (1950) 954-973.

Agency and Department. These terms are used synonymously to include the 9 executive departments and the other independent establishments in the Executive Branch of the Federal government.

Bureau and Office. These terms are used synonymously to denote organizations which are of comparable structural level to each other, but are subordinate units

¹⁴ U. S. Bureau of the Budget, "The Tasks of Management," in Processes of Organization and Management, edited by Catheryn Seckler-Hudson (Washington : Public Affairs Press, 1948) p. 76.

¹⁵ For a discussion of the major processes of organization and management, see Catheryn Seckler-Hudson, ibid., pp. 56-75.

¹⁶ James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, Onward Industry! (New York : Harper & Bros., 1931) p. 13.

of agencies and departments.

Agency and Department levels. The structural organization level pertaining to the head of an agency or department, or his immediate staff, such as "The Office of the Secretary of the Interior."

Bureau and Office levels. The structural organization level pertaining to the head of a bureau or office, or his immediate staff.

Field level. The structural organization level of a bureau which generally is located outside of Washington, D. C., and is subordinate in authority to the Bureau level.

Government. The Federal government of the United States of America.

Classification. Position classification.

Baruch Committee Report. The report of the Committee on Position-Classification and Pay Plans in the Public Service, of the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, submitted under the chairmanship of Ismar Baruch, 1941.

Line activity. The function of command.¹⁷

Staff activity. The function of information or

¹⁷ James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, "The Principles of Organization," Papers on the Science of Administration, edited by Luther Gulick and L. Urwick. (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937) pp.89-98.

counsel.¹⁸

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE THESIS

In order to develop the survey in a logical manner, the remaining portion has been divided sequentially into four chapters. The first chapter which follows consists of a brief outline of the classification plan. The two succeeding chapters consist of (1) a determination of what various champions of the position classification system felt, expected, and declared it could do or was doing for management; and (2) a determination, through the questionnaire technique, of some current attitudes of groups of management toward the degrees of effectiveness and utilization which the position classification system has attained in connection with their line and staff functions as a test against the preceding chapter. The final chapter consists of a resume of the entire problem of the thesis culminating in brief conclusions and recommendations.

VI. SUMMARY

One of the two primary problems of the thesis is to determine the uses and values claimed for the position

¹⁸ Loc. cit.

classification system, as applicable in general to public institutions, and document each of them to a particular source. The other primary problem is to test by the questionnaire method the validity or applicability of these claims in so far as five Federal agencies located in Washington, D. C. are concerned. The uses made of position classification and the operating effectiveness attained in the system are important to management. The written material now in existence in the libraries gives an inadequate treatment of the problems here involved.

CHAPTER II

THE FEDERAL POSITION CLASSIFICATION PLAN

The Federal position classification plan has been covered in this chapter only to the extent deemed necessary to acquaint the uninformed reader with its identity, purposes, and process, as well as with the responsibility for its administration, in order to enhance one's basic understanding of the entire thesis subject.

I. BASIC AUTHORITY

The first comprehensive single piece of Federal legislation dealing with position classification was the Classification Act of 1923.¹ This Act was repealed by Public Law 429--81st Congress, 1st session (63 U. S. Stat. at L. 954-973), known as the "Classification Act of 1949," which kept in force the basic concepts of the former law but streamlined and otherwise improved it.

II DISTINCT FROM OTHER PLANS IN THE ACT

Although specifically stated in the introduction of the law that it may be cited as the "Classification Act of 1949," the Act contains numerous items that are not a part of the position classification plan. Some of

¹ 42 U. S. Stat. at L., 1488-1499.

these matters, although related indirectly in some manner to position classification, are actually plans or programs in themselves. A clear distinction exists between the classification plan of the Act, which is the primary interest of this study, and those matters which in complete substantive form represent different types of programs. Those items, for the most part, are concerned with the plans for salary,² efficiency ratings³ (now called performance ratings), and management improvement administration.⁴

The distinction between, and the relationship of, the pay plan to the classification plan are more confusing than all the others contained in the Act. Because the pay plan is based upon the classification plan in the Federal government, both are sometimes mistakenly regarded as synonymous. Another contributing factor to this confusion of relationship, it is believed, is due to combining on the part of Congress the pay with the duties concept in a single statement in Section 101 (1), Title I, "Declaration of Policy," of the current basic statute. The fact that these concepts are thus combined in a single breath, so to speak, tends to give the

² See Titles VI, VII and VIII of 63 U. S. Stat. at L. (1950), 959-970.

³ See Title IX, ibid., 970-971.

⁴ See Title X, ibid., 971.

illusion that they are one and the same.

Actually, the two are distinct in basis, purpose, and technique.⁵ The position classification plan provides for the grouping of positions into classes on the basis of duties, responsibilities and qualifications required to perform the work, each class being designated by a descriptive title, which is defined by a statement of duties, responsibilities, typical tasks, and qualification standards. The pay plan, however, is a plan by which the scales of pay for positions, previously established and allocated to grades and classes under the classification plan, are determined. More simply stated, the position classification plan serves to place positions into classes; the pay plan serves to fix the salary scale for each class, for each position, and the pay rate for each employee at any particular time. The two plans, therefore, are not the same thing or even parts of each other. In some jurisdictions outside the Federal government, it has been found that the position classification plan had no relation whatever to pay matters.⁶

⁵ See Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, Position Classification in the Public Service, A Report submitted to the Civil Service Assembly (Chicago: Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, 1941), pp. 52-54 for distinction of pay plans from classification plans in both public and private jurisdictions.

⁶ See Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 52-53, footnote 36, for study by O. C. Short.

There is a distinction in responsibility for pay and position classification matters between the executive and the legislative branches of the Federal government. The fixing of pay policy and pay scales is a legislative responsibility, but the classification of positions is an executive function.⁷ Such division of responsibility--not clear to many people--may also account for further confusion between the two plans. At any rate it is important to keep in mind that there are certain factors for Congress to consider in determining pay matters which are not to be considered by the Executive Branch in classifying individual positions. The factors generally entering into the basis of a pay plan are of a socio-economic, fiscal and administrative nature. Some of these include, for example, cost of living as represented in a reasonable minimum family budget, comparison between pay levels in private industry and in the public service, recency and effect of previous salary adjustments, etc.⁸

The other plans contained in the Classification Act of 1949, i. e., performance ratings and management improvement, present no problem in distinguishing them from the position classification system. Their contents

⁷ See infra, pp. 39-40.

⁸ For further discussion, see Ismar Baruch, Facts and Fallacies About Position Classification, Pamphlet No. 10 (Chicago: Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, 1937) pp. 14-15.

and purposes are so obvious in character that discussion herein does not appear necessary.

III. OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the Classification Act of 1949, as expressed in Section 101 (1), of Title I, "Declaration of Policy," was to provide a plan for the classification of positions whereby the determination of the rate of basic compensation to be received by an officer or employee would be based upon the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work, and differences in rates of basic compensation would be in proportion to substantial differences in the difficulty, responsibility and qualification requirements of the work performed, and to the contributions of officers and employees to efficiency and economy in service.

Considered in terms of the position classification process only, Section 101 (1) of the policy statement of the Act declares that the principle of equal grades for substantially equal work shall be followed, and that variations in grades accorded to positions occupied by officers and employees shall be in proportion to substantial differences in the difficulty, responsibility and qualification requirements of the work performed.

The objectives of the position classification

system are aimed at fairness in establishing grade levels, and also at usefulness to management. The concept of utilization was first expressed in the Act in Section 101 (2) of Title I:

Individual positions shall, in accordance with their duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements, be so grouped and identified by classes and grades, as defined in section 301, and the various classes shall be so described in published standards, as provided for in title IV, that the resulting position-classification system can be used in all phases of personnel administration.

It may be said, in the opinion of the writer, that the ideal purposes of the system are: (1) to better enable the taxpayer to receive a just return in services for the taxes paid by him; (2) to enable management to equitably reward its employees for services rendered; (3) to instill in the employee the belief that his output in terms of pay will be substantially equal with other government employees, similarly engaged, to his input in terms of work performed; and (4) to serve as a useful tool of management.

IV. ESSENTIALS OF FEDERAL CLASSIFICATION PLAN

The congressional policies, or objectives, in regard to the Federal position classification plan have been related. Brief references to the mechanics and

details for those policies is covered below.

Section 601 of Title VI, "Basic Compensation Schedules," of the Classification Act of 1949 established two schedules for positions to which the Act applied. These are called the "General Schedule" and the "Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule." Title VI divided the General Schedule into eighteen, and the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule into ten grades of difficulty and responsibility of work.

Section 301 of Title III, "Basis for Classifying Positions," defined three basic terms, as follows:

"Position" means the work, consisting of the duties and responsibilities, assignable to an officer or employee.

"Class" or "classes of positions" includes all positions which are sufficiently similar, as to (A) kind or subject-matter of work, (B) level of difficulty and responsibility, and (C) the qualification requirements of the work, to warrant similar treatment in personnel and pay administration.

"Grade" includes all classes of positions which (although different with respect to kind or subject-matter of work) are sufficiently equivalent as to (A) level of difficulty and responsibility, and (B) level of qualification requirements of the work, to warrant the inclusion of such classes of positions within one range of rates of basic compensation, as specified in title VI.

The statutory provisions basic to Federal position classification have been supplemented by the Civil Service Commission in published regulations. These regulations

included the statutory terms and the process and, at the same time introduced additional nomenclature and steps in the process to give a more complete picture of what is actually involved in classifying, or allocating, positions.⁹

V. RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTRATION

The responsibility for administration of the position classification system is a joint one. Grounded in the roots of Congress which gave it official sanction, the classification system is partially the responsibility of that body as well as of the President of the United States, the Civil Service Commission, the agencies, supervisors, and classification technicians. An elaboration upon the responsibility applicable in each instance, follows.

The Congress. Congressional responsibility for setting policy and investigating the administration of its laws by the Executive Branch is well established. The power to conduct investigations is proof of this responsibility put to action.¹⁰ Delegation of authority

⁹ U. S. Civil Service Commission. Handbook of Occupational Groups and Series of Classes Established Under the Federal Position-Classification Plan. "Introduction." (Washington : Government Printing Office; July, 1950) pp. 1-3.

¹⁰ See Wilfred E. Binkley, President and Congress (New York : Alfred A. Knopf, 1947) pp. 40-41, for first investigation in 1791.

for administration does not allow the delegator to abdicate his over-all responsibility. The fact that Congress often amends its Acts is proof of its awareness that the laws may be imperfect when enacted, or may become obsolete later. The Classification Act of 1923, for example, was amended many times to alter the descriptions of work and the rates of compensation. It is somewhat significant of Congress's continuing responsibility that it made specific provision in the Classification Act of 1949¹¹ for further consideration to be given within one year to the proposed factor of hazard as another basis for fixing additional compensation.

The next year when the national defense program began to gather momentum the House Appropriations Committee offered some personnel riders to the omnibus budget bill. The riders, among other things, were designed to prevent the overclassification of positions such as was experienced during the early days of World War II.¹² Only recently the so-called "Whitten Amendment" was made a part of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1952. This amendment requires every agency to report to Congress each year on actions taken for two objectives: (a) to determine that each new and up-graded job is properly

¹¹ See Section 803.

¹² Jerry Kluttz, "The Federal Diary," The Washington Post, August 25, 1950, Sec. A, pp. 1 and 19.

classified, and (b) to abolish jobs found to be unnecessary.¹³

Congressional responsibility for position classification was vividly pointed out in testimony taken during consideration of the first appropriation bill reported in the first session of Congress following the enactment of the Classification Act of 1923.¹⁴ It was considered the duty of Congress, and the special duty of the Committee on Appropriations, to follow a fixed policy in making appropriations "carrying the classification act into effect that will make the application of the law uniform in all departments of the Government." Congress was charged with responsibility of doing justice not only to the Treasury of the United States but also to the people who are employed by the Federal government.

The President. The specific authority and responsibility of the President of the United States alone to place positions in or remove them from Grade 18 of the General Schedule is contained in Section 505 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949. As head of the Executive Branch, the President of the United States has general

¹³ Kluttz, *ibid.*, January 15, 1952, Sec. B, p. 1, col. 1. See also Public Law No. 253, 82d Cong., 1st sess., Sec. 1310. (Nov. 1, 1951).

¹⁴ U. S. Congress. Congressional Record. 68th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. 65, pt. 1, on Jan. 10, 1924. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1929), p. 788, col. 2; and p. 791, col. 1.

responsibility for the administration of all the executive agencies. The Pendleton Act of 1883, which created the Civil Service Commission, gave the President complete authority over the rules and regulations issued by the Commission. The same Act also left it up to President Arthur to decide whether to appoint the three commissioners or not appoint them, as he saw fit. Thus, "so far as the plain words of the Act are concerned," any President may put an end to the Civil Service Commission by refusing to appoint commissioners.¹⁵

Civil Service Commission. Direct, continuing, and specific over-all authority of the Civil Service Commission in classification matters is contained in Title V, "Authority and Procedure," of the Classification Act of 1949. This Act made clear, for the first time, that it was the Commission's responsibility to establish position classification standards. The Commission may post-audit agency allocations at any time, certify the findings which are binding on the agencies, suspend or revoke part or all of the authority granted to an agency, allocate grades GS-16 and GS-17, and recommend to the President allocations in grade GS-18.

The agencies and supervisors. The responsibility

¹⁵ Charles S. Hyneman, Bureaucracy In A Democracy (New York : Harper and Brothers, 1950) p. 385.

of the agencies for the administration of the classification plan also is contained in Title V of the Act. The agencies allocate through the GS-15 grade level in accordance with published standards. Regulations of the Civil Service Commission¹⁶ and apparently all of the agencies state that the supervisors and employees should share responsibility for keeping allocations current, and may prepare position descriptions. The line employees, being closer to the work performed, are better situated than anyone else for keeping job descriptions current and it therefore appears only logical to charge them with this responsibility.

Position classifiers. Position classifiers serve as technical advisors on the classification system, allocate or recommend allocations, assist management in keeping the plan current, and supplement other phases of administration. The extent to which they should be staff advisors on the one hand, and/or operators on the other, is a matter of growing interest.¹⁷ The extent to which in practice they actually advise, dictate to, or become

¹⁶ U. S. Civil Service Commission. Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter P2 (Washington : Government Printing Office; approved January 28, 1946) p. 22.

¹⁷ Francis E. McGilvery, "An Objective for Position Classification," Personnel Administration, Vol. 14 (January, 1951) pp. 32 ff.; and Ogden C. Reed, "Streamlining the Classification Process," Personnel Administration, Vol. 14 (May, 1951) pp. 31-38.

pressured by management are also matters of growing concern.¹⁸

VI. ORGANIZATIONAL LOCATION OF POSITION CLASSIFICATION

The answers usually given to the question of where, in a Federal agency, the position classification program should be located are not uniform when applied from either a structural or a functional standpoint. It has, in fact, operated in various locations.

Situations have existed whereby the classification office enjoyed a close work-relationship from a structural standpoint to the head of the agency. For example, the Department of Agriculture created "the first departmental personnel office in 1923, when Mr. Stockberger became adviser on classification to the Secretary."¹⁹ For a long time Mr. John Harvey was Director of Classification in the Department of the Interior, reporting to the Secretary. Other situations of this close relationship of the classification officer to the top manager also existed.

More frequently the question has arisen on a functional basis, of whether to locate the classification

¹⁸ McGilvery, op. cit., pp. 32-33; also, see infra, pp. 123-24 for comments #3, #6 and #7.

¹⁹ John M. Gaus, and Leon O. Wolcott, Public Administration and the Department of Agriculture (Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1940) p. 344.

program among the following offices: (a) budget and finance, (b) personnel, and (c) organization and methods.²⁰ The classification system affects these functions in so many ways that it is only natural that the question of organizational arrangement should arise. All of them need information furnished by a classification plan.

The administration of the position classification system is now a responsibility of the personnel organization, in the Federal government.²¹ The debate of its proper location, however, goes on.²²

VII. SUMMARY

The basic authority for the conduct of the Federal position classification system is now contained in the Classification Act of 1949. This Act as a legal instrument, in addition to the position classification plan,

²⁰ See Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 281-297; Leonard D. White, Introduction to the Study of Public Administration (New York: MacMillan, 1939) pp. 328-329; and William E. Mosher and J. Donald Kingsley, Public Personnel Administration (Revised ed., New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941) p. 431. The 1950 edition by Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, p. 215, does not discuss the question as fully as the former publication.

²¹ United States Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Report No. 2198...on Organization, Functions, and Relative Costs of Personnel Offices, 80th Cong., 2d sess., June 4, 1948 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948).

²² See infra, pp. 155-158.

contains other separate and distinct plans dealing with such matters as pay, performance and management improvement. The basic objectives of the classification plan are to achieve the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work, and be of use to management. Positions are classified to grades, class series, and schedules and are further designated by titles. Responsibility for administering the classification plan is shared jointly by Congress, the President, the agencies, supervisors and employees, and position classifiers. The position classification function is organizationally located in the Personnel office, although the question is sometimes still raised as to whether it should remain in personnel or be established elsewhere.

CHAPTER III.

USES OF POSITION CLASSIFICATION

It is clear that Congress from the time of the first Classification Act, intended the position classification system to be utilized on a wider range than merely to function as a technical process, an end objective within itself. As has been pointed out, the concept of use was specified in the Act of 1949 in connection with all phases of personnel administration. In addition Congress specified in Section 401 (c) of Title IV of the Act of 1949 that official class titles established by standards of the Civil Service Commission shall be used for personnel, budget, and fiscal purposes. The preamble of the Classification Act of 1949, in explaining the intent of Congress, ends with a catch-all phrase: "and for other purposes."

Various claims, allegations and suggestions have been made over the years as to the ways in which the position classification system could be, or was being utilized in government or other public institutions as a tool of management. Since the authors often did not make any particular distinction in applicability between institutions when setting forth their claims, the writer has made no attempt to do so herein. This chapter brings together

the claims, allegations and suggestions made and documents them to various authors. For documentation purposes, the uses were arrived at by an individual search for, and study of, written materials found through the use of card catalogues, bibliographies, library reference lists, and footnote references in publications.

"General administration," as has been applied in this chapter, refers to line administration primarily. It also has been applied in instances where the same classification use is applicable to two or more staff functions, or to both line and staff functions. The terms "budget," "fiscal," "personnel," and "organization and methods," refer to staff functions which are self-explanatory.

I. USES IN GENERAL ADMINISTRATION¹

In establishing uniform occupational terminology.

The basic authoritative technical work on position classification placed this use first in the order of its discussion on eight principal specific advantages of the

¹ For a discussion of this topic as related primarily to ungraded jobs in industry, although largely applicable to classified positions in the Federal service, see Robert D. Gray, "Job Analysis As a Technique of Supervision," Personnel, Vol. 18 (March, 1942) pp. 296-303. The term "supervision" as used by Gray is similar to "administration" as used by the writer.

over-all system.² Since it is not uncommon for position classifiers to describe the most important part of a job first, or to request others to follow the same procedure, and since the authors were classification specialists, their placement of this use at the head for discussion is suggestive that it may have been considered the most important one.

Brief, informative titles are time-savers in daily communications. When properly established and used, titles save time and eliminate confusion in correspondence, budgets, personnel records, statistical reports and other such documents. The administration of line and staff functions, by oral or written media, may be facilitated by the use of unambiguous terms supported by definitions. Thus, a simple request to hire 100 civil engineers GS-5 should in itself make known the work to be performed, the degree of responsibility involved, and the qualifications required. A statement that the property and supply function was being mishandled by the administrative officer should be sufficient to identify the general kind of work entailed. It should also serve as

² Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, Position Classification in the Public Service, A Report Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly (Chicago: Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, 1941) p. 56.

a basis for further investigation in the pertinent work area to fix responsibility and correct inadequacies.

One of the principal reasons for the installation and possible subsequent readjustment of the position classification system anywhere is due to the confusion brought about by the use of misleading titles. In Chicago, for instance, around 1909 or 1910, this dilemma existed particularly among the appointing officers, the Mayor, the city council, and the civil service commission. Not only did the need to standardize titles bring about the original installation of position classification in the United States by Chicago,³ and subsequent adoption by the Federal government in 1923,⁴ but it has played an active part in recent efforts to improve administration of the system in both city⁵ and Federal governments.⁶ As has been pointed out, the Classification Act of 1949

³ Fred Telford, "The Classification and Salary Standardization Movement in the Public Service," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 113 (May, 1924) p. 206.

⁴ United States Congress. Joint Commission on Re-classification of Salaries. Report, ... House Document No. 686, 66th Cong., 2d sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1920) 844 pp.

⁵ Maxwell Lehman, "Why New York City Job System Must Be Overhauled," Civil Service Leader (November 9, 1948) p. 13.

⁶ United States Congress. Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Hearings before a subcommittee... on S. 558... and other bills, to Adjust Salaries of Postal Employees and Employees Under the Classification Act of 1923, as Amended, and other Employees, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949) pp. 38, and 300-302.

specifically requires the use of classification titles in various fields of administration.⁷ The Congressional objective was to obtain uniformity and simplicity.

The most exhaustive classification study ever conducted was in 1928 by the Personnel Classification Board. It analyzed about 104,000 field positions. There was found to exist such poor relationship between titles and work that the Board "allowed it to be inferred that they were the result of design rather than accident."⁸

The use of a uniform system of titles for positions and kinds of work in operating and personnel procedures should need little explanation.⁹ It is apparently for this reason that little explanation is to be found in published documents. It is well recognized that a standard classification of expenditures is needed in fiscal administration, and a uniform nomenclature of supplies and equipment is prerequisite to procurement and stock control. It is not illogical, therefore, to classify positions for administrative uses.

In providing a formal system. There are those who favor procedure and method, lodged in written docu-

⁷ See supra, p. 32.

⁸ Lucius Wilmerding, Government By Merit (New York : McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1935) p. 43.

⁹ U. S. Personnel Classification Board, Closing Report of Wage and Personnel Survey, H. Doc. 771, 71st Cong., 3d sess. (Washington : Government Printing Office, 1931) pp. 165-166.

ments, to administration by whim and one's fancy which may be encouraged by the lack of specified conduct. The use of position classification contributes to order and uniformity by providing a formal system for doing specific things.¹⁰ Confusion increases and morale slumps when matters are decided in a haphazard way. There is bound to be less confusion and higher morale when orderly system is followed instead of no system. One of the three main reasons why classification and salary standardization Acts are passed is to bring about uniformity of policy throughout the agencies covered.¹¹

Position classification also increases the effectiveness of administration by providing a formal source for systematic, important records upon which management decisions can be based.¹² Such a tool of administration, while not as glamorous as the contribution referred to above made in the process of actually carrying out the principles of classification, nevertheless serves an important purpose.

In administrative research. In exploring various

¹⁰ Lewis Meriam, Public Personnel Problems, From the Standpoint of the Operating Officer (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1938) p. 31.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 33.

¹² Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 56, footnote 2.

methods of research in the field of public administration, it has been pointed out that position classification can serve as a useful tool. It may, for example, help the "researcher" or government fact-finder to locate and solve work flow bottlenecks,¹³ to understand the structural and functional organization,¹⁴ to develop new techniques of time and motion study stopping short of stop-watch timing and motion-picture filming,¹⁵ to conduct research planning,¹⁶ to classify data,¹⁷ and to chart intelligently.¹⁸

Research, with a view to establishing facts upon which remedial or improved actions may be taken, is a necessary function in many positions. In some positions, such as those of line officers, the degree of research carried on is necessarily less while in others of a staff nature a full time research function may be possible.

The fact that Federal personnel offices are gradually adding research analysts to their staffs, suggest the probability that classification may be playing an important role in this field of administration. Not

¹³ John M. Pfiffner, Research Methods In Public Administration. Political Science Series (New York : The Ronald Press Co., 1940) p. 91.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 91-92.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 93 and 314-315.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 108.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 139.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 298.

only the basic data, but the investigative and analytical processes employed in position classification could well be adapted and utilized in undertaking research problems.

In clarifying jurisdiction of political branches.

The classification system has played an important role in bringing about a greater clarification of the jurisdiction of the executive and legislative branches in personnel and related administrative matters. The struggle between these two major branches of the Federal government for patronage or merit control is the subject of discussion in most of the standard textbooks on public and personnel administration, which also give references to more lengthy treatments.¹⁹ Jurisdictional disputes and confusion had to be minimized before sound administration could begin. The two classification acts, one required to establish and the other to improve the position classification system, were milestones in distinguishing between the policy role of Congress and the management execution function of the President and other officials of the executive branch. Line administration could not carry on effectively without this substantial clarification in authority.

¹⁹ For one such reference, see Wilfred E. Binkley, President and Congress (New York : Alfred A. Knopf, 1947).

The Federal classification acts of 1923 and 1949,²⁰ supplemented by recorded testimony, clearly met and clarified the issue of jurisdiction. It was pointed out early in 1924, for example, that Congress sets the pay scales and the over-all policy and standards for position classification, but it could not revise the grade allocations made by the executive branch nor should it listen to appeals.²¹

In conducting public relations. The Committee on Position Classification and Pay Plans in the Public Service, of the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, did not include the use of position classification in public relations as one of its principal advantages. In its discussion of class specifications, however, the committee made the statement that "they inform civic and taxpayers' groups of the kinds of services to which specified scales of pay apply".²²

The public relations service to be performed by position classification should not be minimized. Soon after the passage of the first Federal classification Act, it was pointed out that the system provides a public

²⁰ See supra, pp. 24-29.

²¹ U. S. Congress. Congressional Record. 68th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. 65, pt. 1, on January 10, 1924. (Washington : Government Printing Office, 1929) p. 790.

²² Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 247-248.

comparison between what the position requires and what qualifications the candidate for the office actually possesses.²³ It seems apparent, however, that little has been done to inform the public of the great responsibilities, and comparatively small pay, which go with many Federal jobs. It is also significant that the Hoover Commission Reports, although criticising many things, contained no statement that Federal employees as a group are not competent.²⁴ If the public were aware of the true state of affairs, it would be less prone to abuse the Federal servant.²⁵ Although studies and opinions more often reflect the disdain of the public for the Federal employee, one ray of sunshine was revealed a few years ago by the Gallup Poll which indicated that the younger generation preferred government service after medicine and engineering.²⁶

The public relations aspects of position classification have a bearing on internal administration, as well as on the interests of special groups outside the govern-

²³ Lewis Meriam, "The Uses of a Personnel Classification in the Public Service," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 113 (May 1924) p. 216.

²⁴ Cecil E. Goode, "The Challenge of Big Government," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (Sept., 1949) p.2.

²⁵ Gordon R. Clapp, "What Price Ability in the Public Service?," Personnel Administration Vol. 10 (May, 1948) pp. 1-4.

²⁶ Goode, op. cit., p. 1.

ment. As Meriam reported in 1924,²⁷ the preparation and publication of position classification statements enormously strengthens the hand of the personnel officer desiring to render the public real service but struggling against crafty pressure for improper appointments. As for group interests outside the government, one recent example of public relations ramifications revolved around the reallocation of sixteen GS-9 clinical psychology positions.²⁸ This particular controversy involved the sixteen clinical psychologists, the Board of Directors of the American Psychological Association, a special committee of the APA, a New York professional association, and the Veterans Administration. An extensive investigation was held, and a large number of letters and some telegrams were exchanged. At the conclusion of the inquiry, the APA committee found that the VA acted entirely within its legal rights and recommended that the association take no further part in the controversy. The interest of special groups is also manifested by the exclusion in Title II, of certain types of positions from jurisdiction of the Classification Act of 1949.

In clarifying management objectives. One of the

²⁷ Meriam, loc. cit.

²⁸ American Psychological Association, "Reallocation of GS-9 Clinical Psychology Positions in the Veterans Administration," The American Psychologist, Vol. 5 (Oct., 1950) pp. 518-519.

prerequisites to a successful business organization is the establishment of sound objectives that are acceptable to the employees. The objectives in mind here are the over-all major purposes and results to be achieved by the organization; not the immediate area of activity restricted to a single-function line supervisor or division head.

The requirement of the position classification system that positions shall be allocated on the basis of their duties and responsibilities makes it necessary to determine, define, and express the assignments in writing prior to analysis by classifiers. If doubt rested in the minds of top management before as to the objectives of the organization, the requirement to set forth the major aims in position descriptions should send them out on investigation until their questions had been answered. They thereby obtain an educational value²⁹ themselves due to the operation of the classification system. Writing and investigation make for clarity and exactness.

In exercising supervision. The uses of position classification as an aid in the work-execution supervision of others have been rather comprehensively treated in a formal document by the United States Civil Service Commis-

²⁹ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 80, footnote 55.

sion.³⁰ The pamphlet covers the advantages of classification in helping the supervisor get the total work of his unit done effectively, in clarifying and dividing work assignments, in planning the organization, in affording an opportunity for the employer and employee to become better acquainted through discussions of the work, and in other phases of direct supervision.

Position classification was also designed as a tool to bring about efficiency and economy in supervision. The Classification Act of 1949 specifically discourages the unnecessary increase of an organization's staff by stating, in no uncertain terms, that a position shall not be allocated "solely on the basis of the size of the group, section, bureau, or other organization unit or the number of subordinates supervised".³¹ Actually, this has always been the policy of the United States Civil Service Commission position classification administrators, although it has not been as well known to other officials as was desirable. Even before the passage of the Classification Act of 1923, the fact that the merit system required an occupational classification was joined with a general demand for greater efficiency in the Federal

³⁰ U. S. Civil Service Commission, Personnel Classification Division. Position Classification As An Aid to Supervision (Washington: Government Printing Office; Feb., 1945).

³¹ See Sec. 303 of 63 U. S. Stat. at L. (1950) 957.

government.³² It is fundamental that efficiency and economy are brought about by good supervision.

The technical process of classifying positions may be invoked to discourage poor supervision and effect economy in management. For example, the classifier may refuse to allocate to higher grades positions which only partly comprise the higher grade work that has been deliberately reassigned from another position that formerly contained all the work.³³ The United States Civil Service Commission has recently gone on record with a proposed regulation for allocating "mixed positions" which discourages supervisors from making an uneconomical distribution of the work of their units.³⁴

The head of a Federal bureau,³⁵ while requesting Congress to make the positions in his agency subject to the Classification Act of 1923, based his request to a large extent upon the fact that the personal attitudes of supervisors very often were conditioning the salaries paid in individual sections of the organization, thus

³² William E. Mosher, J. Donald Kingsley, and O. Glenn Stahl, Public Personnel Administration (3d ed.; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950) p. 209.

³³ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 136, footnote 55.

³⁴ Departmental Circular No. 635, August 11, 1950.

³⁵ U. S. Congress. Senate Committee on Appropriations, Hearings...on the Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1939, on H. J. Res. 326, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1939) pp. 119-120.

resulting in inequities. A sound classification plan, it was pointed out, would obviate personal considerations.

Lewis Meriam in "The Uses of a Personnel Classification in the Public Service,"³⁶ pointed out another use of classification in supervision. He called attention to the fact that a duties classification with qualification statements helps the administrator in checking the judgments of his subordinates who promote employees.

One of the by-product advantages of the position classification system has been its definition of supervision and a further explanation of what it consists. It is not uncommon for employees to wander about in a labyrinth of uncertainty between the distinctions of "supervision" and "review" at some time or other. The distinctions, in order to fix the degree of responsibility and establish the proper relationship of employees, are necessary. Referral of interested parties to the Baruch Committee Report³⁷ or to the United States Civil Service Commission Class Specifications and Statements of Allocation Standards for the Hydraulic Engineering Series P-850-0 (converted to GS-813-0), for example, subtitle "Nature and Extent of Supervisory Control Over the Work of Other

³⁶ Meriam, loc. cit.

³⁷ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 118-121.

Employees,"³⁸ should clarify any question that might have existed relative to the scope and content of the "supervisory pattern".

In maintaining morale. A survey³⁹ made of the various factors which result in high or low morale discloses, upon analysis, that many of the elements are also connected directly or indirectly with the classification process. Some of these factors, to list only a few, are: (1) equal pay for substantially equal work; (2) fair treatment of employees; and (3) a minimum of politics and favoritism in the organization. These factors, as elements which maintain high morale, are well understood; but attention is particularly invited to the study of an authority⁴⁰ regarding the result in low morale due to favoritism by supervisors.

The same authority gives two methods⁴¹ for developing morale: (1) to make certain that employees understand the why and wherefore of their duties; and (2) to delegate and fix responsibility. The position classification plan requires the exercise of these two methods in its administration.

³⁸ U. S. Civil Service Commission, Personnel Classification Division (Washington : Government Printing Office; February, 1949) unnumbered p. 24.

³⁹ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 286.

⁴⁰ Lewis Meriam, Public Personnel Problems, op. cit., pp. 225-228.

⁴¹ Meriam, op. cit., p. 235.

In distinguishing wage and salaried employees.

The Classification Act, as a legal instrument, serves as a tool of management by setting forth both the inclusions and exclusions of various types of positions in existence. One author⁴² has referred to the advantage of distinguishing between exempt and non-exempt employees as a "beneficial by-product", in discussing job evaluation of ungraded positions. It is important, however, from the standpoint of labor relations. The various unions are sensitive about such matters as jurisdiction, membership, and methods of setting pay. Loud clamoring from them at offices confused about the distinction, and therefore the treatment, of wage and salaried employees can result in great embarrassment for the offending organization.

II. USES IN FISCAL ADMINISTRATION

In providing the base for pay plan. A historical sketch given by Congressman Madden,⁴³ during the hearings on the first appropriation bill presented after the enactment of the Classification Act of 1923, disclosed the

⁴² W. D. Jack, "Describing and Rating Positions for a Salary Evaluation Program," Noma Forum, Vol. 19 (Oct., 1943) p. 17.

⁴³ U. S. Congress. Congressional Record (68th Cong., 1st sess. Vol. 65, pt. 1, op. cit., p. 788, 2d col.

unsatisfactory practice of fixing compensation that had been followed in the past. The question of fixing pay of civil employees had always been a troublesome one, both to Congress and the departments. There had been no uniform policy or procedure in the departments, except for about 10 per cent of the salaries which were fixed by specific statutory law. Each department head set his own rates under general lump sum appropriations for the remaining 90 per cent. No two heads of departments had set the same rates for the same class of work; therefore, a system of discrimination had grown up until it became a source of annoyance, injustice and trouble.

Congressman Madden predicted that "in the long run" the Act would work out a system of uniformity and justice in compensation. The Act as passed was directly applicable to the 54,000 positions in the District of Columbia, and it required a "classification" to be made and submitted to Congress which would cover the field employees of more than 100,000. The class specifications prepared were never officially made applicable to the field by Congressional action. In actual practice, however, the departments did use them for guides (without Civil Service post audit) so that some degree of uniformity in setting grade levels was possible.

Fred Telford observed seventeen years ago in "The

Classification and Salary Standardization Movement in the Public Service,"⁴⁴ that the installation of a duties classification system has a strong tendency to force consideration of the compensation problem and to lead, sooner or later, to the development and adoption of some sort of compensation plan. While money is not necessarily the most important work incentive, it is one that can not be over-looked.⁴⁵

The Baruch Committee Report ⁴⁶ stated that a definite salary policy could be based upon the classification plan. The policy of paying Federal employees on the basis of the ultimate position classification factors of difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements of the work was set forth by Congress in the first section of the Classification Act of 1949. In the Federal position classification system, payment according to grade allocations is not only authorized but required.⁴⁷

In 1938 Lewis Meriam listed the fixing and controlling of salaries as one of the two major uses of classification.⁴⁸ He did not elaborate, however, on why he felt

⁴⁴ Annals, op. cit., p. 209.

⁴⁵ For discussion of employee incentives for work other than pay see Walter Scott, R. C. Clothier, S. B. Mathewson, and W. R. Spriegel, Personnel Management (3d ed.; New York : McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1941) pp. 303-310.

⁴⁶ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 61.

⁴⁷ 4 Comp. Gen. 56, July 14, 1924. Also, for some interesting recent cases, see C. G. B-11756, January 23, 1951.

⁴⁸ Meriam, op. cit., pp. 29.

this was one of the two primary services it performs. In 1924 he had pointed out that classification is used for standardizing government salaries; i. e., equal pay for substantially equal work.⁴⁹

Various other advantages in basing fiscal administration upon duties classification have been referred to by parties interested in the subject. The Baruch Committee Report⁵⁰ pointed out that classification provides a reference whereby the administrator can explain and defend why some employees are paid less and others are paid more. W. D. Jack⁵¹ reminded one that any good salary evaluation program should aid in correcting, or at least in minimizing, the exploitation by department heads of the younger members by paying them less than they are worth. Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl⁵² declared that the financial agency could not properly perform its functions unless titles and their definitions describe the duties and responsibilities and indicate the qualifications necessary to fill them.

In distinguishing between grade and salary advancement plans. The position classification plan makes possible

⁴⁹ Meriam, "The Uses of a Personnel Classification in the Public Service," op. cit., p. 217.

⁵⁰ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 61.

⁵¹ Jack, op. cit., p. 14.

⁵² Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 203; also, see supra, pp. 34-36.

a clear distinction between a grade promotion and a salary advancement, as was pointed out in the Baruch Committee Report.⁵³ Where there are more salary plans than one to be administered by the fiscal office, it is obvious that they be clearly distinguished in order to avoid confusion. The Classification Act of 1949 contains several salary plans, only one of which is based entirely upon the classification system. The variations in amounts of pay, the time requirements, the methods of justification, and the procedures of disbursement are some of the items which differentiate these plans from each other.

Although only one pay scheme was based entirely on it, the classification system made direct mechanical contributions to two salary plans. In regard to the pay plan based entirely on the grade structure (Titles VI and VIII of the Classification Act of 1949), the classification system contributed to the establishment of twenty-eight pay ranges condensed into two schedules, and the uniform pay treatment for new appointments, promotions and transfers. In regard to the longevity step increase plan (Section 703 (b) (1) of the Act) the position classification grade structure furnished a control bench mark

⁵³ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 70, footnote 29.

at and below which (grade GS-10) payments may be made, and above which disbursements are prohibited.

Indirect contributions are made by the classification system to the longevity and three other salary plans. Payments under the within-grade salary plan (Section 701 (B) of the Classification Act of 1949), and the longevity step increase plan, are conditioned upon satisfactory employee performance ratings⁵⁴ which, in turn, are based upon job content that can be supplied more or less through the classification process. Payments under the superior accomplishment awards pay plan (Section 702 (a) of the Act) are made in accordance with standards promulgated by the Civil Service Commission.⁵⁵ These standards, among other things, require an outstanding performance above the normal requirements of the position. The classification system provides information that will identify the normal position requirements. Payments made under the management improvement awards plan (Title X of the Act) for efficiency and economy may be made as the result of information supplied by the classification office. This information has to do with

⁵⁴ See sections 9 and 10 of Public Law No. 873, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (September 30, 1950). "The Performance Rating Act of 1950."

⁵⁵ U. S. Civil Service Commission. Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter Z-1, T.S. No. 317 (Washington: Government Printing Office; November 13, 1950) p. 315.

identifying supervisors and employees, and their functions or organization units.

In granting equitable salary treatment to formerly excepted employees brought under the system for the first time. Congress was aware that some injustice might be suffered by employees of the government, hired originally by agencies excepted from the civil service classification system, when their positions were made applicable to the plan for the first time.⁵⁶ The legislators felt that such employees hired in good faith at an agreed-upon salary should not be penalized in pay through improvements brought about in the over-all system by statutory law. These assumptions appear correct because Congress provided in Section 1105 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949 for the continued payment of the same salary to employees whose positions were lowered when brought under the Act, as long as they remained in the positions. A similar provision was made when the Classification Act of 1923 was enacted. It seems incumbent upon the classification office, however, to notify the budget, fiscal and appoint-

⁵⁶ U. S. Congress. Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Hearings before a subcommittee...on S. 558...and other bills, to Adjust Salaries of Postal Employees and Employees Under the Classification Act of 1923, as Amended, and other Employees, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (Washington : Government Printing Office, 1949) pp. 30, 43 and 46. (Section 905 of S. 1762 was included in the Classification Act of 1949 under Section 1105(b)).

ing officers as to which positions are in this category so that future administrative actions can be intelligently planned. Thus, the classification process, instead of working a hardship upon employees in this instance, was used as a tool of management by excepting it temporarily as the basis for the pay plan.

In preventing salary withholding embarrassment.

Position classification and other personnel papers are documents which support pay roll actions. One copy of Standard Form 50, "Notification of Personnel Action," has been expressly ear-marked for use by the pay roll office upon completion of the appointment process in the personnel office.⁵⁷ An improper appointment, called to the attention of the pay roll certifying officer, is sufficient justification to suspend or deny salary payment.

Classification can contribute toward the accomplishment of proper personnel actions which will avoid embarrassing reimbursements. One example may be given by way of illustration. Appointments of technical experts, under Schedule A-6.101(n) of the Civil Service Commission rules and regulations, may be made on a time-limited basis of persons, without respect to civil service qualifica-

⁵⁷ U. S. Civil Service Commission. Federal Personnel Manual. Chapter R1, T.S. 288 (Washington: Government Printing Office; February 16, 1950) p. 17.

tion standards. The position must be classified, however, although duties classification is not required under certain other types of Schedule A appointments. If Standard Form 50 does not indicate that the position has been classified, the pay roll officer may refuse payment. If the classification office determines that the duties are not properly applicable to a "technical expert" position, then steps may be taken to qualify the person and allocate the position in the appropriate manner which will avoid pay roll difficulty. Improper appointments under these conditions could result, under the Commission's post audit procedure, in removal of the appointees or a notification to the Comptroller General to stop salary payments. In this connection the Comptroller General has ruled that, wherever the practice prevails of employing or retaining people as experts or consultants when their positions properly are within the purview of the classification laws, exceptions against illegal expenditures for salary, per diem payments, and traveling expenses in such cases, will be taken by his office in the audit of the accounts of the fiscal officers involved.⁵⁸

On the other hand, there is no general authority to delay administrative pay roll action in effecting

⁵⁸ C. G. B-103199, June 7, 1951.

proper allocations,⁵⁹ although exceptions in specific circumstances have been made.⁶⁰ As an administrative expedient in some unusual and worthy cases, the Civil Service Commission and other agencies have allocated positions "subject to incumbency"; however, it appears that this practice is seldom formally followed now.

III. USES IN BUDGET ADMINISTRATION

In the development of cooperative relations among officials. The development of cooperative relations and practices among officials of the legislative and executive branches, as an advantage of position classification, was referred to by the Baruch Committee Report.⁶¹ This development goes on among executives not only between but within these major divisions of our Federal government. Budgeting for personal services tends to bring up the subject of position classification at many points in the budget process. First-line supervisors, bureau and department heads, budget analysts at all levels in the hierarchical structure, and the various committees of Congress discuss the classification system in connection with

⁵⁹ 18 Comp. Gen. 794, April 17, 1939.

⁶⁰ For an example of authorized delay where an appeal is taken immediately, see 20 Comp. Gen. 451, 455, February 14, 1941.

⁶¹ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 65.

the budget program. It is well known that discussions and personal contacts are strong factors in bringing about sympathetic understanding, no matter what the subject may be.

In the establishment of budgetary controls. The Baruch Committee Report⁶² stated that means of control could be established, through the position classification plan and the budget process, to insure (1) that the will of the appropriating body in authorizing positions of certain kinds would be carried out, and (2) that the salaries appropriated would be paid for the kind of services contemplated and no others. These controls may be direct or indirect, depending upon whether they primarily or secondarily affect the will of Congress.

Classification advice may be used in supplementing budgetary controls. Firm or advisory allocations of positions may be used as checks against their salary levels, and the probable importance of the functions as described in the "Justification of Estimates". Proper collaboration between the budget and classification offices can result in the realistic itemizing of how personal services funds allotted to each project are to be expended by positions. Congress occasionally places limitations on the number and grades of positions, and

⁶² Loc. cit.

on the amount of money that can be spent for personal services. In order to carry out these controls imposed by Congress, the budget and classification offices must work in harmony. It would be a waste of time and effort for classification to go through the process of allocating an Information and Editorial Specialist position to GS-11, for example, if Congressional limitation had restricted it in the budget to GS-9 or had prohibited the use of funds for this type of work.

In connection with regulating expenditures for personal services, Mosher and Kingsley stated that position classification facilitated budgetary control, and was of "incalculable value to the appropriating body and to the budget and accounting offices."⁶³ No significant elaboration was made of the statement, however. The authors commented that this, and other uses of classification, had been "touched" upon at various points in their discussions.

In the presentation of requests for funds. The classification plan can be used by administrative officials as a definite tool in presenting requests for funds. Masses of detail for personal services can be diminished greatly by listing positions built upon official class titles, showing the number and kind in

⁶³ Op. cit., p. 437.

each case.⁶⁴ Whereas any number of operating titles may be used to designate journeyman mining engineering functions, the classification term "Mining Engineer GS-880-11" may do so with brevity and uniformity. Thus, it is also an important device for saving time.

The classifier can aid the budget officer in his preparation of budget cost estimates by making known what positions in his opinion, appear likely to be allocated higher or lower within the year. This may save embarrassment for the budget officer since, otherwise, he may find his appropriation insufficient to cover grades allocated higher by the position classifier than anticipated by him. On the other hand, he may finish with a surplus of funds.

The Baruch Committee Report brought out the value of the position control chart⁶⁵ for budget purposes, made possible because of the classification system. This chart gives a picture of the position-content of different operating units. Executive and legislative officials, using this chart, can more intelligently (1) discuss the need for the number and kinds of positions already ex-

⁶⁴ Position Classification in the Public Service, loc. cit.; also, for a similar general application to city government, see H. R. Catherwood, "Denver's Consolidation of Personnel and Management Functions," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 12 (Jan., 1951) p. 19.

⁶⁵ Position Classification in the Public Service, loc. cit.

isting; (2) the need for the number and kinds of additional positions, authority, or funds which are requested; and (3) compare operating effectiveness of different units engaged in similar work. One of the three main reasons why classification Acts are passed is to provide the appropriating body with a mechanism whereby it may obtain facts in a uniform, orderly, and comprehensive way --- regardless of the form of presentation --- and make adjustments and determine policies on the basis of the information.⁶⁶

In the expansion of the lump-sum appropriation practice. Prior to the Classification Act of 1923, Congress appropriated funds for salaries under the budget process by two principal methods. First, statutory salaries were those fixed by a specific law for specific services or positions; and second, lump-sum salaries were those fixed by heads of departments for specific services or positions out of the general appropriation. It was pointed out that

. . . no two heads of departments in the Government have made the same rates for the same class of work, and so a system of discrimination in favor of a certain class and against certain other classes has grown up in the Government until it has become a source not only of great annoyance but of great injustice, and a source of more or less trouble,

⁶⁶ Meriam, Public Personnel Problems, op. cit., p. 33.

and justly so.⁶⁷

The statutory rolls gave Congress a control over positions, primarily in the City of Washington, but the lump-sum rolls allowed no such control anywhere.

A plea was made during the hearings of the first appropriation bill reported in the House of Representatives after the enactment of the Classification Act of 1923, to appropriate all funds for personal services under the lump-sum method.⁶⁸ It was contemplated at the time that the classification system would cover the field service as well as the District of Columbia.⁶⁹ Under the lump-sum method of appropriating for budgeted services, it was pointed out that the funds would be guarded better than before because, among other reasons, (1) payments would be controlled by the Act, and (2) changes from one grade to another were required to be approved by the position classifiers. Statutory salaries were particularly objectionable because, once fixed, they were seldom changed to reflect greater responsibilities assumed by employees. The Classification Act of 1923 led directly to abolishment of the practice of budgeting and appropriating by statutory lists.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ U. S. Congress, Congressional Record 68th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. 65, pt. 1, loc. cit.

⁶⁸ Ibid., col. 1, p. 791.

⁶⁹ Ibid., col. 2, p. 789.

⁷⁰ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 67.

IV. USES IN PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

In the testing process. The United States Civil Service Commission and personnel offices of other Federal agencies, in their staff capacity, endeavor to maintain and enforce the merit system of employment. They attempt to provide management with competent people to do greatly varied work. One prerequisite to this provision is the testing of prospective employees.

The position classification plan occupies a very important place in the testing process. Personnel administration generally requires that positions be established prior to the employment of people. Where positions have been established, subject to the Classification Act, there should be in existence an orderly arrangement of facts about the duties, responsibilities, and qualification standards. These facts may form the basis for planning and preparing tests, and for acquainting applicants or other interested parties with the basic qualifications to be tested and rated; or, the class specification, based upon these facts, may be reproduced bodily in the public announcement to show the position titles, the work, and the qualifications required.⁷¹ Shortly after the Classification Act of 1923, an authority⁷² in the field

⁷¹ Loc. cit.

⁷² Lewis Meriam, "The Uses of a Personnel Classification in the Public Service," loc. cit.

of personnel administration declared, further, that many modern tests include the actual performance of duties such as are required in the class of positions, and others try aptitudes which are the same aptitudes as those necessary in the class of positions. At any rate, regardless of whether the position classification process furnishes all or only part of the information required in each instance to prepare examinations, the dependence of the test upon adequate duties analysis is immediately apparent. "The content of any valid test must have some definite relationship to the duties of the job."⁷³

An interesting account⁷⁴ appeared not long ago explaining what has happened under the plan which brought about the use of local boards of civil service examiners, and what is done by the Civil Service Commission to prevent waste of Government funds by the operating agencies where there is duplication in recruiting and testing work. Through the use of the position classification system, for example, it was found that unjustifiable duplicative expense could be avoided by having the Civil Service Commission offices, instead of separate agencies,

⁷³ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 98.

⁷⁴ James P. Googe, and John J. Brennan, "What Happened to Boards of U. S. Civil Service Examiners?", Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (July, 1950) p. 17.

hold examinations for positions of the same class in the same area.

In the certification process. Sometimes certification is considered as a separate and distinct process, and sometimes as only a step in the selection process.⁷⁵ In brief, it consists of submitting to the appointing officer the names of persons taken from lists of eligibles who have qualified through tests.

The information gleaned from the operation of the classification system may be used as the basis for preparing eligible lists, and for controlling their use in the filling of requisitions for the certification of eligibles.⁷⁶ Operating officials apply for candidates on "Request for Certification" forms which usually include a duties statement. These duties statements may be taken from position classification descriptions.⁷⁷ The duties can then be checked against the qualifications tested to assure that the qualified applicants have been certified.

Certification, leading to selection, often results in the applicants obtaining probational civil service status which affords them various advantages. This is

⁷⁵ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 148.
⁷⁶ Position Classification in the Public Service,
loc. cit.
⁷⁷ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 149.

in accordance with the merit system. There may be occasions, however, where temporary or indefinite employees occupying positions allocated to one grade, may fail to attain the qualification rating on an examination which would permit them to remain in the grade and obtain a more permanent status. In such cases, there may be sometimes a tendency for the supervisor and the employees to want to down-grade the positions (although with no change in actual performance) so that the incumbents can obtain probational status, and then raise the grade when the qualifying time requirement had been served. This procedure, to at least some extent, circumvents the merit system in that qualified eligibles on the higher grade lists do not receive appointments to these positions. The Civil Service Commission, therefore, has specifically forbidden the downgrading of employees to obtain status⁷⁸ thus utilizing the classification system to protect merit principles. Carried a step further, a case might well be made whereby holding the position in the higher grade--correctly allocated--and recruiting from a certified list of eligibles, results in maintaining and raising standards of competency.

⁷⁸ U. S. Civil Service Commission. Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter A-6 (Washington : Government Printing Office, as revised May 26, 1950) col. 1, p. 58; and Transmittal Sheet No. 303 of June 5, 1950.

In the recruitment and selection processes. After tests have been held and rated, the merit system generally requires that recruitment take place from the certified lists of eligibles. Position classification facts can be drawn upon to explain to the certified applicant the duties and responsibilities involved.⁷⁹ This information may be dispersed through interview, public notices, and various types of communications.

The importance of, and reliance on, titles established under a sound classification system may be further understood when it is realized, as pointed out by the Personnel Classification Board in 1931,⁸⁰ that the designation of the position may be all the information a departmental officer has when the field wants to employ someone. Lewis Meriam⁸¹ stated that the second of the two major uses of position classification under a centralized system, was "for enforcing the merit system in initial recruiting⁸² and promoting".⁸³ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl⁸⁴ pointed out that one of the principal uses

⁷⁹ Position Classification in the Public Service, loc. cit.

⁸⁰ Wilmerding, op. cit., p. 44.

⁸¹ Meriam, Public Personnel Problems, op. cit., p. 29.

⁸² For an account of an agency head who refused the demand of a Congressman to hire a man to do personal work for the legislator, see Warner W. Stockberger, Personnel Administration Development in the United States Department of Agriculture : The First Fifty Years (Washington : U. S. Department of Agriculture; Office of Personnel, 1947) p.12.

⁸³ See infra, pp. 70-72 for uses in promotion.

⁸⁴ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 215.

of position classification may be listed as follows: "It reduces a variety of occupations and positions to manageable proportions, so that recruitment...and selection can be made for whole classes of positions at a time."

A former Vice President for Personnel Administration, General Foods Corporation (later Professor of Industrial Administration at Yale University) once said:

The primary problem facing us in government, education, and industry is leadership--improving the quality of leadership rather than changing radically the system under which this leadership operates.⁸⁵

It is particularly important, therefore, that position classification and all other tools of management contribute a full share toward recruitment by merit in order to improve the quality of leadership. The statement quoted above is somewhat significant in view of the fact that research⁸⁶ reveals that more than 90 per cent of executives fail to make proper use of job descriptions and other essential low cost hiring tools.

In the critical study made by Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of personnel administration, it was considered that the second of the two major uses of classification was for

⁸⁵ Thomas G. Spates, "Getting Results Through People," Advanced Management, Vol. 15 (October, 1950) p. 5.

⁸⁶ Morris I. Pickus, "White Elephants in Business," Systems for Modern Management, Vol. 14 (July, 1950) p. 6.

the purpose of standardizing employment policies.⁸⁷ Since the civil service cuts across agency lines, and since the nature of the work is the basis for classification, it was considered logical that to have the positions classified would make it feasible to frame standard tests for recruitment, and in general to standardize other aspects of employment management.

In induction and orientation. These processes, though closely related to line administration, are generally agreed to be the responsibility of the personnel office. The terms⁸⁸ are applied to acquaint new employees with their positions from the standpoint of the departmental work environment in the broadest sense, and from the viewpoint of the duties of the job, the opportunities for advancement, and related matters.

Position classification provides a means for inducting and orientating employees to their new assignments. Useful information can be obtained from the tools of classification such as job descriptions, organization and staffing charts, and position classifiers' reports. Newly appointed officials are often confronted with the task of acquiring a knowledge of the unit's specific functions, the staffing, the relative responsibility of

⁸⁷ Wilmerding, Jr., Government By Merit, op. cit., p. 38.

⁸⁸ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 405.

employees, and the work relationship of immediate subordinates. A well developed program of induction and orientation will take into consideration the tools of classification to acquaint officials with this desired knowledge.

In promotion and transfer. The term "promotion" signifies the movement of an employee to a higher grade, based on new and increased duties and responsibilities. "Transfer" generally implies a horizontal movement to another organization unit, under a different supervisor.⁸⁹ While these technical differences exist, the terms and processes have been combined for discussion because the basic concepts underlying their utilization of position classification are very much the same.

The Baruch Committee Report seems to have recognized the similarity of the utilization of position classification in promotion and transfer functions since it also combined the two terms for a general discussion on the subject. The report stated that much must be known about positions and their relationships to one another before general policies can be determined and procedures laid down for promotions and transfers. "In fact, the very feasibility of a promotion or transfer is based on the as-

⁸⁹ For a general discussion of promotion and transfer, see ibid., pp. 162ff., and 180ff.

sumption that intelligent comparison is possible between the position from which the employee comes and that to which he goes."⁹⁰ In this connection it pointed out that the position classification plan provides information on (a) the relationships of positions to one another in kind and level of work, (b) the relative place of positions in a promotional sequence, and (c) the areas of activities from which employees may be drawn for higher positions. With respect to (c), the position classification plan provides the basis for depicting and analyzing where and why career avenues are present or lacking, and affords an approach to redistributing work and responsibility for the purpose of creating promotional opportunities.⁹¹ After such analysis and/or work distribution, the next step may result in a direct promotion action for the incumbent. The definiteness of position classification terminology adds much to the intelligent comparison of positions for transfer and promotion purposes, and facilitates these transactions by providing a common understanding of titles in service records, documents, correspondence, orders,

⁹⁰ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 70; also, see supra, p. 67, for statement by Meriam.

⁹¹ For a brief reference on reducing blind-alley positions to a minimum, not covered in the same manner in the 1950 edition, see William E. Mosher, and J. Donald Kingsley, Public Personnel Administration (3d ed.; New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941) p. 323.

or regulatory position schedules.

Class specifications, an important tool of position classification, may serve as a useful instrument in promotion, transfer and other personnel functions. They may be used, for example, to inform the ambitious employee where his position is in relation to others in an organization, the roads and possible extent of opportunities ahead, and the equipment necessary to achieve greater success.⁹²

A requirement in a dynamic promotion program is the use of personnel organization charts in terms of classified positions.⁹³ Such charts are a by-product of the position classification system and show the names, grades, titles and functional locations of positions from the lowest to the highest. If posted in prominent places, they may serve as a challenge and inspiration to employees to remain alert and prepare for greater responsibilities.

In placement and reassignment. The term "placement" generally includes, in a broad sense, recruitment and

⁹² This point was covered under "Employment-Management Relations" in Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 79, rather than under "Promotion and Transfer."

⁹³ Mosher and Kingsley, loc. cit. In the third edition, however, see p. 178, when these authors were joined by Stahl, the use of the personnel chart was not listed as a device, among other tools for publicising promotional opportunities.

selection. There are both initial and subsequent placement.⁹⁴ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, in this connection, refer to "original" and "adjustment" placement, and include appointment and promotion as well as various types of transfer and reassignment actions.⁹⁵ These individual items which may comprise placement, and their utilization of position classification, have been considered separately in this chapter. A special heading for placement has been provided since, sometimes, authoritative books on personnel administration⁹⁶ mention its utilization of position classification.

Perhaps the best and only comprehensive treatment of the relationship of position classification to placement, wherein placement is used to cover examination, certification, selection and appointment, is an article by Mr. W. P. Lehman.⁹⁷ The author pointed out the need for the integration of classification and placement activities beginning with the operating official under whom

⁹⁴ U. S. Civil Service Commission, Personnel Classification Division. Class Specifications and Statements of Allocation Standards for the Placement Series CAF-234-0 (converted to GS-212-0) (Washington : Government Printing Office; December, 1948) p. 1.

⁹⁵ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., pp. 180f.

⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 203 and 215.

⁹⁷ W. P. Lehman, "How Can Classification Aid in Placement?" : A typewritten speech in booklet form delivered...before the Classification Section of the Society for Personnel Administration (Washington : Civil Service Commission; February 12, 1941).

the position exists, and extending through the agency personnel office and the divisions of the Civil Service Commission. On the other hand, Mr. Lehman described case histories as stark evidence that there is a lack of integration of these functions in daily operations.

The Baruch Committee Report⁹⁸ did not include the use of position classification in placement separately as a major value, but did include its parts such as recruiting, testing, certification, promotion and transfer. It also included, but under the use in "Employment-Management Relations", an item which the writer considers more applicable now to the placement function, viz., identifying misplaced employees with positions for which they are better qualified. For example, the writer would suggest a situation wherein the position classifier found, upon desk audit, that a man with superior qualifications was assigned to inferior duties. The classifier could perform a real service to management, especially in skill shortage occupations, to bring this situation to the attention of the placement officer or administrative official for action.

Reassignment is a change of work, not involving increased responsibilities, in the same office.⁹⁹ Good

⁹⁸ Position Classification in the Public Service,
loc. cit.

⁹⁹ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., pp. 180f.

placement requires that reassignments, as well as transfers, be more often executed and more intelligently handled than has been done. There is sometimes a reluctance to reassign people due to the fear of becoming embroiled in red tape regulations or other pressures. The President in at least one instance¹⁰⁰ has directed that the head of each agency shall remove, demote or reassign to any position any employee in the competitive service whose conduct or capacity is such that any of these changes will promote the efficiency of the service. Position classifiers, through direct contacts with employees, obtain valuable information as to both the conduct and capacity of people. This information, requested of the position classifier by proper authority, may be put to good use. It also places the classifier in a position to make suggestions for improvements.

In performance rating. The evaluation of the performance of employees is "a necessary step in discovering, developing, retaining, and utilizing to the fullest extent the most able and efficient employees".¹⁰¹ One of the first things to be done in setting up a work performance plan is to determine the duties which are to be

¹⁰⁰ Executive Order 9830, in Code of Federal Regulations of the United States of America, 1947 Supplement (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1948) pp. 108-126.

¹⁰¹ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 72f.

rated. The position classification plan, through basic analyses already made and recorded in class specifications, as well as through the allocation to the same class of all positions to which the same rating factors would apply, provides duties information against which the performance of incumbents can be measured.¹⁰² The items of work may be selected for rating as they are recorded in class specifications which are based upon prior job analyses, or may be used in the further refinement of rating factors. Where appropriate, the rating factors thus chosen may apply to positions class by class, instead of individual position by individual position, thus providing uniformity and a saving of time and effort.

There are too many instances, however, wherein class specifications do not exist, except for the very general statements in the Classification Act, to cover positions subject to the classification plan. In such situations, the writer suggests that the existing job sheets--if accurate--could be used in much the same manner as, although on a smaller scale than, class specifications.¹⁰³ They are particularly beneficial

¹⁰² Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 215.

¹⁰³ For a consideration of the viewpoint that performance standards should apply only to individual and particular positions, and never to classes or groups, see F. P. Hoskyn, "Five Rules for Work Performance Standards," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (March, 1950) pp. 22-26.

where more precise evaluations are desired. They also save time and work which otherwise would be required to ascertain the duties. Where practicable, the performance requirements could be made a part of the job sheet when positions are allocated, thus affording a better understanding and encouraging a more direct measurement. In this connection it was noted that on an efficiency rating reform case study,¹⁰⁴ 84 out of about 1,700 employees and supervisors in the Department of Commerce stated in writing that in their opinion the elements to be rated should be more related to the duties of the position. Performance requirements based on standard position descriptions¹⁰⁵ provide management with an excellent tool to measure and analyze the effectiveness of individuals and of the agency.

The purpose of establishing performance-rating plans was to recognize the merits of officers and employees, and their contributions to efficiency and economy.¹⁰⁶ The Federal plan specifies, in addition, that all performance rating plans of the Departments should

¹⁰⁴ Catherine S. Lott and John Boddie, "Background for Efficiency Rating Reform - I. What Employees and Supervisors Think of Efficiency Ratings," Personnel Administration Vol. 12 (May, 1950) p. 15.

¹⁰⁵ Paul T. Kosiak, "The Case for Standard Position Descriptions," Personnel Administration, Vol. 11 (November, 1948) pp. 24-26.

¹⁰⁶ Public Law No. 873, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (September 30, 1950). "The Performance Rating Act of 1950."

be approved by the Civil Service Commission for conformance with the requirements of the Act. Subsequently, the Commission instructed the Departments that their plans would be approved if, among other things, the appraisals of performance were based on performance requirements of the duties performed by the employees.¹⁰⁷

Performance ratings are important by law or regulation for a number of reasons. Some of these reasons are: they determine, to a certain extent, whether an employee is eligible (1) for within-grade salary increases, (2) for additional salary step increases for superior accomplishment, (3) for longevity salary increases, (4) for higher retention preference in reductions in force, and (5) for dismissal.

In preventing excessive turnover. Personnel turnover may be considered as the number of additions to the pay roll required to replace separations other than those made for curtailing the size of the working force. In this respect the effects of net increases or decreases in total personnel strength are not actually turnover matters. Many different techniques have been devised to measure personnel turnover, and they are considered suf-

¹⁰⁷ U. S. Civil Service Commission. Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter P-4 (Washington: Government Printing Office; approved October 31, 1950) p. 3.

ficiently adequate if properly handled and defined.¹⁰⁸

A sound and understandable position classification plan upon which the pay plan is based tends to prevent excessive turnover.¹⁰⁹ It removes a large part of the dissatisfaction which prevails when matters are handled entirely on a personal basis. It substitutes an impersonal standard of measurement open for investigation to all, in the place of personal likes and dislikes. It gives less cause for similar jobs in other agencies to appear more desirable since such positions require allocation to the same grade.

Personal favoritism, as well as honest misjudgments of employee work contributions, are more apt to occur where definite policies and standards do not exist for control and guidance. Inadequate salaries, and especially unbalanced ones within an organization, may result to become constant sources of irritation to employees. Morale sags for vice presidents as well as for elevator operators when others, doing comparable grade level work, are paid more. Under such conditions the capable, progressive employees usually seek higher paid and more satisfactory positions.

¹⁰⁸ John W. Mitchell, "Personnel Turnover in the Federal Civil Service," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (September, 1949) p. 11.

¹⁰⁹ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 79.

The class or series of related classes in the position classification plan affords a convenient basis for compiling and analyzing statistics on turnover.¹¹⁰ If it develops that in certain such categories few die, none resign and there are a large number of qualified applicants for the entrance class, the prevailing salaries are not too low. On the other hand if the government is losing its best employees and qualified applicants are not appearing in reasonable numbers, it is apparent that some upward adjustment is needed.

The utilization of position classification to reduce the tremendous cost involved in turnover of personnel should be valuable to management. The fact that the cost of turnover is high has been proven many times through studies in private industry, and in government. Years ago the Administrator of the Works Progress Administration, in requesting Congress to extend position classification to that agency, at least once deplored the costly turnover he was experiencing due to higher salaries offered by other public bodies.¹¹¹ During World War II personnel turnover rates equivalent to more than 100 per cent per year were recorded in some establishments, gov-

¹¹⁰ Meriam, Public Personnel Problems, op. cit., pp. 111-112.

¹¹¹ U. S. Congress. Senate Committee on Appropriations, Hearings...on the Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1939, op. cit., p. 120.

ernmental and private.¹¹² It costs the government a considerable amount of money to train people for various kinds of work, and sometimes a substantial loss results when the trained specialist resigns and a new man must begin all over again.

In employer-employee relations. It is fundamental in maintaining and improving the effectiveness of employees that personnel matters be administered according to definite policies, standards, and procedures formulated in advance. The quality and quantity of production are bound to suffer when personnel matters are decided by the toss of a coin, so to speak, as individual cases arise. The folly of such actions, readily apparent to the workers, would result only in dissatisfaction which could lead to disastrous experiences for both employer and employees.

The position classification plan, due to its definite policies and procedures, contributes to the betterment of employer-employee relations. The objectives and methods are open to public inspection and discussion, which should lead to their mutual understanding and improvement. Since the policies and procedures have established the basis for determining present and new career avenues, within-grade salary increases, and equity

¹¹² Mitchell, op. cit., p. 10.

in salary administration based on grade levels, they thereby provide incentives for efficient work. As the workers come to identify themselves with their organization and to appreciate their part in it more, the happier they are likely to be. Clarification of job content and job relationships, brought about through the position classification process, can add much toward this objective. Job facts and related information drawn from impersonal classification files may furnish an impartial, sound basis for discussing grievances. The availability of these facts makes it possible to conduct conferences on grievance matters in a minimum amount of time. Available facts also make it possible for immediate supervisors down the line in the administrative hierarchy to settle grievances with their employees where they occur-- on the job. The position classification process should render valuable service in all these respects.¹¹³ In regard to grievances, the American Management Association has seen fit to include in its "10 Commandments of Good Organization" an item which stresses the importance of promptly and carefully adjudicating disputes or differences between executives and employees on authority and

¹¹³ Position Classification in the Public Service,
op. cit., pp. 78-82.

responsibilities.¹¹⁴ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, by way of summary, listed this use of classification as follows:

It provides a foundation for common understanding between supervisor and employee as to the job and pay, which facilitates employee-management relations; and it offers as good a protection as has been found against political or personal preferment in determination of public salaries.¹¹⁵

Meriam¹¹⁶ described three broad types of administrators with respect to their habits of analysis of positions and people. The first type is extremely personal in that he thinks of employees as individuals whom he knows very well, whom he likes or dislikes, or to whom he is more or less indifferent. The second type is extremely impersonal and thinks of positions in terms of fairly concrete duties and responsibilities which require reasonably definite qualifications of incumbents. The third type usually starts with a definite, clear-cut analysis of positions, but realizes that people who fill them are human beings with never exactly the same combination of qualities. This type from time to time makes adjustments in duties and assignments so that the work and the employees

¹¹⁴ J. M. Juran, Bureaucracy : A Challenge to Better Management (New York : Harper and Brothers, 1944) pp. 100-101, footnote #1.

¹¹⁵ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, loc. cit.

¹¹⁶ Meriam, op. cit., pp. 15-19.

fit as closely as possible. One of the three main reasons why classification Acts are passed is their usefulness in preventing partisan and highly personal administrators from grossly abusing their powers.¹¹⁷ It is well known that, in addition to national, there is such a thing as "office," politics.

In training. The duties analyses and the class specifications resulting from the position classification system are helpful as a starting point in the planning and execution of employee training programs.¹¹⁸ It is necessary, before employees can be trained, that there be an understanding of what the work is, and what knowledges are required to perform it. This can be obtained to a large extent from position classification records or processes, although it may be necessary to continue with more detailed analyses. The very selection of employees for training is dependent upon these data.

The importance of position classification tools for use in developing training programs, even though they may often serve only as a starting point, can be better appreciated by the realization that frequently there may be no other, or better, aids. The contents of classifi-

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 33.

¹¹⁸ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 73-74; see also Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, loc. cit., for a similar treatment.

cation documents are often suggestive of source material data, the training period required, the sequence of operations, and other helpful information. In the critical days of World War II position classification tools made worthy contributions to training particularly in the newly established war agencies where the line of work was sometimes unfamiliar to the recruits, and to the government as a whole.¹¹⁹ It is well to remember, however, that skill shortage categories also develop in peace and "defense" periods, so that ample provision should be made to train in critical fields on a continuous basis.

The significance and basic concepts of position classification, the drafting of job descriptions, and an understanding of pay administration might well be included as part of a supervisory training program.¹²⁰ According to current literature and formal public discussion on the subject, supervisors who are really capable of performing good supervision are all too few. This type of training, toward which classification can contribute, would pay administration well in dollars and sense.

¹¹⁹ Ralph M. Hogan, and Wallace M. Davis, "Finding Training Materials for the Hard-to-Fill Job," Personnel Administration, Vol. 5 (March, 1943) pp. 3-9.

¹²⁰ James G. Stockard, "Take a Look at Supervisor Training," Personnel Administration Vol. 10 (May, 1948) p. 17.

Position classification offers within its ranks a source for finding and developing competent personnel generalists, usually the greatest problem in establishing such an office. The generalist office is usually found whenever the institution served is so small or inactive that a functional personnel office is not required. As a result all personnel activities are combined in one or more positions. Sometimes this plan of personnel administration has been forced upon agencies because of Congressional or Bureau of the Budget imposition of staffing ratios, or because of efforts to find ways of performing work with less people. The personnel office caught in this predicament might well consider the position classifiers in finding the solution to the problem of recruitment. As one generalist, formerly in placement and other phases of personnel work, stated the situation:

Because position classification offers an excellent training ground for learning facts about jobs and work processes, is so important as a basis for the total personnel job, and is the most difficult personnel field to learn, it is believed that competent classification analysts offer a promising source of generalist material. However, they must have the breadth to recognize the importance of the human relations part of the personnel job.¹²¹

¹²¹ Harold L. Dickinson, "Some Problems in Establishing a Generalist Personnel Office," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (July, 1950) p. 21; see also Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (November, 1949) (A Section Meeting Report of the Society for Personnel Administration) p. 37.

In loyalty program. Executive Order 9835 of March 21, 1947 provided for a Federal Employees Loyalty Program and included basic policies, instructions, and standards to be followed. It included, among other things, a "full field investigation" of applicants for particular positions, as may be designated by the head of the employing department or agency, based on the best interests of national security.¹²² These positions are generally known as "sensitive positions".¹²³ The Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation give special handling to speed and thoroughness in checking applicants for such positions, over non-sensitive cases.

In accordance with requirements of the Executive Order, it became incumbent upon the Federal agencies to determine which were the sensitive positions in their establishments. Ordinarily these involved those in which the incumbents have access to Top Secret, Secret or Confidential information, and any other positions which in the judgment of the head of the agency are sensitive in character. This procedure for determining such positions

¹²² For a general discussion on the background, results and observations of the political loyalty program, see Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., pp. 461-467.

¹²³ U. S. Civil Service Commission. Federal Personnel Manual, Chapter 12 (Washington : Government Printing Office, as revised November 20, 1950) col. 1, p. 1.

was only logical since the employing agencies have a greater knowledge of the duties to be performed than any other agency.

Position classification descriptions, class specifications, charts and reports contain information which could be useful in making determinations of sensitive positions. Position classifiers, being in an excellent position to ascertain the character of duties and responsibilities, are also well qualified to advise on the types and locations of such assignments. If investigation of a present employee should be reopened for any reason, the position classifier might well aid management and his country by suggesting a non-sensitive position to which the worker could be reassigned without undue disturbance.

V. USES IN ORGANIZATION AND METHODS WORK

In planning organization. Since the position classification system requires administrative officials to explain the precise duties and responsibilities of each position under their control, they in turn must of necessity decide definitely on such matters as form of organization, flow of work, and delegation of various kinds and degrees of authority.¹²⁴ They must therefore plan in

¹²⁴ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., p. 75. For a similar statement, see Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 205.

advance the working organization and methods. Of special importance, they must fix responsibility for each particular type of task, recommendation, or decision, which is one fundamental requirement of proper organization.

The planning of organization requires investigation, research and analysis of the functional content of positions or structural units and their relationship to one another.¹²⁵ The classification of positions involves the same or similar processes in the requirement to ascertain the duties and responsibilities, their relative strengths, and the material changes which have taken place in assignments. The two processes, therefore, go hand in hand. In a new agency it is particularly significant that the personnel office must actively participate in organizational planning.¹²⁶

The close relationship of classification and organization is expressed further in the following statement:

The study and planning of organization structure can readily be approached through the techniques of personnel administration that are employed in the classification of positions.

¹²⁵ For an excellent article on the subject, see Bernard L. Gladioux, "Administrative Planning in the Federal Government," in Processes of Organization and Management, edited by Catheryn Seckler-Hudson (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1948) pp. 171-188.

¹²⁶ Virgil L. Couch, "Ratios and Costs of Personnel Administration," Personnel Administration, Vol. 11 (January, 1949) p. 18.

The detailed analysis of positions and their various relationships to one another should be used in large part as the basis upon which to build, revise, and modify the organization structure in which those positions function. Overlapping functions discovered through the classification approach suggest various alternative revisions of the assignments of duties and responsibilities. Conflicts and gaps in authority, if they exist, are almost certain to be revealed by the classification approach.¹²⁷

In 1939 a Presidential study¹²⁸ disclosed that organization and classification work are frequently found in the same division or operating unit "because they are so closely related that a thorough understanding and a proper administration of the one involves measurably a comparable understanding of the other."

The classification process does not include the authority to prescribe organization structure, lines of authority, work sequences, or the number of positions of each kind, yet it must consider these matters and determine what exists in each instance. The resulting situation thus disclosed may be so illogical or wasteful as to require improvement in the structure, authority and work sequences. The official having the authority to

¹²⁷ Floyd W. Reeves and Paul T. David, "Personnel Administration in the Federal Service : A Staff Report...", President's Committee on Administrative Management (Washington : Government Printing Office; 1937) pp. 58-59.

¹²⁸ U. S. President. The President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement. Documents and Reports to Accompany Report on Civil Service Improvement. Vol. 3, pt. I (Report later published as H. Doc. No. 118, 77th Cong.) (Washington : Government Printing Office; 1942) p. 41.

make the changes can then use the classification facts as his basic tools and the classes and class titles of the position classification plan to point out the changes and explain them to others.¹²⁹

It is quite evident that the position classification plan, with the processes of fact-finding and analysis it involves, has special contributions to make in solving the technical problems of organization structure. Also, it often has a direct, or indirect, bearing upon management, the force which operates through structural organization. For example, in the following list of principles of organization and management,¹³⁰ the position classifier, the organization and methods examiner, and the administrator are concerned with all:

- (1) Policy should be carefully defined and imparted to those responsible for its achievement.
- (2) Work should be subdivided, systematically planned and programmed.
- (3) Appropriate methods and procedures should be developed and utilized by those responsible for policy achievement.
- (4) Tasks and responsibilities should be specifically assigned and understood.

¹²⁹ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 75-76.

¹³⁰ Catheryn Seckler-Hudson, "Principles of Organization and Management," in Processes of Organization and Management, edited by Seckler-Hudson (Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1948) pp. 40-45.

- (5) Appropriate resources (men, money, material) in terms of availability and priority should be equitably allocated.
- (6) Authority commensurate with responsibility should be delegated and located as close as possible to the point where operations occur.
- (7) Adequate structural relationships through which to apply and flow the resources and through which to operate should be established.
- (8) Effective and qualified leadership should stud each organization and each subdivision of the organization.
- (9) Unity of command and purpose should permeate the organization.
- (10) Continuous accountability for utilization of resources and for the production of results should be required.
- (11) Effective coordination of all individual efforts within the organization should be achieved.
- (12) Continuous reconsideration of all matters pertaining to the organization should be a part of regular operations.

Position classifiers, in order to get their own job done, are often forced to work outside of their main function because top management has failed to correct organizational difficulties before the start of the classification process. As was pointed out by the Director of the Administrative Division, Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks, top management should--but does not always--do its job first before a classification technician can do his

work properly.¹³¹

In clarifying organization. It is surprising sometimes how many employees and administrators do not have a clear understanding of their work relationships to one another, even though an office has been in existence for some time. The writer has encountered numerous occasions whereupon employees erroneously claimed supervision over others, or thought they worked in a different unit of an organization, or could not give a coherent outline of the objectives or operations of the Section. Such conditions clearly suggest a need for clarifying the organization.

Good organization requires, among other things, that delegations of authority and responsibility be clear-cut and well understood by those affected. Departure from these principles are brought out in the open through the position classification process, and their correction is a substantial contribution toward the achievement of the objectives of an institution.¹³²

One of the classification tools which has been used successfully by an agency to graphically present and

¹³¹ See statement attributed to Robert W. Reinhold under "What They are Saying at the Society Meetings," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (November, 1949) p. 37.

¹³² Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 76-77.

clarify the division of work within an organization is the responsibility distribution chart.¹³³ This includes the specific functions performed and the part each position plays in the work operations. It involves the systematic accounting for responsibility through the use of a flow chart. Its use in the agency made relations with operating officials easier, reduced time required for conferences, and insured against gaps of unassigned responsibility. The budget and planning office of the agency, seeing its advantages, adopted the chart as a regular tool in its work.

The Vice President, Personnel Administration, of the General Foods Corporation, has suggested six specifications of sound organization which should be a part of any personnel policy, including government and industry.¹³⁴ Out of the six, he has listed three which have to do with the role of clarification. Position classification is directly involved in all three, which are: (1) The purpose of the organization and each part thereof should be clearly defined and explained, (2) Every position in the organization should be described in writing, and (3) A clear and well-understood line of authority

¹³³ John J. Kennedy, and Frank J. Waldenfels, "The Responsibility Chart : A Classification and Administrative Analysis Tool." Public Personnel Review, Vol. 4 (October, 1943) pp. 254-259.

¹³⁴ Spates, loc. cit.

should run from the top to the bottom of every organization.

In improving organization. An organization usually begins to change as soon as it is set up. Substantive functions and structural alignments shift to meet the needs and demands of the moment. These pressures may be either personal or impersonal, or both. More often they are prompted by a desire to improve the present arrangement. The process of organization is continuous and dynamic.¹³⁵

The logical procedures and analyses of duties, responsibilities and qualifications conducted through the classification process disclose facts "which serve classification and organization purposes equally." Discussion of the organizational defects with appropriate officials, supplemented by the dire consequences which the enterprise is or may be suffering, should lead to their correction. Some of the more common defects discovered through operation of the classification plan are in:¹³⁶

supervisory relationships

flow of work

¹³⁵ Russell Robb, "Organization as Affected by Purpose and Conditions," in Processes of Organization and Management, op. cit., pp. 112-124.

¹³⁶ Position Classification in the Public Service, op. cit., pp. 75-78.

organization structure
 locations and boundaries of responsibilities
 work-sequences
 number of positions
 assignments of work
 delegations of kinds and degree of authority
 relationships between positions not supervisory
 to each other
 over-lapping duplication and gaps in responsi-
 bilities
 number of supervisory levels
 span of control

A review of some other works of well-known authors in the field of administration discloses the following information and opinions on the improvement of organization through classification. Shortly after the Classification Act of 1923, Lewis Meriam briefly stated in an article that one of the uses of classification was that it revealed weak spots in organization.¹³⁷ Two authorities, in their revised edition of 1941, stated about as briefly that it improved departmental organization and management.¹³⁸ In the third edition of their book, joined by O. Glenn Stahl,¹³⁹ a broader listing covered the following aids of position classification to organization:

¹³⁷ Meriam, "The Uses of a Personnel Classification in the Public Service," op. cit., p. 219.

¹³⁸ Mosher and Kingsley, op. cit., p. 437.

¹³⁹ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 215.

(a) establishment of uniform job terminology, (b) placement of responsibility in each position, (c) providing basis for translating needs for positions into fiscal terms, thus facilitating budgetary procedures, and (d) uncovering matters of duplication, inconsistency, and the like.

In controlling organization. An analysis of the problem of government personnel resulted in the conclusion that one of the two major uses of classification was to maintain, and therefore control, a proper organization.¹⁴⁰ A proper organization, it was pointed out, meets three requirements: first, an adequate number of positions in each type of work; second, internal relationships which prevent misassignments of positions; and third, training posts in types of work where competence depends on departmental knowledge and experience. Failure to meet these requirements causes poor management. For example, an insufficient number of scientific research positions can only result in the work being neglected. In addition, scientific men in administrative positions will be prevented from pursuing the slow and patent methods of research while, at the same time, administrative work may suffer; and it is a deplorable situation whereby future administrators must enter as office

¹⁴⁰ Wilmerding, op. cit., pp. 35-37.

boys and be trained in routine habits rather than in creative thought, to the detriment of their abilities.

A thought-provoking discussion of a few years ago suggested whereby standard position descriptions may serve management in several ways when it became necessary for an agency to centralize various activities or standardize its field and departmental offices.¹⁴¹ Such positions result from a thorough analysis of functions and units of an organization. Close cooperation is essential between administrators, organization examiners, and position classifiers in order to properly ascertain the contents and relationships of positions. Thus, an employee doing a job, designated by an authorized title, will carry on essentially the same tasks no matter within which organizational unit or geographic area he may be assigned. Such an arrangement enables management better to establish standards of performance, control organization, and achieve its goals.

In Management Improvement Program. The United States Congress formalized the management improvement plan and awards program of the Federal government.¹⁴² The plan requires, among other things, that each department make systematic reviews of the operations of its

¹⁴¹ Kosiak, loc. cit.

¹⁴² See Title X of 63 U. S. Stat. at L. (1950) 971.

activities, functions, or organization units on a continuous basis in order to determine the units that are outstanding in efficiency and economy, and to identify and reward with cash the employees and supervisors who have contributed so much toward achieving the higher standards.

Here again, the close relationship of classification to positions, activities, functions and organization structure afford an opportunity to serve as a tool of management. It is quite common that classifiers receive recommendations to upgrade positions only to discover, upon investigation, that the proposals are based upon efficiency of the workers rather than on increased duties and responsibilities. Knowledge of particular achievements of individuals in effecting economies also come to light through classification recommendations. Spectacular accomplishments by entire organization units, and their identity, may be discovered through techniques applied in the classification of positions. These matters, coming to the position classifier through the misunderstanding by the administrators of the purposes of classification or through incidental knowledge obtained in connection with proper recommendations, should be referred to the proper officials for consideration in the management improvement program. Additional help of an

analytical or suggestive character may well be included with the referral.

A statement of management improvement activities aimed at increasing the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of operations was required to be submitted with budget estimates for the first time to cover fiscal year 1951.¹⁴³ Emphasis was placed on substantive operations, rather than on "housekeeping" activities. Examples of the type of operating problems included are: failure of activities to accomplish program objectives; overlapping or contradictory services to the public; increasing backlogs; and excessive staff turnover. By way of discovery, referral and helpful suggestion the position classifiers may aid management here in much the same manner as in the cash awards program.

In the management improvement program, with its recent emphasis on work simplification and organization studies, the classification survey represents the main area of coordination.¹⁴⁴ This is due to the reason that the position description identifies the distribution of work assignments as well as serving the basis for evaluation. The clarifying role of the classification survey

¹⁴³ U. S. Bureau of the Budget. Bulletin No. 50-2. "Programming of Agency Management Improvement Activities." (Washington; August 1, 1949) 2 pp.

¹⁴⁴ Ogden C. Reed, "Streamlining the Classification Process," Personnel Administration, Vol. 14 (May, 1951) p. 23.

is particularly beneficial.

VI. SUMMARY OF USES

In general administration.

Position classification has been proclaimed useful, to some degree or other, in line administration through various ways. Some of these uses may be interpreted as applicable in the same ways to two or more staff functions as well. The uses generally proclaimed, but in piece-meal fashion, are: (1) in establishing uniform occupational terminology; (2) in providing a formal system; (3) in administrative research; (4) in clarifying jurisdiction of political branches; (5) in conducting public relations; (6) in clarifying management objectives; (7) in distinguishing between wage and salaried employees for pay and related purposes.

In budget and fiscal administration.

The uses of position classification in budget administration have been set forth as follows: (1) in the development of cooperative relations among officials; (2) in the establishment of budgetary controls; (3) in the presentation of requests for funds; and (4) in the expansion of the lump-sum appropriation practice. The uses in fiscal administration have been proclaimed thusly: (1) in providing the base for pay plans; (2) in distinguishing

between grade and salary advancement plans; (3) in granting equitable salary treatment to formerly excepted employees brought under the system for the first time; and (4) in preventing salary withholding embarrassment.

In personnel administration.

Position classification serves other phases of personnel administration in more ways than it does any other staff function. It has been proclaimed useful as follows: (1) in the testing process; (2) in the certification process; (3) in the recruitment and selection process; (4) in induction and orientation; (5) in promotion and transfer; (6) in placement and reassignment; (7) in performance rating; (8) in preventing excessive turnover; (9) in employer-employee relationships; (10) in training; and (11) in the loyalty program.

In organization and methods work.

Recognized authorities have proclaimed that a close relationship exists between position classification and organization and methods work. Both can be supplemented by the other. The supplemental aids furnished by position classification, or the uses, are as follows: (1) in planning organization; (2) in improving organization; (3) in controlling organization; and (4) in conducting the Management Improvement Program authorized by Congress.

CHAPTER IV

A QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY

The aim of this chapter is to set forth the processes and the results of a fact-finding study conducted by the writer, through the means of questionnaires, to test, in the practical operation of various Federal agencies, the current validity of the uses claimed in Chapter III. This involves an explanation of the purposes entailed, the types of questionnaires used, the methods of approach followed, the information obtained, and the analyses arrived at.

I. PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

In Chapter III a number of administrative advantages to the line functions of management were discussed which various advocates and observers of position classification claimed were either automatically set in motion, or could be attained, by its installation and operation. In addition a number of uses which were being made, or that could be made, of position classification to facilitate and supplement the separate staff functions of budget, fiscal, organization and methods, and other phases of personnel were pointed out as set forth in rather general terms by these same advocates, or others.

Very little specific, substantial, research proof has been presented in any public writings to support or refute these general statements, so often made in a tone of finality. The same or similar opinions on the uses of classification sometimes have been repeated, however, and individual experiences pertaining to isolated instances occasionally have been related.

Contrary to the advantages set forth, there have been criticisms leveled against the position classification system. These criticisms have attacked both its operation and its utilization. Some of the censures have been made by people who were in favor of the objectives of the system but interested in its continued improvement, and some apparently have been made by persons neither in favor of the plan nor its continuance. As in the case presented for the advantages of position classification, very little proof, other than general conclusions and explanation, or isolated incidents, has been promulgated to support or refute the criticisms made.

The general purpose of the study was to subject to a test some of the claims made of the usefulness and effectiveness of position classification by making inquiry of people employed in the Federal government whose daily work qualifies them as sources of competent authority. All the claims were not tested thusly because it was felt

the large number of questions required to do so would discourage replies. Further, on the theory of sampling, it did not seem necessary to test all the claims in order to obtain a valid basis on which to draw both general and specific conclusions. Is position classification a tool of management, or have we merely come to assume it is valid through unquestioned use? Is the position classification program itself effective? The study may be considered as an answer, at least a partial one, to these questions.

More specifically stated, the purposes of the questionnaires were four-fold: (1) to determine the degree of various attitudes held by a group of line supervisors and administrators toward (a) the process of classifying positions, and (b) the extent to which classification has achieved uniform occupational terminology in communications; and (c) to identify the above group as falling above or below 10 years of service, and the extent and significance to which the positions occupied were administrative or professional in character; and (2) to determine the extent that a representative group of staff officers feel position classification is being, or could be, utilized in assisting them to carry out their substantive responsibilities; (3) to determine the degree of some attitudes held, and practices experienced,

by position classifiers (a) which would have a bearing upon some of the criticisms of the operation of the system made by line supervisors and administrators, (b) which would have a bearing upon the use, or lack of use, which is made of position classification by other staff officers, and (c) which would bring forth their expressions on certain techniques, both current and in transition; and (4) to ascertain the viewpoint of both the line and staff officers questioned, as separate groups, as to the degree they believe the classification process is an aid to management in attaining the over-all objectives of the organization.

II. TYPES OF QUESTIONNAIRES AND RECIPIENTS

The questionnaires contained inquiries designed to eluce opinions and facts, based upon the experiences of the recipients, which would accomplish the purposes of the study. None of the questionnaires were purely of a fact-finding or attitude character, but all were mixed in this respect. All the questionnaires contained eleven inquiries except the one on general administration, which included twelve.

The recipients of the questionnaire on general administration were bureau heads, and their subordinate chiefs of divisions, branches and sections engaged pri-

marily in line operations. The recipients of the other questionnaires were subject matter specialists, including both the bureau and agency levels, in their staff fields of budget, over-all personnel, organization and methods, and position classification.

The recipients were employees of five agencies in the Washington area, including 20 of their component operating bureaus and four of their top level staff offices. Due to the centralized organization of the Veterans Administration, wherein a considerable amount of staff and operating work is performed in the Nation's capitol, all the offices included there were considered on the bureau level for purposes of this study. A list of the agencies and the bureaus or offices which were subjected to the inquiry, follows:

Department of the Interior
 Office of the Secretary
 Bureau of Mines
 Fish and Wildlife Service
 Bureau of Indian Affairs
 National Park Service

Department of the Navy
 Office of the Secretary
 Bureau of Aeronautics
 Bureau of Ordnance
 Bureau of Ships
 Bureau of Yards and Docks

Department of Commerce → OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
 Bureau of Census
 Civil Aeronautics Administration
 Patent Office
 Weather Bureau

Department of Agriculture
 Office of the Secretary
 Production and Marketing Administration
 Rural Electrification Administration
 Forest Service
 Office of Plant and Operations

Veterans Administration
 Office of Assistant Administrator for Construction, Supply and Real Estate
 Office of Assistant Administrator for Contact and Administrative Services
 Office of Assistant Administrator for Personnel
 Office of Assistant Administrator for Claims.

III. THE COMPILATION, TRANSMITTAL AND RETURN OF QUESTIONNAIRES

A review, involving considerable research in public, institutional, and agency libraries, was made of all available literature. Periodicals, books, pamphlets, newspapers, etc., were consulted for information relative to the thesis topic. Discussion was held with a few specialists in the fields of budget, finance, personnel, classification and organization. Keeping this in mind as a background, a selection was made of the various types of effectiveness and uses which were to be tested. In formulating the questions, allowance was made for expressing various degrees of reply ranging, in general, from one extreme of "no opinion" to such other remarks as "yes, always", or "outstanding." Opportunity was provided at the end of each questionnaire for any comments the recipient felt inclined to make.

After compiling the questions, detailed preparation was made to select the specific recipients and forward the questionnaires to the appropriate offices. Covering memoranda¹ were composed and transmitted with each questionnaire which explained the purpose of the inquiry, identified the capacity in which the writer was making the study, stated that neither the name nor position title of the recipient would be used or disclosed to the public in any manner, and asked for cooperation. The United States Government Organization Manual 1950-51 was helpful in identifying the people and their positions at the agency level, although even in this area the information was not complete. It was of very little assistance at the bureau level. Complete information as to names, position titles, room numbers, street addresses, and agencies were obtained, however, from the respective agency telephone directories. The recipients were selected entirely on the basis of their fields of work as evidenced by the listings in the Manual and the directories, and for applicability of their work to the types of questionnaires involved, rather than from a personal standpoint.

The recipients were encouraged in three ways to complete and return the questionnaires. First, they were specifically told that no request was being made for

¹ See Appendixes A, B and C.

them to sign the papers, thus stressing anonymity and allowing the greatest latitude for freedom of expression. Second, stamped envelopes with the return address of the writer were enclosed for convenience. And third, they were informed that the study would not reflect the attitudes or conditions in their agency or bureau, but instead would represent the over-all picture resulting in the collective returns from the several agencies.

IV. REPLIES OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATORS²

The "Questionnaire for Administrators on the Position Classification System and its Relationship to Certain Phases of General Administration"³ was sent to 60 people, all at the bureau level and designated herein as "recipients." Thirty, or 50 percent, returned it with answers and these have been designated as "respondents." For purposes of calculation, those who indicated "no opinion" to some questions but took a stand on others were counted as respondents, or replies, in all instances. Eleven questions were asked, not including the single cross-section inquiry made of all the recipients engaged in both line and staff work, and these eleven are presented below with the replies and other information.

² See supra, pp. 106-107 for identification.

³ See Appendix D for sample of first page.

Tabulated results.

1. (a) Do you feel that position classifiers, before classifying existing positions, give the incumbents an opportunity to explain the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required?

	No.:	%	:
yes, always	11	36 2/3	:
yes, very often	7	23 1/3	:
yes, often	6	20	:
yes, but seldom	6	20	:
no, never	0	0	:
no opinion	0	0	:
Total	30	100	:

All of the administrators and supervisors who replied, or 100 per cent of the respondents, answered "yes" to varying degrees. Four-fifths, or 80 per cent, indicated a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always." The remainder felt that the low frequency rate of "but seldom" expressed the situation more appropriately. Thus, it was shown that not only were the position classifiers interviewing the incumbents before classifying positions, in the opinion of line administrators, but also that 80 per cent of the line officer respondents felt that they were very active in this respect.

(b) Do you feel that position classifiers, before classifying positions, give supervisors of the incumbents an opportunity to explain the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required?

	No.:	%	:
yes, always	17	56 2/3	:
yes, very often	8	26 2/3	:
yes, often	3	10	:
yes, but seldom	2	6 2/3	:
no, never	0	0	:
no opinion	0	0	:
Total	30	100	:

All of the respondents, or 100 per cent, answered "yes" to the question. Over one-half checked the degree "always"--a greater number than marked the same degree in #1(a)--indicating that supervisors are contacted sometimes when the incumbents are not. Over nine-tenths, or 93 1/3 per cent, indicated a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always" whereby position classifiers give supervisors an opportunity to explain the duties prior to classifying the jobs.

2. Do you feel that administrators adjust an otherwise desirable organizational or procedural pattern in order to justify higher grade allocations?

	:No. :	% :
yes, always	: 0 :	0 :
yes, very often	: 1 :	3 1/3 :
yes, often	: 6 :	20 :
yes, but seldom	: 16 :	53 1/3 :
no, never	: 5 :	16 2/3 :
no opinion	: 2 :	6 2/3 :
Total	: 30 :	100 :

This is a management question. It is therefore discouraging that 76 2/3 per cent of the replies, or three-fourths, were in the affirmative to varying degrees. On the other hand an encouraging note was sounded, in so far as this study is concerned, in that slightly less than three-fourths of the replies, or 70 per cent, indicated a low frequency rate ranging from "seldom" to "never" at which an otherwise desirable organizational or procedural pattern was changed in order to justify

higher grades.

3. How much confidence do you have in the comparative ability of your own Bureau position classifiers and those of your Department or of the Civil Service Commission?

	No.:	%
same confidence in all	16	53 1/3
more confidence in Bureau	11	36 2/3
more confidence in Department	0	0
more confidence in CSC	3	10
Total	30	100

All recipients of the questionnaire were currently employed at the bureau level. It is therefore somewhat significant that the preponderant number of replies indicated equal confidence in the ability of the classifiers at all three levels, over one-third favored those working in the bureaus, and none showed greater faith in the Department, even preferring the Civil Service Commission to a small degree.

4. Do you feel that position classifiers give adequate-to-you explanations of the position classification system?

	No.:	%
yes, always	6	20
yes, very often	8	26 2/3
yes, often	3	10
yes, but seldom	9	30
no, never	3	10
no opinion	1	3 1/3
Total	30	100

Over four-fifths answered in the four affirmative degrees tending to create the illusion of a healthy situ-

ation. This response is clouded, however, by a substantial minority of two-fifths, or 40 per cent, who indicated the explanations were given at a low frequency rate of "seldom" or "never." One respondent stated, "There is no fully adequate explanation" (of the position classification system).

5. Position classification standards are prepared in order to establish criteria against which positions will be allocated. Does it appear that writers of position classification standards, prior to issuing them for official use, give job incumbents who perform the work involved in the standards, an opportunity to explain the duties, responsibilities and qualifications required?

	: No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 10 :	33 1/3:	:
yes, very often	: 4 :	13 1/3:	:
yes, often	: 6 :	20 :	:
yes, but seldom	: 3 :	10 :	:
no, never	: 3 :	10 :	:
no opinion	: 4 :	13 1/3:	:
Total	: 30 :	100 :	:

Three-fourths of the respondents, or 76 2/3 per cent, answered "yes" to the question, and the two-thirds who checked the upper degrees, representing a high frequency rate, are an indication that the standards program does involve active participation by administrators.

6. (a) In general, does it appear that the Federal classification system achieves the principle of "equal pay for substantially equal work"?

	: No.:	%	:
yes	: 19 :	63 1/3:	:
no	: 9 :	30 :	:
no opinion	: 2 :	6 2/3:	:
Total	: 30 :	100 :	:

The principle stated above is a primary objective of the position classification system. On the basis of the returns, approximately two-thirds of the line administrators felt that the system achieves this objective, while about one-third did not--a substantial minority.

(b) If your answer to 6(a) is "no", do you feel that the present classification system should be retained in general but strengthened in order to achieve equal pay for substantially equal work?

	:No.:	%	:
yes	8	88 8/9	:
no	0	0	:
no opinion	1	11 1/9	:
Total	9	100	:

Out of the 30 per cent in 6(a) who answered "no", consisting of about one-third who felt the principle of "equal pay for substantially equal work" was not being achieved, approximately nine-tenths nevertheless were in favor of continuing but strengthening the system. No one felt inclined to discard position classification.

(c) If your answer to 6(b) is "no", can you suggest at this point how it may be strengthened?

Since none of the 9 respondents answered "no" in 6(b), this question did not require an answer. One respondent with less than 10 years service, however, stated, "In higher brackets, especially GS-12 to 15, bring standards up to general business pay scales." It is apparent that he had reference to revising the pay

scales rather than the classification standards, and he may be confused as to the relationship between the two systems.

7. (a) Has the authority for making final grade allocations of positions been delegated in part or in entirety by the Department to your Bureau?

	No.	%
yes	19	63 1/3
no	3	10
don't know	6	20
no answer given	2	6 2/3
Total	30	100

About two-thirds of the replies showed some degree of delegation to the bureaus by the departments for position classification. One-tenth indicated no delegation whatever had been made, one-fifth did not know the extent of delegation to the bureaus, and about one-twentieth failed to reply. Although no provision was made in the questionnaire for the "no answer given" category, it is shown in the results to indicate the complete status of the returns.

7. (b) Does the position classification office usually act on proposed grade allocations fast enough to satisfy you as a supervisor:

- (1) when authority for making final grade allocations is exercised within the Bureau by virtue of delegated authority from the Department?

	:No.:	%:
yes	: 15 :	50 :
no	: 8 :	26 2/3 :
don't know	: 5 :	16 2/3 :
no answer given	: 2 :	6 2/3 :
Total	: 30 :	100 :

One-half of the questionnaire respondents indicated satisfaction with the rate of speed grade allocations are made within the bureaus. The slightly over one-fourth who proclaimed dissatisfaction gives rise to the belief that service needs to be improved in order to render quicker action.

7. (b) (2) and also when authority for making final grade allocations is exercised by the department, such authority not having been delegated to the bureau?

	:No.:	%:
yes	: 8 :	26 2/3 :
no	: 9 :	30 :
don't know	: 9 :	30 :
no answer given	: 4 :	13 1/3 :
Total	: 30 :	100 :

Here again, as in question #3, the replies indicated greater satisfaction with the classification program at the bureau level than at the departmental level. Only slightly more than one-fourth appeared satisfied with the rate of speed grade allocations are acted on by the departments, while close to one-third registered disapproval. The approvals were fairly balanced by the disapprovals of the time taken by the departments to act, whereas a definite showing of greater satisfaction than dissatisfaction

was displayed in #7(b)(1) of the rate in which the bureaus rendered decisions.

8. Do you feel that the position classification system restricts recognition of the appropriate grade for professional positions which are supervised by an administrator?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 0 :	0	:
yes, very often	: 3 :	10	:
yes, often	: 7 :	23 1/3:	
yes, but seldom	: 6 :	20	:
no, never	: 8 :	26 2/3:	
no opinion	: 6 :	20	:
Total	:30 :	100	:

The bare preponderance of affirmative replies made, representing 53 1/3 per cent of the respondents, indicated to varying degrees of occurrence an opinion that grades of professional positions were restricted by those of administrative supervisors. Slightly over one-fourth answered "no, never" and one-fifth "yes, but seldom", collectively representing a low frequency rate close to one-half, or 46 2/3 per cent, of the returns. One-third--a substantial minority--expressed a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "very often."

9. One of the purposes advanced for the position classification system is to provide uniform occupational terminology for use in communications. To what extent do you feel this objective has been achieved in communications of a line nature?

	:No. :	%	:
very much	: 11 :	36 2/3:	
little	: 5 :	16 2/3:	
very little	: 4 :	13 1/3:	
no opinion	: 10 :	33 1/3:	
Total	: 30 :	100	:

Two-thirds of the respondents expressed an opinion on the question, all affirmatively. Slightly more than one-third felt that the objective of using position classification to establish occupational terminology in line communications had been achieved at a high degree of "very much", while slightly less than one-third--a substantial minority of 30 per cent--indicated that a low degree of "little" or "very little" success had been realized. One-third checked "no opinion" which indicated they had not concerned themselves with this use of classification.

10. (a) Do you feel that, on the whole throughout the Federal government, the position classifiers have enough support from management in order to do the best job?

	No.:	%
yes, entirely	12	40
yes, almost	7	23 1/3
no	7	23 1/3
no opinion	4	13 1/3
Total	30	100

Only two-fifths of the respondents felt that "entirely" enough support was given by management to enable position classifiers to do the best job. Those who replied "almost", combined with those in the "entirely" group, represent more than three-fifths who indicated a high degree of support by management, but not necessarily the ideal. On the other hand, if "almost" were considered

an unsatisfactory situation since it does not reach what may be considered the ideal of "entirely", the two groups of "almost" and "no" could be combined to represent over two-fifths, or $46 \frac{2}{3}$ per cent, who reported an unfavorable condition or low degree of support by management. Slightly over one-tenth did not reply.

10. (b) To do an adequate job?

	:No. :	% :
yes, entirely	: 7 :	$23 \frac{1}{3}$:
yes, almost	: 11 :	$36 \frac{2}{3}$:
no	: 5 :	$16 \frac{2}{3}$:
no opinion	: 6 :	20 :
no answer given	: 1 :	$3 \frac{1}{3}$:
Total	: 30 :	100 :

Only about one-fourth of the respondents felt that management gave "entirely" enough support in order that position classifiers could do an adequate job. The combined "almost" and "entirely" groups represent exactly three-fifths who indicated a high degree of support by management. As pointed out in #10(a), if "almost" were considered somewhat deficient in that it is something less than what may be considered the ideal represented by "entirely", the combined "almost" and "no" groups would represent more than half the respondents, or $53 \frac{1}{3}$ per cent, who indicated a low degree of support. One respondent who answered "no", added by way of comment, "There is too much interference by management." No clue was given as to why almost one-fourth of the respondents

failed to answer this particular question. The "no answer given" category was not included on the questionnaire but has been added here to reflect a full picture of the returns.

11. (a) Have you been in the Federal service 10 years or more?

	No.	%
yes	26	86 2/3
no	3	10
no answer given	1	3 1/3
Total	30	100

Over four-fifths of the respondents had been in the Federal service 10 years or more, which appears to qualify them to participate in the test which was made. Only one-tenth indicated they had less years of service.

11. (b) Do you occupy a professional or an administrative position?

	No.	%
professional	4	13 1/3
administrative	17	56 2/3
both	7	23 1/3
no answer given	2	6 2/3
Total	30	100

The study showed that over one-half of the respondents held purely administrative jobs, and slightly less than one-fourth held positions of both a combined administrative-professional nature, thus collectively representing four-fifths of the total, or 80 per cent. Slightly more than one-tenth held purely professional jobs which, when combined with those of both an administrative-

professional nature, collectively represent more than one-third of the total, or 36 2/3 per cent, in which professional responsibilities were vested.

Written comments.

One person--a Section Chief-- received a questionnaire but was not counted as a respondent because she wrote a brief letter instead of returning the completed form. She stated:

The duties and responsibilities of my position give me no opportunity to become aware of the functions, responsibilities and mechanics of operation of the position classification system in the _____
_____⁴

Obviously, both management and the personnel office have failed in this case to carry out their responsibilities and make known to the supervisor her full duties, and she has indicated a lack of initiative.

Following, and numbered in order to better distinguish one from another, are quoted general comments made by the respondents:

1. I believe that almost all job descriptions that have come to my attention have had entirely too much meaningless "gobbledegook" in them, and suggest attempts to "blow up" the job description so it will sound more impressive. I have noted a definite lack of positive, clear, and concise statements in job descriptions. Most would mean a lot more if they were trimmed about 50%.

2. Our chief criticism is that some classifiers are not as objective as we could wish (our opinion).

⁴ Underscoreing represents name of bureau.

3. Believe position classification attempts to back up "equal pay for equal work," that it does not completely succeed, that its failures are often due to "pressure" by staff and operating officials in forcing jobs and grades thru the classification office, and that it has little opportunity, in the face of resistance, to do much in the area of your question 11.⁵

4. In spite of the fact that classification is an aid to management and worker there is much room for improvement. The classifier frequently fails to give full consideration to the problems involved in the job and interprets the duties performed by emphasizing the lowest levels and disregarding the more difficult aspects. Possibly because the classifier has not received his basic training in the operational phases of the work he is inclined to over-emphasize staff positions and minimize the importance of operating jobs. He is also inclined to adhere too closely to job specifications and overlook the problems involved in the particular job.

5. Position classification is o. k. as far as it goes. Too much of a priesthood. Personally, I like the old-fashioned hiring hall system.⁶

6. Classifiers often put themselves in the position of trying to perform management's job. Classifiers usually are not engineering personnel, therefore they are not qualified to classify professional jobs.

7. Civil Service Commission standards and terminology are so inflexible that good organization and employee utilization, or strict classifications, must be compromised.

Management seldom does any positive planning of a scientific nature with respect to either organization or employee utilization. Of necessity the classifier must concern himself with these matters--for which he has no responsibility--which puts him in the middle between top management and the supervisor and/or employee. Classification operates

⁵ Question 11 was the over-all cross-section question dealing with classification's aid to management, which is considered infra, on pp. 170-174.

⁶ This entire statement is somewhat puzzling since the respondent answered "yes" to question #6(a), "no, never" to #8, and "entirely" to both #10(a) and #10(b).

satisfactorily whenever management does its job.

8. Head of one section and acting head of another section. Both jobs are GS-12, but no compensation has been received in addition for responsibility of 2 sections.⁷

V. REPLIES OF BUDGET OFFICERS

The "Questionnaire for Budget Officers on the Position Classification System and its Relationship to Certain Phases of Budget Administration"⁸ was sent to 20 people designated as "recipients." Four, or one-fifth, were at the departmental or agency level, and sixteen, or four-fifths, were at the bureau level. Fifteen, or 75 per cent, completed and returned the inquiry and have been designated as "respondents." Ten questions were asked, not including the single cross-section inquiry made of all the recipients, and these ten are presented below with the replies and other information.

Tabulated results.

1. Official position class titles are established by the Civil Service Commission in published standards to "denote a group of positions which are sufficiently similar in kind of work, level of difficulty and responsibility, and qualifications required." Examples of such position class titles are : Procurement Officer GS-333-12 for one class, and Safety Engineer GS-803-12 for a different class. Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-11 of September 22, 1950, however, requires the use of operating titles in budget preparation. Both types of titles actually are found in the budget estimates.

⁷ This situation requires action by management, and then position classification.

⁸ See Appendix E for sample of first page.

Therefore,

Do you feel that the use of official Civil Service titles contribute to a greater understanding in the budget process than the use of operating titles such as Chief, Procurement Division GS-12, or Regional Safety Engineer GS-12?

	:No. :	%	:
yes, greater	: 2 :	13 1/3:	:
same	: 2 :	13 1/3:	:
no, less	: 11 :	73 1/3:	:
Total	: 15 :	100	:

Approximately three-fourths of the replies were to the effect that official Civil Service titles contributed less to an understanding in the budget process than the use of operating titles. The fact that the illustrations of operating titles given above were at the GS-12 grade level rather than GS-4 or GS-5 may have accounted, in part, for the resultant percentages. In this connection one respondent drew a distinction and added that he felt the Civil Service titles made the greater contribution in lower grades, but that the operating titles were of more significance in the higher grades, "especially from GS-14 up."

2. To what extent are official class titles which have been established by the Civil Service Commission, and which are used by your agency in position classification and pay roll activities, also used in budget preparation?

	:No.:	%	:
always	: 1 :	6 2/3:	:
very much	: 4 :	26 2/3:	:
much	: 5 :	33 1/3:	:
very little	: 3 :	20	:
none	: 2 :	13 1/3:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	: 15 :	100	:

Slightly less than nine-tenths, or $86 \frac{2}{3}$ per cent, replied that Civil Service titles were being used in budget preparations. Exactly two-thirds of the respondents reported a high frequency rate ranging from "much" to "always" in which official class titles were used in budget preparations. Exactly one-third--a substantial minority--stated that a low frequency rate of "none" or "very little" use was made of the Civil Service titles in budgets.

3. Does there appear to be a tendency now to use Civil Service position classification titles for budget purposes more than in past years?

	:No. :	%	:
yes	: 3 :	20	:
no	: 11 :	$73 \frac{1}{3}$:
no opinion	: 1 :	$6 \frac{2}{3}$:
Total	: 15 :	100	:

Approximately three-fourths of the respondents indicated there was no tendency to use Civil Service titles more than in past years, although one-fifth reported there was such a trend. This may be an indication that the budget officers are following the Bureau of the Budget regulations more than the pertinent provision contained in The Classification Act of 1949.

4. (a) In budgetary administration, is it necessary to establish a means of control to insure that the will of the appropriating body in authorizing positions of certain kinds and/or numbers will be carried out?

	:No.:	<u>%</u>	:
always	: 3 :	20	:
very often	: 4 :	26 2/3:	:
often	: 1 :	6 2/3:	:
very seldom	: 6 :	40	:
never	: 1 :	6 2/3:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:15 :	100	:

Slightly more than nine-tenths, or 93 1/3 per cent, felt that some control was necessary, and slightly more than half, or 53 1/3 per cent, indicated a high frequency occurrence ranging from "often" to "always." Over two-fifths, or 46 2/3 per cent, indicated a low occurrence rate ranging from "very seldom" to "never."

4.(b) (Please reply unless your answer to the above is "never.") Is there a need for stronger controls in this respect which will require closer collaboration between budget and classification officers?⁹

	:No. :	<u>%</u>	:
yes, a great need	: 3 :	20	:
yes, a small need	: 1 :	6 2/3:	:
no need	: 10 :	66 2/3:	:
no opinion	: 1 :	6 2/3:	:
Total	: 15 :	100	:

Two-thirds felt there was no need whatsoever for stronger controls that would require closer collaboration between budget and classification officers. On the other hand, it appears significant in this instance that slightly more than one-fourth reported a need, with one-fifth expressing "a great need" for closer collaboration.

⁹ The respondent who answered "never" to #4(a) also replied to #4(b), which accounts for 15 instead of 14 replies.

5. In Federal budgetary administration, is use made of position classification titles and grades in giving a position control organization picture of different operating units?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 1 :	6 2/3:	:
yes, very often	: 2 :	13 1/3:	:
yes, often	: 8 :	53 1/3:	:
yes, but seldom	: 3 :	20 :	:
no, never	: 0 :	0 :	:
no opinion	: 1 :	6 2/3:	:
Total	:15 :	:100 :	:

Slightly more than nine-tenths, or 93 1/3 per cent, reported that use was being made of position classification titles and grades to give a position control organization picture of different operating units. Almost three-fourths indicated a high frequency range from "often" to "always." No one indicated a total disregard of the use.

6.(a) Would it aid the Budget Officers in their preparation of budget estimates for position classifiers to make known what incumbered positions appear likely to be allocated higher or lower, within the year?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, very much	: 7 :	46 2/3:	:
yes, a little	: 7 :	46 2/3:	:
no	: 1 :	6 2/3:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0 :	:
Total	:15 :	:100 :	:

Slightly more than nine-tenths, or 93 1/3 per cent, stated that it would aid the budget officers if the position classifiers made known what incumbered positions appeared likely to change grades within the year. The

percentage figure that felt this information would aid very much equalled the number that felt it would help only a little. The one respondent who answered "no" made the comment, "Only operating people would have the knowledge."¹⁰

6.(b) If "yes", do you believe greater collaboration is needed in this respect?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, a lot	6	42 6/7	:
yes, a little	6	42 6/7	:
no	2	14 2/7	:
no opinion	0	0	:
Total	14	100	:

Slightly less than nine-tenths, or 85 5/7 per cent, felt that greater collaboration was needed. Again, an equal percentage division took place between those that believed "a lot" greater collaboration was needed and those that answered "a little."

7. Vacancy positions are shown in budgets at the entrance salary rates of their grades. Does the fact that these positions may be filled by reassignment or by transfer of employees already in that grade and at the salary rates achieved through within-grade promotions, lessen the need for collaboration in budgeting between budget officers and classification officers?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, lessens to small extent	1	6 2/3	:
yes, lessens to great extent	0	0	:
yes, completely lessens need	1	6 2/3	:
no	12	80	:
no opinion	1	6 2/3	:
Total	15	100	:

¹⁰ This comment, of course, reflects the lack of knowledge on the part of the respondent and does not represent the actual facts.

The returns indicated that the filling of some positions at, and others above, the salary levels of the base pay rates of grades, did not create such a hopeless situation as to lessen the need for collaboration in budgeting between the budget and classification staffs. Exactly four-fifths of the respondents said it did not lessen the need, and none of the 13 1/3 per cent who took the opposite view said that it lessened "to a great extent."

8. In which of these situations does there appear to be greater need for collaboration where position classification has either a direct or an indirect bearing on budgeting:

- (1) between position classifiers and operating officials during the latter's preparation of estimates and attempts to keep within allotments?; or
- (2) between position classifiers and budget officers during the latter's preparation of an agency budget?

	:No.:	$\frac{\%}{:}$:
greater need for collaboration in (1)	: 7 :	$\frac{46 \frac{2}{3}}{:}$:
greater need for collaboration in (2)	: 0 :	$\frac{0}{:}$:
same need for collaboration in both	: 7 :	$\frac{46 \frac{2}{3}}{:}$:
no opinion	: 1 :	$\frac{6 \frac{2}{3}}{:}$:
Total	:15 :	$\frac{100}{:}$:

The same number of respondents who answered that there was a greater need for collaboration between position classifiers and operating officials than between position classifiers and budget officers, also replied that there was an equal need for greater collaboration

in both instances. Considering that the replies for equal need were, in some respect, actually votes for both instances, it appears that a resultant tally somewhat favors the opinion that there is a greater need for collaboration in budget matters between the position classification and operating officials than the former and the budget officials. No one felt there was a greater need for collaboration between position classifiers and budget officers.

9. In the justification portion for the personal services part of the budget, data on work load measurements and operating standards are deemed essential. To what extent are these data derived from the position classification office?

	:No.:	%	:
to a large extent	: 0 :	0	:
only to a minor extent:	5 :	33 1/3:	:
not at all	: 9 :	60	:
no opinion	: 1 :	6 2/3:	:
Total	:15 :	100	:

The preponderant opinion, representing slightly less than two-thirds of the returns, or 60 per cent, was that data on work load measurements and operating standards were not derived at all from the position classification office. One-third, however, felt that the classification office did supply these data, but only to a minor extent.

10. (a) The Classification Act of 1949 provides a plan for classifying positions upon which Congress based the salary plans. In bureau or department opera-

tions, except for this feature, does it appear that work relationships between classification and fiscal functions (finance officers and accountants) are rather indirect, mechanical and routine?

	:No. :	% :
yes	: 11 :	73 1/3 :
no	: 0 :	0 :
no opinion	: 4 :	26 2/3 :
Total	: 15 :	100 :

On the basis of everyone who took a stand on the question, which represented approximately three-fourths of the respondents, the work-relationships between the classification and fiscal functions are rather indirect, mechanical and routine.

10. (b) If answer is "no" and time will permit, your reasons for this reply will be appreciated.

Since no one answered "no" to #10(a), the provision made here for comments did not require, and did not receive them.

Written comments.

A general comment was made at the end of only one questionnaire, although a few specific remarks were made by some when they checked the questions, and these have been included in the Tabulated results. The general comment was:

There is a feeling on my part that the recognition of 31 U.S.C. 694 by position classification officers

would be a tremendous aid to budgetary administration.¹¹

The legal citation referred to is another example of the collaboration required between position classifiers, budget officers and management in order to enforce the provisions of a legal instrument. The reference reads as follows:

No appropriation or fund made available by this or any other appropriation Act to the executive departments and establishments, including corporations, for personal services shall be available to pay any increased cost resulting from the allocation or reallocation hereafter of a position to a higher grade, or resulting from the creation of a new position, if such increased cost would result in an increase in the total obligations on an annual basis under such appropriation or fund: Provided, That this prohibition shall not apply to the initial creation of positions to carry out new programs or functions for which specific appropriations are made available.

VI. REPLIES OF PERSONNEL OFFICERS

The "Questionnaire for Personnel Officers on the Position Classification System and its Relationship to Certain Phases of Personnel Administration"¹² was sent to 20 people. Three, or 15 per cent, were at the departmental or agency level, and seventeen, or 85 per cent, were at the bureau level. Thirteen, or 65 per cent,

¹¹ For a legal opinion on the matter, see C. G. B-68301, August 13, 1947.

¹² See Appendix F for sample of first page.

completed and returned the inquiry and are referred to herein as "respondents", even though they may not have expressed an opinion to every particular question. That is, they are regarded as respondents to the total questionnaire even though they may have checked "no opinion", or otherwise failed to answer, on one or more questions. Ten questions were asked, not including the single cross-section inquiry made of all the recipients in the case study, and these ten are presented below with the replies and other information.

Tabulated results.

1. The position classification system provides a source of information, which can be drawn upon by the Civil Service Commission, agency Boards of Examiners, and other employment officers for facts about the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required to perform the work of positions. Are such facts obtained from the classification system in order to form the basis for further studies:

(a) in preparing tests?

	:No.:	<u>%</u>	:
yes, always	: 0 :	0	:
yes, very often	: 5 :	38 6/13:	:
yes, often	: 3 :	23 1/13:	:
yes, but seldom	: 5 :	38 6/13:	:
no, never	: 0 :	0	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:13 :	100	:

All of the respondents stated that facts provided by the position classification system were actually used, to varying degrees, to form the basis for further studies

in preparing tests. Slightly over three-fifths indicated that facts were obtained in this manner either "often" or "very often", representing a high occurrence, but not the highest possible, of course. One respondent qualified his "often" reply by stating, "yes, by C.S.C., I think." A substantial minority of almost two-fifths indicated that use of position classification in preparing tests was exercised "but seldom", a low frequency rate.

(b) in informing prospective applicants about the basic qualifications to be rated?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
yes, very often	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
yes, often	: 5 :	38 6/13:	:
yes, but seldom	: 3 :	23 1/13:	:
no, never	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
no opinion	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
Total	:13 :	100	:

Almost 85 per cent answered in the affirmative with one, or about 8 per cent, expressing no opinion by stating, "Don't know." About 62 per cent indicated a high rate of occurrence ranging from "often" to "always." The two extremes of "always" and "never" were equally balanced for small percentages. Almost one-third, or 30 10/13 per cent, indicated a low occurrence of "seldom" or "never."

(c) in preparing eligible lists?

	<u>No.:</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>:</u>
yes, always	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
yes, very often	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
yes, often	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
yes, but seldom	: 5 :	38 6/13:	:
no, never	: 3 :	23 1/13:	:
no opinion	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
Total	:13 :	100	:

While approximately 70 per cent answered in the affirmative, to varying degrees, it should be noted that slightly over 60 per cent indicated a low frequency rate of "but seldom" or "never." One respondent who answered "seldom" made the additional statement, "Only in cases of selective certification." A minority of slightly over 30 per cent indicated a frequent occurrence of "often" to "always." The same respondent who expressed no opinion to inquiry #1(b) replied likewise to #1(c) with the explanation, "Don't know."

(d) in controlling the use of eligible lists in the filling of requisitions for the certification of eligibles?

	<u>No.:</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>:</u>
yes, always	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
yes, very often	: 3 :	23 1/13:	:
yes, often	: 4 :	30 10/13:	:
yes, but seldom	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
no, never	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
no opinion	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
Total	:13 :	100	:

Slightly over three-fourths of the respondents answered in the affirmative, with slightly over three-fifths indicating a high occurrence of "often" to "always." Approximately 30 per cent specified a low frequency rate of

"but seldom" or "never." The respondent who checked "no opinion" was the same one who qualified his "often" reply to #1(a). In this instance he stated, "What's the difference between (c) and (d)?"

2. Have you known of any occasions in the Federal government within the past ten years where the position classification standards were reproduced bodily in the public announcement of the examination test to show the pertinent facts such as the names of the positions, the work they involve, and the qualifications required?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 0 :	0	:
yes, very often	: 2 :	15 5/13:	
yes, often	: 1 :	7 9/13:	
yes, but seldom	: 2 :	15 5/13:	
no, never	: 7 :	53 11/13:	
no opinion	: 1 :	7 9/13:	
Total	:13 :	100	:

Slightly less than two-fifths answered in the affirmative, with only slightly less than one-fourth indicating a frequent occurrence of "often" or "very often", and no one reporting "always." A preponderant reply of over 50 per cent was "never" which, when added to the response made for "but seldom", represented about 70 per cent of the returns and thus indicated a low frequency rate for this use of position classification. One respondent who answered "never" qualified his reply by stating, "Not for professional positions."

3. In placement work (including requisition, certification and appointment in this instance), the opinion has been expressed that duties statements and qualifica-

tions requirements on requisition forms are often meager and ill-defined for maximum usefulness. To what extent are these duties statements and qualifications requirements taken from position classification sources?

	:No.:	%	:
always	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
very often	: 3 :	23 1/13:	:
often	: 3 :	23 1/13:	:
seldom	: 5 :	38 6/13:	:
never	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:13 :	100	:

Slightly over 90 per cent answered in the affirmative, to varying degrees of occurrence. While a slight preponderance indicated a frequent occurrence rate ranging from "often" to "always", a significant minority of slightly less than 50 per cent reported a low frequency rate ranging from "seldom" to "never." The one respondent who answered "always" is the same one who commented on #1(a) and #1(d). In this instance he stated, "We have only the job description."

4. In the testing process the position classification plan is a tool that saves time when:

(a) the tester does not have to determine over and over again the duties to be tested as new employees fill old jobs?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, and always occurs	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
yes, and very often occurs	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
yes, and often occurs	: 3 :	23 1/13:	:
yes, but seldom occurs	: 4 :	30 10/13:	:
no, never occurs	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:13 :	100	:

Approximately 85 per cent of the respondents agreed

with the premise stated above, and none of the remainder explained by way of comment why they disagreed. Slightly more than 50 per cent indicated a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always", but this was significantly balanced by a slightly less than 50 per cent minority who felt that the use occurred only "seldom" or "never."

(b) the tester can key the examination to classes of positions instead of to individual positions?

	No.	%
yes, and always occurs	3	23 1/13
yes, and very often occurs	3	23 1/13
yes, and often occurs	3	23 1/13
yes, but seldom occurs	4	30 10/13
no, and never occurs	0	0
no opinion	0	0
Total	13	100

All, or 100 per cent answered that the position classification plan is a time-saving tool when the tester can key the examination to classes of positions instead of to individual positions. Almost 70 per cent indicated a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always", while the remainder of only 30 per cent specified a "seldom" occurrence.

(c) this (a & b) decreases the number of eligible lists maintained to meet the needs of the Department?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, and always occurs	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
yes, and very often occurs	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
yes, and often occurs	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
yes, but seldom occurs	: 6 :	46 2/13:	:
no, and never occurs	: 0 :	0 :	:
no opinion	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
Total	:13 :	100 :	:

Substantially more than four-fifths of the respondents, or $84 \frac{8}{13}$ per cent, replied in the affirmative to varying degrees, with the remainder expressing no opinion. The single opinion preponderantly expressed--representing a majority of those who answered "yes" but slightly less than the total number of respondents--or $46 \frac{2}{13}$ per cent, indicated a low occurrence frequency rate of "seldom"; and a substantial minority of almost two-fifths reported a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always."

5. Does the classification system provide information which can be used in transfer actions:

(a) on relationships of positions to one another in kind and level of work?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, and always used	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
yes, and very often used	: 6 :	46 2/13:	:
yes, and often used	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
yes, but seldom used	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
no, and never used	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0 :	:
Total	:13 :	100 :	:

Substantially more than four-fifths, or $84 \frac{8}{13}$ per cent, of the respondents answered in the affirmative. Approximately 70 per cent of the total respondents indicated a high frequency rate for this use, ranging from

"often" to "always." Slightly less than one-third, or 30 10/13 per cent, reported a low frequency rate of "seldom" or "never" for this use in transfer actions.

(b) on the areas of activities from which employees may be drawn?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, and always used	: 0 :	0	:
yes, and very often used	: 4 :	30 10/13:	:
yes, and often used	: 5 :	38 6/13:	:
yes, but seldom used	: 3 :	23 1/13:	:
no, and never used	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:13 :	100	:

Slightly more than nine-tenths, or 92 4/13 per cent of the respondents reported that the classification system did provide information, which could be used in transfer actions, on the areas of activities from which employees may be drawn. Slightly less than two-thirds, or about 70 per cent of the total respondents indicated that the information was used at a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "very often", as against a low frequency rate reported by slightly less than one-third of "seldom" or "never."

(c) by the identification of career avenues?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, and always used	: 0 :	0	:
yes, and very often used	: 0 :	0	:
yes, and often used	: 6 :	46 2/13:	:
yes, but seldom used	: 6 :	46 2/13:	:
no, and never used	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:13 :	100	:

Again, slightly more than nine-tenths of the respondents, or 92 $\frac{4}{13}$ per cent, answered "yes" to varying degrees. It is somewhat significant, however, that a majority of slightly more than half, or 53 $\frac{11}{13}$ per cent, of the respondents indicated a low frequency rate of "seldom" or "never" at which use was made of available position classification information in transfer actions to identify career avenues.

6. Does the classification plan aid in identifying misplaced employees with positions for which they are better qualified?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 0 :	0	:
yes, very often	: 4 :	30 $\frac{10}{13}$:	:
yes, often	: 3 :	23 $\frac{1}{13}$:	:
yes, but seldom	: 4 :	30 $\frac{10}{13}$:	:
no, never	: 2 :	15 $\frac{5}{13}$:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:13 :	100	:

Substantially more than four-fifths, or 84 $\frac{8}{13}$ per cent, indicated to various degrees that the classification plan aided in identifying misplaced employees with positions for which they are better qualified. Only a slight majority of the total respondents, or 53 $\frac{11}{13}$ per cent, reported a high frequency rate of "often" or "very often" that it aided in this respect, and the remainder indicated a low frequency of "seldom" or "never."

7. To your knowledge, have organization charts in terms of classified positions been posted in conspicuous

places in the Federal Service, for the purpose of challenging employees in a promotion program?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, and always occurs	: 0 :	0	:
yes, and very often occurs	: 0 :	0	:
yes, and often occurs	: 0 :	0	:
yes, but seldom occurs	: 2 :	15	5/13:
no, never	: 10 :	76	12/13:
no opinion	: 1 :	7	9/13:
Total	: 13 :	100	:

Substantially less than one-fifth, or 15 5/13 per cent, of the respondents replied in the affirmative and all of these indicated a low frequency rate of "seldom." The combined low frequency rate of "seldom" and "never" represented slightly more than nine tenths of the replies. The one respondent who checked "no opinion" commented: "Charts frequently posted but not for the purpose of challenging employees. May do so indirectly."

8. The position classification system develops basic information as to the work involved in jobs. Is this basic information, which is developed in the position classification process, actually used for performance rating purposes?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 2 :	15	5/13:
yes, very often	: 4 :	30	10/13:
yes, often	: 2 :	15	5/13:
yes, but seldom	: 3 :	23	1/13:
no, never	: 2 :	15	5/13:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	: 13 :	100	:

Substantially more than four-fifths, or 84 8/13 per cent of the respondents, stated to varying degrees that the basic information on work involved in jobs, developed

in the position classification process, is actually used for performance rating purposes. While slightly more than three-fifths, or $61 \frac{7}{13}$ per cent, indicated a high frequency rate of use, a substantial minority of almost two-fifths, or $38 \frac{6}{13}$ per cent, reported a low occurrence ranging from "seldom" to "never." One of the respondents who answered "never" added, "Maybe it will under the new system."

9. Should one part of the position classification sheet include the performance requirements?

	No.:	%	:
yes, always	5	$38 \frac{6}{13}$:
let supervisor decide	3	$23 \frac{1}{13}$:
no, never	2	$15 \frac{5}{13}$:
no opinion	0	0	:
my alternate sugges- tion is	3	$23 \frac{1}{13}$:
<u>Total</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>100</u>	:

All of the respondents replied to the question. No single category of replies received a majority of all opinions given, although those who stated that the position classification sheet should "always" include the performance requirements represented a preponderance of almost two-fifths by comparison with the other categories. Of those who answered the question without giving alternate suggestions, the "always" group represented exactly one-half, or 50 per cent. Almost one-fourth would not attempt uniformity, but would leave the matter up to the

supervisors to decide. A small minority of less than one-fifth checked "never." The three alternate suggestions were as follows:

- (1) A very good idea, but impractical in many kinds of jobs. O. k. for stenos--typists--book-keepers, etc.
- (2) Yes, if specifically defined.
- (3) I believe that performance requirements in general should be developed separately since their development and improvement cannot always be feasibly accomplished simultaneously with the preparation and revision of position descriptions.

10. Are position classification standards used as an aid by training specialists in the development of employee training programs?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
yes, very often	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
yes, often	: 5 :	38 6/13:	:
yes, but seldom	: 5 :	38 6/13:	:
no, never	: 1 :	7 9/13:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:13 :	:100	:

Slightly over nine-tenths, or $92 \frac{4}{13}$ per cent, recognized the use of position classification standards in the development of training programs. A majority of the respondents, or $53 \frac{11}{13}$ per cent, indicated a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always." A substantial minority of $46 \frac{1}{13}$ per cent, however, indicated a low occurrence rate of "seldom" or "never."

Written comments.

General comments were made at the end of only two questionnaires and are set forth below, although the comments made to specific questions within the inquiry have been included in the tabulated results. Incidentally, the #1 comments were made by the same respondent who remarked on items #1(a) #1(d), and #3 in the questionnaire:

1(a). Widely used to straighten out organizational conflicts.

(b) The uses of classification mentioned above are obscured and hindered by the corruption of the system engendered by squabbles about grade determination.

2(a). Close coordination is needed between classifiers, placement officers and testing officials to attain the best results in a personnel management program. Each should have proper perspective as to their place in the organization and the relation of their work to others, so each functions as an aid to good management, and not try to have individual programs as the end result.

(b). Specifications have increased production and resulted in more equitable allocations, government-wide. Delegation of authority (classification, employment, etc.) to operating levels has improved management practices and expedited work.

(c) Thorough and frequent inspections are needed to maintain quality and quantity of work.

VII. REPLIES OF ORGANIZATION AND METHODS ANALYSTS

The "Questionnaire for Organization and Methods Analysts on the Position Classification System and its

Relationship to Certain Phases of the Organization and Methods Function,"¹³ was sent to 20 people. Three, or 15 per cent, were at the departmental or agency level, and seventeen, or 85 per cent, were at the bureau level. Sixteen, or 80 per cent, completed and returned the inquiry and are therefore referred to herein as "respondents" even though they may have checked the box "no opinion" on one or more questions. Ten questions were asked, not including the single cross-section inquiry made of all the recipients, and these ten are presented below with the replies and other information.

Tabulated results.

1. (a) Do the processes of fact-finding and analysis the classification system involves (of duties and responsibilities of positions, their supervisory relationships, and the tracing of flow of work, etc.) disclose illogical organization situations, to your knowledge?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, constantly	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
yes, very often	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
yes, often	: 9 :	56 1/4:	:
yes, but rarely	: 5 :	31 1/4:	:
no, never	: 0 :	0 :	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0 :	:
Total	:16 :	:100 :	:

The entire group of respondents stated, based on their personal knowledge, that the processes of the classification system did disclose illogical organization situa-

¹³ See Appendix G for sample of first page.

tions. Slightly more than three-fifths, or 68 3/4 per cent, indicated a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "constantly." A minority of almost one-third, or 31 1/4 per cent, reported a low rate of occurrence, i. e., "but rarely." One who checked "but rarely" probably should have marked a higher frequency rate since he commented: "Management and personnel people in this organization coordinate work closely to the mutual benefit of both."

(b) If your answer to question #1(a) was "no" to any degree, a brief comment on the reason behind your reply will be appreciated, at this point.

Since none of the respondents answered "no" to question #1(a), comments were not required here and none were made.

2. To what extent do you feel that position classifiers report what appear to be illogical organization situations, when found, to officials having the power to make, or recommend, corrections?

	No.:	%
always	3	18 3/4
very often	4	25
often	4	25
rarely	5	31 1/4
never	0	0
no opinion	0	0
Total	16	100

All, or 100 per cent, replied that the position classifiers do report to the proper officials what appear

to be illogical organization situations. More than three-fifths, or $68 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent, felt that these reports were made at a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always." Slightly less than one-third indicated that these reports were made only "rarely."

3. Can officials who have the power to prescribe, or recommend to top management, changes in the organization structure, use the classification facts as one of their basic tools for explaining such prescriptions and recommendations?

	No.	%
yes, always	2	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
yes, very often	5	31 $\frac{1}{4}$
yes, often	4	25
yes, but seldom	3	18 $\frac{3}{4}$
no, never	1	6 $\frac{1}{4}$
no opinion	1	6 $\frac{1}{4}$
Total	16	100

Over four-fifths, or $87 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent, of the respondents felt that the responsible officials could use position classification facts for explaining organization changes recommended or effected. A high frequency rate for this use was reported by more than three-fifths, or $68 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent, ranging from "often" to "always", with a low occurrence of "seldom" or "never" indicated by one-fourth of the respondents. One respondent remarked: "A useful tool where personal considerations hamper application of O & M principles."

4. Position classifiers' tools (classification re-

ports, position descriptions, exhibits, etc) should indicate what actually is the executive's span of control. Can organization and methods analysts use this information for further studies of the span of control problem?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 4 :	25	:
yes, very often	: 4 :	25	:
yes, often	: 2 :	12 1/2:	:
yes, but rarely	: 5 :	31 1/4:	:
no, never	: 0 :	0	:
no opinion	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
Total	:16 :	100	:

All of the respondents who expressed an opinion, representing 93 3/4 per cent of the total involved, felt that organization and methods analysts could use this classification information for further studies. Slightly more than three-fifths, or 62 1/2 per cent, indicated a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always", although slightly less than one-third felt that use could be made of the information "but rarely."

5. (a) Does the position classification function in the Washington area sometimes provide the only organization work performed by Bureau technicians?

	:No.:	%	:
yes	: 5 :	31 1/4:	:
no	:11 :	68 3/4:	:
don't know	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:16 :	100	:

Although a preponderant majority of slightly more than three-fifths of the respondent organization and methods analysts replied "no", a substantial minority of slightly less than one-third recognized that the classifica-

tion function in the Washington area sometimes provided the only organization work performed by Bureau technicians.

(b) Does the position classification function in the field service sometimes provide the only organization work performed by local technicians?

	:No.:	%	:
yes	7	43 3/4	:
no	6	37 1/2	:
don't know	3	18 3/4	:
Total	16	100	:

Slightly more than four-fifths, or 81 1/4 per cent, took a stand on the question by answering either "yes" or "no." Of this four-fifths, slightly more than one-half replied that, in the field service, the classification function sometimes provided the only organization work performed by local technicians. The preponderant response out of the three possible ones--but not representing a total majority--was in the affirmative.

6. The classification office can furnish facts as to activities, functions and organization units upon which Management Improvement Awards, provided by Title X of The Classification Act of 1949, can be considered on the basis of outstanding efficiency and economy. Does it appear that use is being made of the classification office for this purpose?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	0	0	:
yes, very often	0	0	:
yes, often	3	18 3/4	:
yes, but seldom	4	25	:
no, never	7	43 3/4	:
no opinion	2	12 1/2	:
Total	16	100	:

Only a minority of slightly over two-fifths, or $43 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent, reported that use was being made of the classification office to furnish facts for the Management Improvement Awards program. A small fraction of less than one-fifth reported a high frequency rate of "often", but a substantial majority of over three-fifths, or $68 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent, indicated a low frequency rate of "seldom" or "never."

7. Do you believe, where positions can be standardized, that standard position descriptions will help:

(a) in coordinating functions?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, entirely	: 0 :	0	:
yes, very much	: 5 :	$31 \frac{1}{4}$:
yes, much	: 6 :	$37 \frac{1}{2}$:
yes, but little	: 1 :	$6 \frac{1}{4}$:
yes, but very little	: 3 :	$18 \frac{3}{4}$:
no, never	: 1 :	$6 \frac{1}{4}$:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:16 :	100	:

Over nine-tenths, or $93 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent, of the respondents felt that standard position descriptions would help in coordinating functions. Over three-fifths, or $68 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent, indicated a high degree of help ranging from "much" to "very much." Almost one-third, or $31 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent, indicated a low degree of assistance ranging from "little" to "no, never." One respondent who checked "much" added: "Helps stabilize patterns and relationships."

(b) to encourage economy?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, entirely	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
yes, very much	: 3 :	18 3/4:	:
yes, much	: 4 :	25 :	:
yes, but little	: 2 :	12 1/2:	:
yes, but very little	: 4 :	25 :	:
no, never	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
no opinion	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
Total	:16 :	100 :	:

Over four-fifths, or 87 1/2 per cent, of the respondents felt that standard position descriptions would help to encourage economy. Exactly half, or 50 per cent, indicated a high degree of assistance in this respect, ranging from "much" to "entirely." A substantial minority, however, of slightly more than two-fifths, or 43 3/4 per cent, believed a low degree of assistance would be realized in encouraging economy, ranging from "little" to "never." One respondent who checked "but very little" added: "Budget fluctuations tend to enforce constant costly revisions for redistribution of workloads. If the budget doesn't fluctuate, the workload may, and an SPD may deteriorate into a screen for inefficient manpower utilization."

8. Do position descriptions, reports and other classification records give as much information as the organization and methods analysts should expect from them?

	:No.:	%	:
always	0	0	:
very often	7	43 3/4	:
often	2	12 1/2	:
seldom	6	37 1/2	:
never	0	0	:
no answer	1	6 1/4	:
Total	16	100	:

Over nine-tenths, or 93 3/4 per cent, stated that these position classification tools gave as much information as they should expect. However, although over half, or 56 1/4 per cent, indicated a high frequency rate of "often" or "very often", a substantial minority of over one-third reported a low frequency rate of "seldom." One respondent who answered "seldom" added: "Classification reports not commonly made available."

9. The 1937 President's Committee on Administrative Management stated that the study and planning of organization structure can be readily approached through the techniques that are employed in the classification of positions. Do you agree?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, entirely	0	0	:
yes, to a very great extent	4	25	:
yes, to a great extent	6	37 1/2	:
yes, but to a minor extent	4	25	:
no, not at all	1	6 1/4	:
no opinion	1	6 1/4	:
Total	16	100	:

Well over four-fifths, or 87 1/2 per cent, replied that the study and planning of organization structure could be readily approached through the techniques that are employed in the classification of positions. Over three-fifths, or 62 1/2 per cent, indicated that this

could be done to a large extent ranging from "a great extent" to "a very great extent." One respondent who checked "to a great extent" added: "Following the initial breakdown, techniques must be similar to make the organization structure hold together."

10. Where, in your opinion, should the position classification function be located:

(a) in the organization office?	yes	: 3 :	18 3/4:	:
	no	: 13 :	81 1/4:	:
(b) in the personnel office?	yes	: 10 :	62 1/2:	:
	no	: 6 :	37 1/2:	:
(c) in the budget office?	yes	: 0 :	0 :	:
	no	: 16 :	100 :	:
(d) as a separate unit, directly under the head or assistant head of the agency?	yes	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
	no	: 15 :	93 3/4:	:
	Totals	: 16 :	100 :	:
(e) If none of the above, where else?				
	A or B	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
	In an office combining A, B & C	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:

A preponderance of over three-fifths of the respondents, or 62 1/2 per cent, felt that the position classification function should be located in the personnel office. Almost one-fifth, or 18 3/4 per cent, felt it should be located in the organization office.

In view of the reply of the first respondent in (e), location in the organization office could increase to represent one-fourth, or 25 per cent, of the answers; and

location in the personnel office could increase to 68 3/4 per cent, but still represent a rough three-fifths of the returns.

The reply of the second respondent in (e) indicates that he may have had in mind a small office in a small bureau where definite structural and functional divisions may not be necessary and one person can direct all activities. On the other hand, he may have had in mind a larger office where the staff functions are structurally separate from each other but are coordinated and directed by an over-all administrative officer.

Another respondent who checked (b), and therefore whose reply has been counted as preferring the personnel office, qualified his return by adding: "Classification can be either in the personnel or organization office." If the above count were revised to include his return as favoring the organization office, and added to the similar preference expressed by the first respondent in (e), location in the organization office could increase to approximately one-third, or 31 1/4 per cent.

One respondent remarked: "(a) and (b) should collaborate more closely."

Written comments.

General comments were made at the end of several

questionnaires and are set forth below, although the comments made to specific questions within the inquiry have been included in the tabulated results:

1. Recommendations by the organization office concerning function, organization, and staffing should always precede classification, and classification should be performed in accordance with those recommendations. In other words, the correct procedure is to plan a sound organization and staffing and then to classify the jobs. Classification is thus a subsidiary function and should never form the basis for determination of function, organization, or staffing.

2. The degree to which classification is used to improve organization and methods depends in part on the attitude of the line executives in an agency and in part on the aggressiveness and ability of the classification personnel.

3. The classification process can be most useful if it emphasizes three factors: (1) that positions cannot be dealt with in a vacuum but only as pieces of an organization; (2) positions are as dynamic as organizations; and (3) management manages people not positions or organizations. Recognizing these factors the classification process should be based on first determining management's desires and needs and then giving logical expression to them. It is in this way that classification and organization and methods can join hands, being techniques of providing the mechanistic aspects of the management job.

4. I believe greater emphasis should be made of joint surveys by the two staffs.

5. Too often, there is little or no working relationship between the O & M activity and position classification. This is particularly true in the agency I just left. However, my present agency combines organization and position classification in one Division and it will be interesting to see what the results are.

6. The second respondent who replied to 10(e) also

stated:

In my mind, the relationship between organization and methods and classification is not adequate. There is a far more realistic affinity between them than between personnel and classification. The first pairing uses similar tools to deal with an impersonal subject matter; such is not the case with the latter.

VIII. REPLIES OF POSITION CLASSIFIERS

The "Questionnaire for Position Classifiers on the Classification System and its Relationship to Certain Phases of Management" ¹⁴ was sent to 20 people. Five, or one-fourth, were at the departmental or agency level; and fifteen, or three-fourths, were at the bureau level. Sixteen, or 80 per cent, completed and returned the inquiry and are referred to herein as "respondents" even though they may have checked the box "no opinion" on one or more questions. Ten questions were asked, not including the single cross-section inquiry made of all the recipients, and these ten are presented below with the replies and other information.

Tabulated results.

1. To what extent do you feel that progress has been made in the last five years, as a result of published position classification standards, in the technical determination of the relative values of jobs subject to the Federal position classification system?

¹⁴ See Appendix H for sample of first page.

	:No.:	<u>%</u>	:
very much	: 6 :	37 1/2:	:
much	: 5 :	31 1/4:	:
little	: 2 :	12 1/2:	:
very little	: 3 :	18 3/4:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:16 :	100	:

All the respondents verified to various degrees that progress had been made as the result of published standards. Over three-fifths, or 68 3/4 per cent, felt that great progress had been achieved and indicated this by checking "much" or "very much." A minority, but a significant one of 31 1/4 per cent or almost one-third, felt that only small progress had been achieved and therefore checked "little" or "very little."

2. Do you find that the position classification office is blamed for delays in consummating promotions and other personnel actions, whereas the real delay is caused in other service or operating offices by failure to draw up an approved organization chart, obtain funds, reconcile conflicts in duties, etc.?

	:No.:	<u>%</u>	:
yes, always	: 0 :	0	:
yes, very often	: 8 :	50	:
yes, often	: 6 :	37 1/2:	:
yes, but seldom	: 2 :	12 1/2:	:
no, never	: 0 :	0	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:16 :	100	:

A 100 per cent reply was made by the respondents to the effect that the position classification office was blamed for delays whereas the real cause for the delays rested in other service or operating offices. Well over

four-fifths, or 87 1/2 per cent, indicated a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "very often."

3. Do you feel that Bureau heads and Division chiefs invite position classifiers for advice early enough when reorganizations are taking place?

	No.	%
yes, always	1	6 1/4
yes, very often	4	25
yes, often	6	37 1/2
yes, but seldom	4	25
no, never	1	6 1/4
no opinion	0	0
Total	15	100

Over nine-tenths, or 93 3/4 per cent, felt that Bureau heads and Division chiefs invited the position classifiers early enough for advice. A high frequency rate was reported by over three-fifths, or 68 3/4 per cent, of the respondents ranging from "often" to "always." A low rate was indicated by approximately one-third, or 31 1/4 per cent, of the respondents ranging from "seldom" to "never."

The one respondent who checked "always" qualified his reply by remarking: "In this Department." Two who checked "often" also made comments. One of these stated: "But the number who do not is substantial enough to cause a great deal of trouble;" and the other added: "Request for advice could come much earlier than is usually the case." A respondent who checked "very often" commented:

This is a most important phase of position classification, one which most people refuse to recognize. Classifiers are frequently called upon to make organizational recommendations predicated upon the securing of the optimum grade levels. My experience has indicated that classifiers participate more actively in organizational determinations than many so-called organization and methods examiners.

4. Assuming that position classifiers should have a broad and sympathetic understanding of the problems of management, and should effectively tie in classification with administration to the greatest extent possible within the classification system:

(a) Do you feel that the position classifiers as a group in the Washington area do have this understanding?

	: No. :	%	:
yes, all	: 0 :	0	:
yes, most	: 2 :	12 1/2:	:
yes, many	: 11 :	68 3/4:	:
yes, but very few	: 2 :	12 1/2:	:
no, none	: 0 :	0	:
no opinion	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
Total	: 16 :	100	:

Over nine-tenths, or 93 3/4 per cent, of the respondents expressed an opinion and they all felt that the position classifiers in the Washington area did have this understanding. Over four-fifths of the respondents, or 81 1/4 per cent, felt that a large number had this understanding ranging from "many" to "most."

Two respondents who checked "many" qualified their replies by additional comments. One stated, "Except those in CSC"; and the other remarked, "Outside of top-level position classifiers I doubt if they have this

understanding."

(b) Do you feel that the position classifiers as a group in the Washington area do cooperate with operating officials?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
yes, very much	: 8 :	50 :	:
yes, a lot	: 7 :	43 3/4:	:
yes, a little	: 0 :	0 :	:
yes, but very little	: 0 :	0 :	:
no, never	: 0 :	0 :	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0 :	:
Total	:16 :	100 :	:

All, or 100 per cent of the respondents, replied in the affirmative. They all reported a high frequency or degree rate ranging from "a lot" to "always." The respondent who checked "always" made the following statement: "Yes, too much." One respondent who checked "very much" commented:

Item 4 is only one side of the coin. Classifiers at least will say that they have a lot more sympathy with the problems of management than management (particularly at the operating levels) has with the problems and objectives of classification. As a generalization, I would say management below the very top level has absolutely no genuine interest in promoting the basic theory of Federal classification (not that this basic theory is above approach--equal pay for equal work).

Another respondent who also checked "very much" stated:

Position classification at best is a thankless function. Although we classifiers feel that we do

aid and work with operating officials, the opinion generally exists throughout Government that classification is a hindrance. It is a strange phenomena --e.g., an engineer will resent anyone refuting his technical recommendations; similarly, a doctor, lawyer, or any other professional or administrative group. However, they all show no reluctance to indicate that the classifier has 'missed the boat,' etc., when recommended grades are either turned down or raised. Everyone on the operating side of the fence considers themselves as personnel and classification experts.

5. For management purposes, should a portion of the position classification sheet include the "qualifications required to perform the work"?

	: No. :	% :
yes, always	: 12 :	75 :
let supervisor decide	: 0 :	0 :
no, never	: 3 :	18 3/4 :
no opinion	: 1 :	6 1/4 :
Total	: 16 :	100 :
my further suggestion is: _____		

All of the respondents expressed an opinion. An over-whelming majority of three-fourths, or 75 per cent, felt that the position classification sheet should always include the qualifications required to perform the work. Uniformity of treatment was preferred by all so as to definitely include or exclude the qualifications rather than leave the matter up to the supervisors for decision. A small minority of less than one-fifth reported that the qualifications statement should "never" be included. Several further suggestions, or comments, were made:

(1) The "never" group:

Would be of little value to management.

Abandon qualification requirements as a part of position descriptions--they are not prepared realistically anyway.

(2) The "always" group:

If cooperation in CSC between examining and classification is ever possible.

Such statements should be in terms of minimum knowledges, skills and abilities required for successful work performance.

Provided the statement goes beyond the qualification standards used to qualify the incumbent for the job and provided the statement furnishes additional information pertinent to the allocation of the job. Otherwise no--a useless appendage.

The job sheet and qualification standards should appear on the same form and for similar purposes. Doesn't assist or help classifiers in allocating positions, as presently constituted.

6. Have you been consulted by budget analysts for assistance in helping them establish uniform position titles for use in budget preparation?

	No.	%
yes, always	1	6 1/4
yes, very often	2	12 1/2
yes, often	3	18 3/4
yes, but seldom	4	25
no, never	6	37 1/2
no opinion	0	0
Total	16	100

While a preponderant number of three-fifths, or 62 1/2 per cent, of the respondents replied "yes", to varying degrees, a substantial minority of over one-third, or

37 1/2 per cent, stated they had "never" been consulted by budget analysts for such assistance. The "never" group added to the "seldom" group comprises a large three-fifths, or 62 1/2 per cent, of the respondents who indicated a low frequency rate of consultation.

7. Regardless of the additional grades accorded by the Classification Act of 1949 or other additional grades which may be accorded in the future, and forgetting the pay plan, do you feel that the basic classification techniques prevent full recognition of the grade of the professional technician who is supervised in varying degrees by the administrator?

	: No. :	%	:
yes, always	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
yes, very often	: 2 :	12 1/2:	:
yes, often	: 0 :	0 :	:
yes, but seldom	: 6 :	37 1/2:	:
no, never	: 7 :	43 3/4:	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0 :	:
Total	: 16 :	100 :	:

Slightly more than half of the respondents, or 56 1/4 per cent, felt that to varying degrees the basic classification techniques prevented full recognition of the grade of the professional technician who is supervised by the administrator. Almost one-fifth, or 18 3/4 per cent, felt that this occurred at a high rate ranging from "very often" to "always"; but over four-fifths indicated a low frequency rate ranging from "seldom" to "never."

Two of the respondents who checked "seldom" added a comment. One stated, "However, there is no reason why

they should;" the other, "Basic classification techniques have little to do with the selection and placement of this class of employee."

8. Have you noticed within the past few years that position classifiers have put forth a special effort to explain the classification system to Federal employees?

	:No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
yes, very often	: 4 :	25 :	:
yes, often	: 6 :	37 1/2:	:
yes, but seldom	: 4 :	25 :	:
no, never	: 0 :	0 :	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0 :	:
no answer 15	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
Total	:16 :	100 :	:

All but one of the respondents, or 93 3/4 per cent, checked an answer and all of these replied, to varying degrees, they had noticed that position classifiers had put forth a special effort within the past few years to explain the classification system to Federal employees. Over three-fifths of the respondents, or 68 3/4 per cent, reported that they had noticed this at a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always." Exactly one-fourth had noticed it "but seldom."

The respondent who did not check a box indicated a very good situation, however, by stating: "Has been part of our program, and very actively so--can't therefore say it's only recently that a 'special' effort has

been made."

9. Are the "qualifications required" statements in position classification standards issued by the Civil Service Commission, too meager?

	:No.:	%
yes, always	: 6 :	37 1/2% :
yes, very often	: 3 :	18 3/4% :
yes, often	: 4 :	25 % :
yes, but seldom	: 1 :	6 1/4% :
no, never	: 1 :	6 1/4% :
no opinion	: 1 :	6 1/4% :
Total	:16 :	100 % :

A preponderance of over four-fifths, or 87 1/2 per cent, felt to varying degrees that the "qualifications required" statement in position classification standards issued by the Civil Service Commission were too meager. Of significance, also, is the fact that over four-fifths, or 81 1/4 per cent, reported a high frequency rate ranging from "often" to "always." Only a little more than one-tenth, or 12 1/2 per cent, indicated it was rarely ever that the "qualifications required" statements were too meager, and accordingly checked "seldom" or "never."

One respondent who checked "very often" commented that the statements were too general for any practical value, or if specific requirements were listed the pertinent elements were too often absent. Another respondent checked "always" and remarked:

In view of official standards developed by CSC I

feel such statements unnecessary. They are seldom in agreement and are misleading to field personnel. They are useful only if they can be used for grade determination.

10. Is there collaboration in the Federal service between employment and classification technicians?

	No.:	%	:
yes, always	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
yes, very often	: 3 :	18 3/4:	:
yes, often	: 8 :	50 :	:
yes, but seldom	: 4 :	25 :	:
no, never	: 0 :	0 :	:
no opinion	: 0 :	0 :	:
Total	: 16 :	100 :	:

All, or 100 per cent, reported affirmatively that the employment and classification technicians did collaborate with each other. Three-fourths, or 75 per cent, reported a high frequency rate of collaboration ranging from "often" to "always"; but the remainder indicated a low frequency rate of "seldom."

One respondent who replied "often" commented: "At the Bureau level. At the Departmental and CSC levels there is very little."

Written comments.

Four respondents commented as follows:

1. No possibility of classification system achieving its basic ends until a strong and realistic base of supervisory and management improvement provides the needed foothold.

2. It is not the system that is faulty, unless the absence of automatic enforcement may be

considered a fault. The weakness lies in the unwillingness to classify solely on the elements included in the activities to be performed and without regard to wishes (with respect to employee selection) of the employing office. The only perfect classification will be made when the activity is performed by an independent agency not influenced by bureau, agency or political influence. As now practiced, the classification system is an aid to the bureau or agency in placing personally selected employees where desired.

3. I have based my answers on my own experience, and on opinions and ideas I have gathered from my associations with classifiers in Washington and the Field. The average technician has improved his general outlook and understanding very much in the last few years. However, there are still too many who live in an ivory tower, who can do nothing but quote platitudes, cite regulations, and read class specifications word by word without relating them to a work or administrative situation. I sincerely hope I am not guilty of this!

4. (a) A training school for classifiers should be established by a central agency such as the Civil Service Commission to obtain best results.

(b) Specific training needed in :

(1) Interpretation and proper application of the specifications.

(2) Classifiers' place in organization and their use as an effective tool of management.

(3) Supervisory participation in position classification.

(c) Background for classification training:

(1) College education

(2) Thorough knowledge of agency organization and of the manner in which it functions at all levels.

IX. REPLIES OF ALL RESPONDENT GROUPS TO THE CROSS-SECTION QUESTION

Each one of the questionnaires which were sent to the respondents employed in the various fields of management contained one identical question. This question, with the tabulated and written replies made, is set forth below. There were thirty line administrator, fifteen budget officer, thirteen personnel officer, sixteen organization and methods analyst, and sixteen position classifier, respondents. In other words the numbers considered as recipients and respondents to this question, and the bureau and agency levels involved, are the same as were applicable when each group was treated separately on the previous inquiries covered. The question is as follows:

To what degree do you believe the classification process is an aid to management in attaining the over-all objectives of the organization?

Replies of general administrators.

	:No. :	% :
outstanding	: 3 :	10 :
very great	: 12 :	40 :
great	: 11 :	36 2/3 :
small	: 3 :	10 :
very small	: 0 :	0 :
none	: 0 :	0 :
no answer given ¹⁶	: 1 :	3 1/3 :
Total	: 30 :	100 :

All of the respondent administrators answered the

¹⁶ Not on questionnaire.

question except one, and all the replies made--or 96 2/3 per cent--indicated that to varying degrees the classification process was an aid to management in attaining the over-all objectives of the organization. Well over four-fifths, or 86 2/3 per cent, of the respondents felt that classification aided to a high degree ranging from "great" to "outstanding." No significant number indicated a low degree. No qualifying comments were made.

Replies of budget officers.

	<u>No.:</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>:</u>
outstanding	: 0 :	0	:
very much	: 3 :	20	:
great	: 5 :	33 1/3:	
small	: 2 :	13 1/3:	
very small	: 4 :	26 2/3:	
none	: 1 :	6 2/3:	
Total	:15 :	100	:

Over nine-tenths of the respondents, or 93 1/3 per cent, felt to varying degrees that position classification was an aid to management in attaining the over-all objectives of the organization. Over one-half, or 53 1/3 per cent, indicated a high degree of assistance ranging from "great" to "outstanding." A substantial minority of over two-fifths, or 46 2/3 per cent, indicated a low degree of aid ranging from "small" to "none." One felt that it aided "none." No qualifying comments were made.

Replies of personnel officers.

	:No.:	%	:
outstanding	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
very great	: 6 :	46 2/13:	:
great	: 3 :	23 1/13:	:
small	: 0 :	0 :	:
very small	: 2 :	15 5/13:	:
none	: 0 :	0 :	:
Total	:13 :	:100 :	:

All, or 100 per cent, of the respondents answered the question in the affirmative. Over four-fifths, or $84 \frac{8}{13}$ per cent, indicated that the classification process aided management to a high degree in attaining the overall objectives, ranging from "great" to "outstanding." The remaining small minority of about 15 per cent indicated the low degree.

One respondent who checked "very great" stated, "Often imposes undue restriction in placement, but can be improved."

Replies of organization and methods analysts.

	:No.:	%	:
outstanding	: 0 :	0 :	:
very great	: 6 :	37 1/2:	:
great	: 5 :	31 1/4:	:
small	: 4 :	25 :	:
very small	: 1 :	6 1/4:	:
none	: 0 :	0 :	:
Total	:16 :	:100 :	:

All, or 100 per cent, answered the question in the affirmative. Over three-fifths, or $68 \frac{3}{4}$ per cent, felt that classification aided management to a high degree ranging from "great" to "outstanding"; while the remainder

of about one-third, or $31 \frac{1}{4}$ per cent, indicated a low degree of "small" or "very small."

One respondent who checked "small" stated, "But can, and should be great aid."

Replies of position classifiers.

	:No.:	%	:
outstanding	: 0 :	0	:
very great	: 8 :	50	:
great	: 6 :	$37 \frac{1}{2}$:
small	: 1 :	$6 \frac{1}{4}$:
very small	: 1 :	$6 \frac{1}{4}$:
none	: 0 :	0	:
Total	:16 :	100	:

All, or 100 per cent, answered in the affirmative that classification was an aid to management. Over four-fifths, or $87 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent, felt that classification aided to a high degree ranging from "great" to "very great," but no one checked "outstanding." A small minority of about 12 per cent felt it aided only to a low degree of "small" or "very small."

One respondent who replied "very great" commented:

Depends on which side of the fence you are on. Some operating officials feel that classification is a 'stumbling block' to management. On the other hand they make considerable use of our knowledge of organization, procedures, etc. It is when we do not approve desired grades that our assistance or value is questioned. Classification is an aid to management at the top level and it is also a control.

Another respondent who also checked "very great" stated:

When the process is not too stretched, procrustean-wise, and where intelligently handled it is of great help. But under present economic and recruiting conditions, the process must become distorted and agonized if it is going to be of any real aid to management. A suitable price control program and job freeze, taken at the right time, would have maintained things in proportion. But since classification has been used as the doctor to fix up, by legal means, all the administrative ills from which management suffers, it will continue to be imposed upon in that fashion, until management is cured by sounder planning, and preparedness in all its other aspects.

X. SUMMARY

From an over-all standpoint, the percentage of replies was encouraging. The returns by each group, for instance, represented higher percentages than a scientific questionnaire study once conducted by professors of the University of Minnesota.¹⁷ The number, and the directness, of additional written comments generally showed an intense interest.

On the positive side of the picture, as evidenced by the tallies of the responses, the following was disclosed:

Replies of general administrators.

1. The unanimous response of line administrators that position classifiers, before classifying positions,

¹⁷ William E. Mosher, J. Donald Kingsley, and O. Glenn Stahl, Public Personnel Administration (3d ed.; New York : Harper and Brothers, 1950) p. 392.

do give the incumbents and/or their supervisors an opportunity to explain the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required to perform the work, deflates the criticism sometimes made to the contrary. The supervisors are contacted a little more frequently than the incumbents, probably due to the fact that all necessary information is sometimes obtained from the supervisors thus obviating the necessity to interview others.¹⁸

2. It is only infrequently that an otherwise desirable organization is adjusted in order to obtain higher grades.¹⁹

3. Substantial confidence is had in the ability of position classifiers at all levels: Civil Service Commission, Department and Bureau.²⁰

4. Job incumbents are given an opportunity, and at a comparatively high frequency rate, to explain their work when class specifications writers prepare standards.²¹

5. Considering that the classification system is not an "exact science," it is encouraging that about two-thirds felt the principle of "equal pay for substantially equal work" was achieved. Without such a system of any

¹⁸ See supra, pp. 111-112.

¹⁹ See supra, pp. 112-113.

²⁰ See supra, p. 113.

²¹ See supra, p. 114.

kind, it is very doubtful that such a high percentage would appear satisfied. Even of the minority who felt the principle was not being attained, no one was inclined to discard the system.²²

6. In general, the position classification office usually takes action fast enough on grade recommendations to satisfy line administrators when authority to make final grade allocations is exercised within the Bureau.²³

7. A high degree of support (but not "entirely" enough) is given by management to enable the position classifiers to do the best job, as well as an adequate job.²⁴

8. Since almost nine-tenths of the respondents had been in the Federal service ten years or more, the group is considered a qualified one to answer the questionnaire.²⁵

Replies of budget officers.

1. Official class titles established by the Civil Service Commission, and used by agencies in position classification and pay roll activities, are used in

22 See supra, pp. 114-115.

23 See supra, pp. 116-117.

24 See supra, pp. 119-121.

25 See supra, p. 121.

budget preparation, and at a high frequency rate.²⁶

2. In budgetary administration it is necessary to establish a means of control to insure that the will of the appropriating body in authorizing positions of certain kinds and/or numbers will be carried out. The frequency at which this is necessary appears rather evenly balanced between high and low.²⁷

3. It was disclosed that use is being made of position titles and grades to give a position control organization picture of different operating units, and at a frequent rate.²⁸

4. It is an aid to budget officers in their work for position classifiers to make known what incumbered positions appear likely to be allocated higher or lower within the year, although the frequency at which this is an aid appears evenly balanced between high and low.²⁹

5. It was strongly indicated that the filling of some positions at, and others above, the salary levels of the base pay rates of grades did not lessen the need for collaboration between budget and classification staffs.³⁰

Replies of personnel officers.

-
- 26 See supra, pp. 125-126.
27 See supra, pp. 126-127.
28 See supra, p. 128.
29 See supra, pp. 128-129.
30 See supra, pp. 129-130.

1. It was demonstrated that facts are drawn from the position classification system by the Civil Service Commission, agency Boards of Examiners, and employment officers and used to form the basis for further studies (a) in preparing tests; (b) in informing prospective applicants about the basic qualifications to be tested; (c) in preparing eligible lists; and (d) in controlling the use of eligible lists in the filling of requisitions for the certification of eligibles. There is a comparable high frequency rate with which such facts are used in (a), (b) and (d); but the frequency rate viewed from the agency and bureau levels is substantially lower in (c) and justifiably so to the writer since this is a function carried on primarily only by the Civil Service Commission.³¹

2. It was largely verified that the position classification plan saves time to some extent in the testing process when: (a) the tester does not have to determine over and over again the duties to be tested as new employees fill old jobs; (b) the tester can key the examination to classes of positions instead of to individual jobs; (c) and this (a & b) decreases the number of eligible lists maintained to meet the need of the Departments. The use is more frequent in (b) than in (a), but

³¹ See supra, pp. 134-137.

both are high. The infrequent rate for (c) is substantially good since the function is usually carried on only by the Civil Service Commission. Therefore, all the respondents could not express an opinion.³²

3. The classification system provides information which can be used in transfer actions: (a) on the relationships of positions to one another in kind and level of work; and (b) on the areas of activities from which employees may be drawn; and (c) by the identification of career avenues. The information is used at a high frequency rate in (a) and (b).³³

4. Basic information developed through the position classification system is used to a high degree for performance rating purposes. Improvement in the frequency rate should be made, however.³⁴

5. Although the percentage of replies did not disclose any majority opinion on the matter, the preponderant reply favored the inclusion of the performance requirements on the position description.³⁵

6. It was definitely shown that position classification standards are used, but to varying degrees, as an aid by training specialists. The high frequency rate is

32 See supra, pp. 138-140.
33 See supra, pp. 140-142.
34 See supra, pp. 143-144.
35 See supra, pp. 144-145.

slightly greater than the low frequency rate.³⁶

Replies of organization and methods analysts.

1. The processes of fact-finding and analysis the position classification system involves disclose illogical organization situations, and frequently.³⁷

2. Position classifiers frequently report illogical organization situations, when found, to proper officials.³⁸

3. Officials who have the power to prescribe, or recommend to top management, changes in the organization structure frequently use classification facts as one of their basic tools for explaining such prescriptions and recommendations.³⁹

4. Position classifiers reports and other materials indicate what actually is the executive's span of control, and organization and methods analysts can frequently use this information for further studies.⁴⁰

5. Where positions can be standardized, the use of standard position descriptions will help to a great extent in coordinating functions, and to a lesser extent in encouraging economy.⁴¹

36 See supra, pp. 145.
 37 See supra, pp. 147-148.
 38 See supra, pp. 148-149.
 39 See supra, p. 149.
 40 See supra, pp. 149-150.
 41 See supra, pp. 152-153.

6. Position descriptions, reports and other classification records more frequently than not provide as much useful information as the organization and methods analysts should expect from them. Further improvement should be made, however.⁴²

7. General agreement was expressed with the 1937 President's Committee on Administrative Management that the study and planning of organization structure could be readily approached through the techniques that are employed in the classification of positions.⁴³

8. The preferred location of the position classification function was in the personnel office, and next in the organization office.⁴⁴

Replies of position classifiers.

1. As a favorable observation for the promptness of the position classification program, the classifiers have found that, although the classification office is blamed for delays, other offices--and not it--are often the real culprits.⁴⁵

2. It is felt by position classifiers that they as a group in the Washington area have a broad and sympa-

42 See supra, pp. 153-154.
 43 See supra, pp. 154-155.
 44 See supra, pp. 155-156.
 45 See supra, pp. 159-160.

thetic understanding of the problems of management. It is unanimously felt by the respondents that classifiers as a group do cooperate with operating officials in Washington at a high frequency rate.⁴⁶

3. For management purposes, it was generally felt that a portion of the position classification sheet should include the qualifications required to perform the work.⁴⁷

4. Although it was generally felt that the grades of professional positions are restricted by those of administrative supervisors to some extent, it is encouraging that over four-fifths of the respondents indicated this occurred at a low frequency rate.⁴⁸

5. It has been noticed within the past few years that the position classifiers have put forth special effort to explain the classification system to Federal employees.⁴⁹

6. Employment and classification technicians collaborate at a rather high frequency rate in the Federal service. On the other hand this rate could be improved, and indications for needed improvement point particularly to the Department and Civil Service Commission

⁴⁶ See supra, pp. 161-163.
⁴⁷ See supra, pp. 163-164.
⁴⁸ See supra, pp. 165-166.
⁴⁹ See supra, pp. 166-167.

levels.⁵⁰

Replies to cross-section question.

The response was excellent from the standpoint of participation in the inquiry on the degree to which the classification process is an aid to management in attaining the over-all objectives of the organization. Also, over four-fifths of the administrators, the personnel officers, and the position classifiers, and well over three-fifths of the organization and methods analysts felt that classification aided to a high degree.⁵¹ Although the percentage of budget officers who shared the same high opinion of position classification was not as great as found in the other respondent groups, the number represented slightly more than one-half of their total.⁵² Only one respondent out of all the five groups indicated that classification aided "none", and he was a budget officer.

On the negative side of the picture, as evidenced by the returns of the respondents, the following was

50 See supra, p. 168.
 51 See supra, pp. 170-174.
 52 See supra, p. 171.

disclosed:

Replies of general administrators.

1. It is felt by a preponderant percentage that line administrators do adjust otherwise desirable organizations in order to obtain higher grade allocations. The adjustment could result in a faulty organization; but even if it did not, the additional work to change something already desirable can hardly be justified. It should be possible to recognize higher grades, where otherwise warranted, without revising sound organizations.⁵³

2. Less confidence is had in the ability of Departmental position classifiers than those in either the Bureau or Civil Service Commission levels.⁵⁴

3. The substantial minority of 40 per cent who felt the frequency rate was low at which position classifiers gave them adequate explanations of the system, is too large a group to suffer this experience.⁵⁵

4. A minority, but nevertheless a substantial one of about one-third, felt the classification system did not achieve "equal pay for substantially equal work."⁵⁶

5. While about two-thirds reported that some

⁵³ See supra, pp. 112-113.

⁵⁴ See supra, p. 113.

⁵⁵ See supra, pp. 113-114.

⁵⁶ See supra, pp. 114-115.

authority had been delegated by the Department to their Bureau to make final grade allocations, as an advocate of delegation as far as practicable the writer feels that greater authority could be delegated. One-tenth reported definitely that no delegation to any degree had been made, and one-fifth showed an indifference to the point that they did not make inquiry and therefore reported they did not know whether any delegation had been made or not.⁵⁷

6. In general, the position classification system usually does not act fast enough on grade recommendations to satisfy line administrators when authority to make final grade allocations is exercised by the Department rather than by the Bureau.⁵⁸

7. In general, it is felt that the grades of professional positions are restricted by those of administrative supervisors. This opinion was expressed even though 80 per cent of the respondents had some administrative responsibility and only $36 \frac{2}{3}$ per cent had some professional duties (many occupied "mixed" positions), as reflected in inquiry #11 (b).⁵⁹

8. While two-thirds felt that the position classification system provided uniform occupational terminology

⁵⁷ See supra, p. 116.

⁵⁸ See supra, pp. 117-118.

⁵⁹ See supra, pp. 118 and 121-122.

for use in communications, one-third was not sufficiently informed to express an opinion. There was not a great difference between the high and the low frequency rates reported.⁶⁰

9. Only 40 per cent of the respondents felt that "entirely" enough support was given by management in order that position classifiers could do the best job.⁶¹

Replies of budget officers.

1. In the budget process the operating titles are more satisfactory than official Civil Service class titles. This appears especially true in the higher grades.⁶²

2. There does not appear to be a tendency now to use Civil Service position classification titles for budget purposes more than in past years. While such action may or may not add to clarity in the budget, it is an indication that the provision in the Classification Act of 1949 which requires it, without exception, is being violated.⁶³

3. Although two-thirds felt satisfied, a substantial minority felt that there was a need for greater collaboration between budget and classification officers to

⁶⁰ See supra, pp. 118-119.

⁶¹ See supra, pp. 119-120.

⁶² See supra, pp. 124-125.

⁶³ See supra, p. 126.

establish stronger controls to carry out the will of the appropriating body, with one-fifth expressing "a great need."

4. It was substantially shown that greater collaboration is needed between position classifiers and budget officers in order to keep informed on what positions were likely to be allocated higher or lower within the year, for budget purposes.⁶⁵

5. The budget officers felt that there was a greater need for collaboration between position classifiers and operating officials during the latter's preparation of estimates and attempts to keep within allotments than between position classifiers and budget officers during the latter's preparation of an agency budget.⁶⁶

6. Only one-third, as against almost two-thirds, reported that data on workload measurements and operating standards were derived at all from the position classification office.⁶⁷

7. The work relationships between position classification and fiscal functions (except for the fact that the salary plan is based on the classification plan) are merely indirect, mechanical and routine.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ See supra, p. 129.

⁶⁶ See supra, pp. 130-131.

⁶⁷ See supra, p. 131.

⁶⁸ See supra, pp. 131-132.

Replies of personnel officers.

1. It was demonstrated that only a minority of the respondents have seen within the past ten years instances where position classification standards have been reproduced bodily in examination announcements. The majority have never seen the standards reproduced for this purpose.⁶⁹

2. Although over 90 per cent recognized that to some extent the duties and qualifications statements on personnel requisition forms are taken from position classification sources, almost half of the respondents demonstrated that this was done only infrequently.⁷⁰

3. The rate is too infrequent at which the information provided by the classification system is used in transfer actions for the identification of career avenues.⁷¹

4. Although it was preponderantly shown that the classification plan aids in identifying misplaced employees with positions for which they are better qualified, too high a minority (almost half) reported a low frequency at which it was used.⁷²

5. Only to a minor extent have organization charts

⁶⁹ See supra, p. 137.

⁷⁰ See supra, pp. 137-138.

⁷¹ See supra, pp. 141-142.

⁷² See supra, p. 142.

in terms of classified positions been posted and used thusly as part of a promotion program.⁷³

Replies of organization and methods analysts.

1. One of the handicaps under which position classifiers operate in the Washington area was shown when almost one-third of the respondents stated that the classification function sometimes provided the only organization work performed by Bureau technicians. As for the field service, slightly more than one-half of those who expressed an opinion stated that the classification function provided the only organizational work performed.⁷⁴

2. Only minor use is being made of the position classification office to furnish facts upon which Management Improvement Awards can be considered on the basis of outstanding efficiency and economy.⁷⁵

Replies of position classifiers.

1. Although it was felt unanimously that progress had been made in the last five years in the position classification system as a result of published standards, and the preponderant opinion was that such progress had been great, nevertheless, a substantial minority of al-

⁷³ See supra, pp. 142-143.
⁷⁴ See supra, pp. 150-151.
⁷⁵ See supra, pp. 151-152.

most one-third felt that little advancement had been made. If it can be assumed that one-third of the classifiers in the Government feel this way, the standards program has not yet reached the desired point of adequacy.⁷⁶

2. Management blames the classification office for delays in effecting personnel actions whereas frequently it is the one causing the tardiness because of its own failures to take prerequisite action. Such criticism should be placed on management where it appears to belong.⁷⁷

3. Although most Bureau heads and Division chiefs often invite position classifiers for advice early enough when reorganizations are taking place, a substantial minority seldom do and thus cause a great amount of difficulty.⁷⁸

4. It is only infrequently, as a rule, that budget analysts have called on position classifiers for assistance in establishing uniform titles for use in budget preparation. Greater collaboration is needed in order to improve budget presentation.⁷⁹

5. As in the case of line administrators, it is

76 See supra, pp. 158-159.
 77 See supra, pp. 159-160.
 78 See supra, pp. 160-161.
 79 See supra, pp. 164-165.

generally felt that the grades of the professional positions are restricted to some extent by those of the administrative supervisors due to the basic classification techniques.⁸⁰

6. It was substantially shown, and at a high frequency rate, that the "qualifications required" statements in position classification standards issued by the Civil Service Commission are too meager.⁸¹

Replies to cross-section question.

1. A substantial minority of over two-fifths of the budget officers indicated a low degree to which the position classification process was an aid to management in attaining the over-all objectives of the organization.⁸²

Statistical significance.

The percentage of replies to each questionnaire are as follows: 50 per cent for line administrators; 65 per cent for personnel officers; 75 per cent for budget officers; and 80 per cent for organization and methods analysts and position classifiers. The over-all return is considered

⁸⁰ See supra, pp. 165-166 and 118.
⁸¹ See supra, pp. 167-168.
⁸² See supra, p. 171.

good. Due to the anonymity of the respondents, which was stressed in sending out the questionnaires, no provision was made for follow-up. The fact that there were a minor number of "no replies" and failures to reply has no significant bearing upon the results of the questionnaires. The value of the results, more-over, depend not on fine statistical differences but on the indications of attitudes held toward, and uses made of, position classification.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Herein are contained various conclusions drawn from the literature and the questionnaire study on the uses and operation of the position classification system. Various recommendations are also contained herein looking toward improvement in the utilization and operation of position classification, as well as for further studies which could be made in these areas.

I. CONCLUSIONS ON THE USES OF POSITION CLASSIFICATION

The uses proclaimed in available literature for position classification have been set forth in the body of Chapter III, with a summary listing at the end. As can be seen by a review of these uses, they reach into every important phase of staff and line administration.

Congress intended that position classification be used for personnel and other management processes. It accordingly took action to delegate authority for position classification to the Civil Service Commission and the President, and provided for substantial redelegation to the agencies and their subordinate units. As a tool of management, Congress felt that position classification to a large extent should be placed in the hands of agency administrators who should be responsible for it. Placed

side by side with other staff functions, serving administration, an opportunity is provided for integration with and supplementation of other management processes. Made the responsibility of good management, the logical assumption was that administrators would treat it intelligently since they would also be accountable for it.

The concept of usefulness of position classification is not new. It appears, however, that it is only recently that the concept of use has been stressed.¹ In the opinion of the writer, this stress has been very limited and represents only what should be the initial steps toward a full program.

The uses of position classification are treated in little detail in published literature. Perhaps this is because classification has been accepted as a useful tool for so long that there appeared to be no practical value in conducting studies which, presumably, would result only to verify a foregone conclusion. The scarcity of such studies also may be due to a lack of funds for qualified people to carry on the necessary research. Again, in a few quarters, there may have been a reluctance to examine into this matter because of the fear that the degree of utilization made, or possible, may be found

¹ William E. Mosher, J. Donald Kingsley, and O. Glenn Stahl, Public Personnel Administration (3d ed.; New York : Harper and Brothers, 1950) p. 210.

unfavorable. At any rate, regardless of the reason or reasons, the cold fact is that this field has barely been touched below the general surface.

The coverage in literature of the uses of position classification is substantially the same as described in 1943 by the Assistant Personnel Director of the Michigan State Civil Service Commission, who was also a lecturer at the University of Michigan:

The very limited use to which the public service puts position descriptions is further illustrated by the fact that its classification literature makes almost no point of the uses to which the description should be put in the operating departments themselves. Baruch devotes a footnote to the subject (op. cit., p. 181); Mosher and Kingsley do not discuss it at all; and others accord it similar attention.²

It is not enough for management to merely know that position classification can aid the budget process in the establishment of budgetary controls; for example the methods, procedures, types of knowledge available, timing and other details which point up "how" this can be done should also be known. There appears to be no valid reason why this information should not be published for general consumption the same as is done for many other techniques and processes.

² Edward H. Litchfield, "Organization Analysis Surveys in a Personnel Agency Program," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 4 (October, 1943) p. 233, footnote 15.

To know that a piece of information is useful to some extent is not always enough either. The degree, or frequency, of utilization made, or possible, of a tool may well be the real test of its validity. If a soldier's gun shoots only ten times out of a hundred attempts, for example, it could scarcely be regarded as a valid instrument. If classification is to stand justified on the basis of utilization, then the frequency, depth and substantive content of its contribution should also be considered. On the basis of the questionnaire study made, while there is ample evidence that position classification is useful to some extent in all the limited number of ways inquired into, there is some evidence the degree of utilization is so low that the use is insignificant. On the whole, however, the evidence pointing to frequency or validity was more encouraging than discouraging.

While position classification is generally thought of first in connection with its use on which to base a pay plan, there are other very important needs for it. From a historical standpoint, for example, Fred Telford³ recorded that it was the need to standardize titles which brought about the original installation of position classification in the United States by Chicago around 1909

³ See supra, p. 35.

or 1910. The questionnaire study results showed that line administrators, by far, still recognized this service provided by classification, although no significant difference was reported between the high and low frequency rates at which it was employed. Budget officers reported a frequent use of class titles and grades, but preferred operating titles especially at the higher grade levels. In modern personnel administration, the use of position titles with standard definitions is indispensable, although various refinements are needed.

Other uses, with occasional statements by authors as to how important they are, have been recorded. Incidentally, authors do not always agree on the relative importance of each use. Witness, for example, the statement by Lewis Meriam--as opposed to Telford's evaluation--that the two major uses for classification are in connection with fixing and controlling salaries, and for recruiting and promoting.⁴ On the other hand, more recent authors have stated that classification has not contributed much to establish lines of promotion.⁵ Assuming that the latter statement is correct, one clue for the explanation appears in the questionnaire study which showed that the information available for use to

⁴ See supra, pp. 50 and 67.

⁵ Mosher, Kingsley and Stahl, op. cit., p. 168.

identify career avenues is not being used enough.⁶

The uses of classification are not confined to the subject-matter supplementation of other staff functions, but instead have a very real impact on day-to-day line operations. The fact that an impersonal standard exists against which all employees similarly engaged can be measured is a tremendous morale builder and stabilizer. Witness, for example, in the questionnaire study that no line administrator--not even those few who felt that the principle of equal pay for equal work was not being attained--wished to discard the system. It also has an impact on the exercise of supervision, establishment of jurisdiction between branches of government, in clarifying management objectives, and in administrative research. Standard position descriptions, and other classification tools, contribute to management clarity and economy.⁷

II. SUGGESTIONS FOR INCREASING UTILIZATION

Ten suggestions are offered as various means of increasing the utilization of position classification. All except the first one are made as the result of conditions indicated in the questionnaire study.

1. Recommendations for improving the utilization

⁶ See supra, pp. 141-142.

⁷ See supra, p. 45 for economy brought about through position classification.

of position classification, from the standpoint of meshing with other functions of a line and staff nature, are somewhat stalemated due to the lack of specific detailed knowledge as to how it can be useful. Therefore, the first suggestion to be made by the writer is that comprehensive studies be made and the results published in order to stimulate a greater utilization of position classification.

2. The performance rating system as now conducted in the Federal government is comparatively new, although it contains many of the same objectives associated with the former efficiency rating system. Although basic information developed through the position classification system is used to a high degree for performance rating purposes, it is the opinion of the writer that improvement needs to be made in the frequency rate and in the employee coverage. A performance rating system tends to lose its balance unless it is applied uniformly to all positions of a similar nature.

3. Classification tools such as position descriptions, position analysis reports, and records should be made more informative and more available for use by administrators and organization and methods analysts. This would involve clearer work descriptions, and the reporting of administrative problems such as jurisdictional disputes,

personality conflicts, duplication of work, lack of provision for work execution, and similar conditions.

4. The overwhelming questionnaire response of the position classifiers indicated a very healthy attitude in that they feel they are sympathetic to management and cooperate to a high degree. The study disclosed also that they frequently, within the past few years, have put forth special effort to explain the classification system to other employees. The administrators in general supported this latter view. The fact, however, that a substantial minority of 40 per cent of the administrators felt that only infrequently were they given adequate explanations of the system indicates that the need to explain continues. This need, in so far as the utilization is concerned, is further indicated by the fact that one-third of the administrators did not appear sufficiently informed to express an opinion on whether position classification provided uniform occupational terminology which is used in communications.

5. Congress, which appropriates funds on the basis of budget estimates, required in the Classification Act of 1949 that class titles be used in budget preparation. The study made herein disclosed that the class titles are used in the agencies to a high degree, but not always. It appears that since the class titles at all levels are

adequate for a substantial minority of the budget officers questioned, i. e., 25 per cent, and since the appropriating body has expressed a preference for them, a closer examination may disclose they can meet the needs for all in preparing budgets. It appears that the possibilities have not been fully investigated since the position classifiers reported it was only seldom that they have been consulted by budget analysts for assistance in establishing uniform titles. Closer collaboration is recommended which should either result in full compliance with the requirement stated in the Classification Act, or its revision.

6. The complaint has been voiced that the certification and recruitment processes have been hampered due to the meager information placed on personnel requisition forms.⁸ It is no wonder that the information is often meager in view of the fact that almost half of the respondent personnel officers indicated that such information was seldom taken from position classification sources. It is obvious that employment and personnel officers should make greater use of position descriptions for this

⁸ William E. Mosher and J. Donald Kingsley, Public Personnel Administration (Revised ed.; New York: Harper and Brothers., 1941) p. 252. The importance of understanding the nature of positions being filled was stressed in the 1950 edition, but without actually voicing the criticism made in the previous edition.

purpose.

7. Personnel officers preponderantly recognized that the classification plan aids in identifying misplaced employees with positions for which they are better qualified. A substantial minority, however, reported that use was seldom made of position classification in this connection. Such a situation is deplorable, and should be rectified through conscientious efforts on the part of employment and personnel officers to do a better job in placement.

8. It is evident from the two foregoing paragraphs based on the questionnaire study that employment, examining and classification officers do not collaborate to the extent they should. This is further demonstrated by the fact that the Civil Service Commission continues to issue examination announcements and regulations⁹ referring to Typist GS-4 positions whereas the position classification standards permit a grade no higher than GS-3 for typist work. Another example of inconsistency, but by no means the only other one practiced, is the use of such descriptive terms as "Junior," "Senior," etc., in examination announcements¹⁰ although position classification practices

⁹ See, for recent example, letter of November 23, 1951 from the Executive Director of the Commission to the Federal Departments, "Promotion to positions of Stenographer and Typist, GS-1-4." Also, see supra, pp. 73-74.

¹⁰ See U.S.C.S.C. Announcement No. 250, issued October 17, 1950.

specifically prohibit the use of these adjectives in job titles. It has been the experience of the writer that such announcements cause confusion, but more often in field agency offices than in Washington, D. C.

9. If position classifiers were freed from the necessity of doing organization work and other functions, which generally are the responsibility of management or other staff officers, then they would have more time to explain the uses of classification and bring about greater collaboration. If they are not freed from these duties which they perform, after management has failed, in order to get their own work done, then they at least should be recognized by management in terms of the job accomplished by proper titles, grades, salaries, and general acceptability in work situations.

10. Greater use should be made of the position classification office to furnish facts upon which management improvement awards can be considered on the basis of outstanding efficiency and economy. The failure to make use of the classification office for this purpose is only one reason which may explain the poor progress made in the program. Senator Russell Long (D., La.) at a dinner meeting for the Society of Personnel Administration sharply criticized the agencies for failing to carry out the program.¹¹

¹¹ Society for Personnel Administration, Newsletter, II (Washington : February 1, 1951) p. 2.

III. CONCLUSIONS ON THE OPERATION OF THE POSITION CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

A great deal has been said, and much has been written, expressing the opinions of individuals about the successes and failures of the position classification system to achieve the principle of "equal pay for substantially equal work." There appears to be no point in relating the divergent views here since the isolated incidents compiled on one side would merely tend to balance or cancel those on the other side, regardless of which had the greater number. Let us instead look briefly at some of the reasons which have been promulgated as to why position classification was installed, what makes for an effective or an ineffective classification program, and what the respondents to the questionnaire study felt about the situation as it exists today.

Reasons for conducting position classification.

In addition to the advantages to be realized from the uses covered in Chapter III, and the Congressional objective of "equal pay for substantially equal work," there are other reasons for having a position classification plan. Those we are concerned with here have to do with management weaknesses or errors in the treatment of employees.

We have already seen how the head of a Federal bureau, whose positions were not subject to the classification plan, testified before Congress that the personal attitudes of supervisors were conditioning the salaries paid.¹² Similarly, we have noted three distinct types of administrators as described by Lewis Meriam, all of whom differ in their treatment of positions and people.¹³ Another author has described various salary inequities which are primarily due to management errors where a job classification plan does not exist, as follows: favoritism, demotion without reduction in pay, promotion without sufficient increase in pay, error in judging worth of a job, aggressive versus conservative supervisors and workers, payment for something other than work, union pressure, minority group discrimination, and discrimination against the physically handicapped.¹⁴ The use of a formal position classification system tends to halt the commission of these human errors so as to evaluate every position and person against the same criteria.

Prerequisites to effectiveness.

There are a number of factors that make a classification program effective. Placed in reverse, these same

¹² See supra, pp. 45-46.

¹³ See supra, pp. 83-84.

¹⁴ Jay L. Otis, and Richard H. Leukart, Job Evaluation (New York : Prentice-Hall, Inc.; 1948) pp. 9-14.

factors tend to make the program ineffective. The following conditions appear absolutely necessary to successful operation:

1. Legislative support. This must be shown not only by fine phrases in laws and speeches, but by adequate appropriations to carry on the classification program. Congress has not always been consistent in what it has said and what it has done. For example, even though one of its investigating committees had pointed up the need to correct inequities in classification, the chairman of the appropriations sub-committee shortly thereafter questioned the need for the Civil Service Commission to issue allocations standards in wartime, and drastically cut the funds recommended.¹⁵

2. Executive support. The acceptance by management of the competent decisions made by the position classifiers is very important to the program's success. The fear in some quarters that management support was not sufficient has led to several recommendations that position classification be removed from all control of administrators, and one only recently.¹⁶

The fear is not a new one. As a matter of fact the conviction that position classifiers needed administrative

¹⁵ Gladys M. Kammerer, Impact of War on Federal Personnel Administration 1939-1945 (Lexington, Ky. : University of Kentucky Press, 1951) p. 245.

¹⁶ Donald McInnis, "Delegation of Classification Authority : Theory and Practice," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 12 (July, 1951) pp. 134-136.

protection in the performance of their duties was voiced in Congress even at the time of the enactment of the Classification Act of 1923.¹⁷ With the exception of correcting actions on post audit and withdrawing delegated authority to effect classifications, the penalty for a responsible official who abuses his classification responsibility is much the same as when the system was established in 1923. In other words, there is no other penalty in the Act itself for willfully and corruptly abusing classification authority; there is "nothing but the criminal law."¹⁸ According to the writer's discussion with an attorney, there appears to be no special significance in one's recourse to the criminal law in such matters.

There is a work-relationship which both the administrator and the technical expert should ever try to achieve. It is one of integration, "that means that a solution has been found in which both desires have found a place, that neither side has had to sacrifice anything."¹⁹ Integration involves invention, suggestion and mutual

¹⁷ U. S. Congress. Congressional Record. 68th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. 65, pt. 1, on January 10, 1924. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1929) Col. 1, p. 791.

¹⁸ Ibid., Col. 1, p. 794.

¹⁹ Henry C. Metcalf, and L. Urwick, editors, Dynamic Administration. The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941) pp. 32-33.

acceptance without the losses which occur through compromise. The best results are obtained through the principle of "power-with," a jointly developed power, rather than "power-over." Further, where supervisory relationships exist, the principle of depersonalizing orders and obeying "the law of the situation"²⁰ should be followed in which no one is under any one else, but all cooperate to get a job done.

Management should "play the game." The writer is inclined to believe that it generally does.

3. Competent position classifiers. Competency includes other requirements in addition to technical accuracy, such as social intelligence, fairness, objectivity, knowledge of the immediate organization and functions as well as of other organizations and functions, investigative ability, a government-wide viewpoint, the ability to suggest solutions to management's problems without sacrificing classification principles, and courage although not stubbornness. These qualifications have been stated very well by a former member of the Civil Service Commission who also remarked: "The correct classification of positions is clearly a difficult and hazardous task."²¹

²⁰ Ibid., pp. 59 and 63.

²¹ Leonard D. White, Introduction to the Study of Public Administration (3d ed., New York : The Mac-Millan Company, 1950) p. 381.

4. Valid classification standards. Obviously, the tools to do a job should be plentiful and applicable.

5. Cooperation of employees. Most employees will cooperate, especially if the objectives of the system have been explained. This cooperation should take the form of supplying information, writing position descriptions or drafts, refusing to exert pressure, and personal integrity.

6. Flexible pay plan. One of the ten principle changes of the period during World War II on personnel administration was the intensification of pressures for higher pay.²² To relieve the pressure to distort classification allocations, the pay plan should be more responsive in adjusting to the cost of living, and the labor market. An executive branch agency should administer the plan.

Effectiveness as disclosed by questionnaire study.

By far the greater number of administrators felt that the classification system achieved the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work; however, a substantial minority did not. In the opinion of the line administrators, budget officers, personnel officers, or-

²² Kammerer, op. cit., p. 8.

ganization and methods analysts, and position classifiers the classification program is a great aid in attaining the over-all objectives of the organization. In general, it is the opinion of the writer that the system is working relatively well, is serving a real need, but like all other management functions could stand improvement.

IV. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF OPERATIONS

Since no special study of the literature on the improvement of the operation of the position classification system was made a part of this thesis, no effort has been made to cover such material at this point. The following recommendations for the improvement of the operation of the system are based only on the information obtained from the questionnaire study:

1. Even though it is only infrequently that an otherwise desirable organization structure is adjusted in order to obtain higher grades, according to line administrators, the greater percentage feel that the practice is done. Morale on this point, therefore, must be low. To raise the morale and confidence in administration and position classification, and educational program should be launched by all agencies where it is applicable to inform the administrators that such cases are the exception rather than the rule.

2. When the bureau officials expressed greater confidence in the ability of the bureau position classification technicians than those of the department level, such an opinion could be interpreted merely as prejudice in favor of their own technicians who naturally work closer with them. However, this interpretation does not hold in view of the same bureau officials expressing greater confidence in the ability of the Civil Service Commission position classifiers--a group even farther removed--than those at the department level. The obvious recommendation, therefore, is that the departmental position classifiers and their supervisors examine their programs and attitudes and correct the weaknesses disclosed.

3. Position classifiers should continue to point out the purposes, procedures and benefits of the classification system to line administrators.

4. Every effort should be made to increase the technical competence and sympathetic administrative attitude of position classifiers. In addition, the proper relationships of management and the classification expert should be clearly set forth in Civil Service and agency regulations and policies so as to lessen the tension between the two. These needs are apparent in view of the approximately one-third minority of administrators who

felt that the system was not achieving its objective of equal pay for substantially equal work, and only 40 per cent who felt that "entirely" enough support was given to classifiers by management.

5. Redelegations of authority to consummate classification and other personnel actions should be made, but wisely, to the lowest organizational units practicable.

6. A reexamination should be made of the basic classification techniques so as to revise where, and if, necessary in order that the grades of professional positions will not be restricted by those of administrative supervisors. The writer is of the personal opinion that it is not the basic techniques that are faulty in this respect, but that the application of them are, in many cases, and especially where the administrative technician rather than the professional technician is supervised administratively.²³

7. Although great strides have been made in the last five years in the preparation of position classifica-

²³ The opinion that supervision should not be a grade restriction between the professional and administrative technicians on the one hand and the administrative supervisors on the other was also voiced in the following study: The President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement : Documents and Reports to accompany Report on Civil Service Improvement - "Classification," April 25, 1939. (Washington : Government Printing Office, 1942) pp. 165-166.

tion standards, improvement is still very much needed in both quality and quantity.

8. Bureau heads and division chiefs, when planning reorganizations, should invite position classifiers for classification advice more often and earlier in their undertakings.

9. Management should strive for an enlightened, competent, democratic leadership which rests upon the principle of "power-with" rather than "power-over." Both management and the classifier should solve their problems, when they arise, on the principle of integration.

10. The number of "super-grade" positions allowed at the GS 16, 17 and 18 levels, should be substantially increased. The present restriction is not in conformance with the basic principle of the classification system.

V. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Detailed and comprehensive studies are needed to clarify wherein position classification is, or can be, useful to other functions. The results of the studies should be published.

2. The uses of position classification, particularly those set forth in Chapter III but which were not tested in Chapter IV, should be thoroughly tested for

validity.

3. Studies could be made and principles set forth government-wide which establish at what points, and under what circumstances, technical classification decisions may be over-ruled--if at all--in favor of management desires. It is believed that many position classifiers and administrative officials have a sound understanding of their work-relationships, but apparently too many do not. A formalization of these relationships would be helpful to the guidance of future as well as current employees in the agencies, and a recognition of them by Civil Service Commission classifiers would facilitate the post-audit program. No doubt the whole matter of relationship is confused since classification has been assigned the dual roles of service and control.

4. Methods and procedures should be developed and action taken on them by Congress and all others who share in the responsibility for position classification, which will permit management to be more directly responsive in meeting the needs of employees without distorting classification processes. Of primary importance is delegation by Congress to an agency for the administration of the pay plan, whereby rates within established ceilings could be adjusted to meet economic and recruitment conditions.

5. There may be better methods by which to arrive

at position classification determinations. Some efforts have been made in this direction. It is recommended that more research be made looking toward improving position classification techniques.

6. The problem of obtaining a better balance between the salary fixing procedures of wage board and classified employees needs attention.²⁴

7. To what extent do higher rates of pay result in obtaining better qualified employees? How much is it necessary to raise salaries in order to recruit better qualified employees?

VI. SUMMARY

There are many uses of position classification in staff and line operations. The literature on the subject is scarce and scanty. Published studies are desirable to correct this condition.

The success or failure of the operation of the position classification program depends jointly upon Congress, the President, the Civil Service Commission, officials and employees in the agencies and the position classifiers. The success of the program is more depend-

²⁴ U. S. Congress. The Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. A Report to the Congress by the Commission on . . ., February, 1949. "Personnel Management." (Washington : Government Printing Office, 1949) pp. 24-28.

ent, however, upon the active support of agency officials. It appears to be reasonably effective, although improvements are urgently needed. The solution to the difficulties arising in the operation of the classification system between the classification expert and the administrator lies primarily, in the opinion of the writer, in the principle of integration as expressed by Mary Parker Follett.²⁵

²⁵ See supra, pp. 205-206.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

OFFICIAL

- Congressional Record, 68th Cong., 1st sess., Vol. 65, pt. 1 (Jan. 10, 1924). 1018 pp.
- Public Law No. 774, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (Sept. 8, 1950).
"The Defense Production Act of 1950."
- Public Law No. 873, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (Sept. 30, 1950).
"The Performance Rating Act of 1950."
- Public Law No. 253, 82d Cong., 1st sess. (Nov. 1, 1951).
"Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952."
- U. S. Bureau of the Budget. Bulletin No. 50-2. "Programming of Agency Management Improvement Activities." Washington : August 1, 1949. 2 pp.
- U. S. Civil Service Commission. Departmental Circular No. 635. "Trial Period for Policy of Allocating Mixed Positions Under the Classification Act of 1949." Washington : August 11, 1950. 2 pp.
- . Federal Personnel Manual. Washington : Government Printing Office. (Continuously revised).
- . First Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission Under Classification Act of 1949. H. Doc. 195. 82d Cong., 1st sess. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1951. 23 pp.
- . Handbook of Occupational Groups and Series of Classes Established Under the Federal Position-Classification Plan. Washington : Government Printing Office; July, 1950. 144pp.
- . Personnel Classification Division. Class Specifications and Statements of Allocation Standards. Washington : Government Printing Office. (Continuously revised).
- . Position Classification As An Aid to Supervision. Washington : Government Printing Office; February, 1945. 14 pp.
- U. S. Congress. House of Representatives. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report No. 2198, Organization, Functions, and Relative Costs of Per-

- sonnel Offices. 80th Cong., 2d sess. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1948. 49 pp.
- . Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries. Report...H. Doc. 536. 56th Cong., 2d sess. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1920. 344 pp.
- . Report of President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement. H. Doc. No. 118. 77th Cong., 1st sess. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1941. 128 pp.
- . Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Hearings, 81st Cong., 1st sess., on S. 558...and other bills, to Adjust Salaries of Postal Employees and Employees Under the Classification Act of 1923, as Amended, and other Employees. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1949. 390 pp.
- . Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Hearings,... 76th Cong., 1st sess., on the Work Relief and Public Works Appropriation Act of 1939, and on H. J. Res. 326. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1939. 351 pp.
- U. S. General Accounting Office. 4 C. G. 56, July 14, 1924.
- . 4 C. G. 474, November 24, 1924.
- . 18 C. G. 794, April 17, 1939.
- . 20 C. G. 451, 455. February 14, 1941.
- . C. G. B-11756, January 23, 1951.
- U. S. General Services Administration, Federal Register Division. United States Government Organization Manual 1950-51. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1950. 657 pp.
- U. S. Personnel Classification Board. Closing Report of Wage and Personnel Survey. H. Doc. 771. 71st Cong., 3d sess. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1931. 404 pp.
- U. S. President. Executive Order 10161, in Federal Register. Washington : Government Printing Office; September 12, 1950. p. 6107.

----. The President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement. Documents and Reports to Accompany Report on Civil Service Improvement. Vol. 3, pt. I. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1942. 196 pp.

42 U. S. Statutes at Large 2684 pp.

63 U. S. Statutes at Large 1296 pp.

UNOFFICIAL

A. Books

Binkley, Wilfred E. President and Congress. New York : Alfred A. Knopf, 1947. 312 pp.

Bush, George Pollock, and Lowell H. Hattery, editors. Scientific Research : Its Administration and Organization. Washington : American University Press, 1950. 190 pp.

Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada. Position Classification in the Public Service, A Report Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly. Chicago : Civil Service Assembly, 1941. 404 pp.

Gaus, John M., and Leon O. Wolcott. Public Administration and the Department of Agriculture. Chicago : Public Administration Service, 1940. 534 pp.

Hyneman, Charles S. Bureaucracy in a Democracy. New York : Harper and Brothers, 1950. 586 pp.

Juran, J. M. Bureaucracy : A Challenge to Better Management. New York : Harper and Brothers, 1944. 138 pp.

Kammerer, Gladys Marie. Impact of War on Federal Personnel Administration 1939 - 1945. Lexington, Ky. : University of Kentucky Press, 1951. 363 pp.

Meriam, Lewis. Public Personnel Problems, From the Standpoint of the Operating Officer. Washington : The Brookings Institution, 1938. 440 pp.

Metzalf, Henry C., and L. Urwick, editors. Dynamic Admin-

- istration. New York : Harper and Brothers, 1941.
320 pp.
- Mooney, James D., and Alan C. Reiley. Onward Industry!
New York : Harper and Brothers, 1931. 564 pp.
- . "The Principles of Organization," Papers on the
Science of Administration, edited by Luther Gulick
and L. Urwick. New York : Institute of Public Ad-
ministration, 1937. pp. 89-98.
- Mosher, William E., and J. Donald Kingsley, Public Per-
sonnel Administration. Revised ed. New York : Har-
per and Brothers, 1941. 671 pp.
- Mosher, William E., J. Donald Kingsley and O. Glenn Stahl,
Public Personnel Administration. 3d ed. New York :
Harper and Brothers, 1950. 652 pp.
- Otis, Jay L., and Richard H. Leukart. Job Evaluation.
New York : Prentice-Hall, Inc.; 1948. 473 pp.
- Pfiffner, John M. Research Methods in Public Administra-
tion. Political Science Series. New York : The
Ronald Press Co., 1940. 447 pp.
- Scott, Walter, R. C. Clothier, S. B. Mathewson, and W. R.
Spriegel, Personnel Management. 3d ed. New York :
McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1941. 589 pp.
- Seckler-Hudson, Catheryn, editor. Processes of Organiza-
tion and Management. Washington : Public Affairs
Press, 1948. 296 pp.
- Stockberger, Warner W. Personnel Administration Develop-
ment in the United States Department of Agriculture :
The First Fifty Years. Washington : U. S. Department
of Agriculture, Office of Personnel, 1947. 216 pp.
- White, Leonard D. Introduction to the Study of Public Ad-
ministration. New York : Macmillan, 1939. pp.328-29.
- , ----. 3d ed. New York : The Macmillan Co., 1950.
612 pp.
- Wilmerding, Lucius. Government By Merit. New York : Me-
Graw-Hill Book Company, 1935. 294 pp.

B. Pamphlets

- Baruch, Ismar. Facts and Fallacies About Position Classification. Chicago : Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, 1937. 25 pp.
- Gladieux, Bernard L. "Administrative Planning in the Federal Government," in Processes of Organization and Management, edited by Catheryn Seckler-Hudson. Washington : Public Affairs Press, 1948. pp. 171-188.
- Lehman, W. P. "How Can Classification Aid in Placement?" : A Typewritten Speech in booklet form delivered before the Classification Section of the Society for Personnel Administration. Washington : Civil Service Commission; February 12, 1941. 9 pp.
- Meriam, Lewis. "The Uses of a Personnel Classification in the Public Service," in Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 113 (May, 1924) pp. 215-220.
- Reeves, Floyd W., and Paul T. David. "Personnel Administration in the Federal Service," The President's Committee on Administrative Management. Washington : Government Printing Office, 1937. 75 pp.
- Robb, Russell. "Organization as Affected by Purpose and Conditions," in Processes of Organization and Management, edited by Catheryn Seckler-Hudson. Washington : Public Affairs Press, 1948. pp. 112-124.
- Seckler-Hudson, Catheryn. "Principles of Organization and Management," in Processes of Organization and Management, edited by Seckler-Hudson. Washington : Public Affairs Press, 1948. pp. 39-46.
- Telford, Fred. "The Classification and Salary Standardization Movement in the Public Service," in Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 113 (May, 1924) pp. 206-215.

C. Periodical Articles

- American Psychological Association. "Reallocation of GS-9 Clinical Psychology Positions in the Veterans Administration." The American Psychologist, Vol. 5 (October, 1950). pp. 518-519.

- Ash, Phillip. "A Statistical Analysis of the Navy's Method of Position Evaluation," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 11 (July, 1950) pp. 130-138.
- Catherwood, H. R. "Denver's Consolidation of Personnel and Management Functions," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 12 (January, 1951) pp. 17-20.
- Clapp, Gordon R. "What Price Ability in the Public Service," Personnel Administration, Vol. 10 (May, 1948) pp. 1-4.
- Couch, Virgil L. "Ratios and Costs of Personnel Administration," Personnel Administration, Vol. 11 (January, 1949) pp. 16-21.
- Dickinson, Harold L. "Some Problems in Establishing a Generalist Personnel Office," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (July, 1950) pp. 19-22.
- Goode, Cecil E. "The Challenge of Big Government," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (September, 1949) pp. 1-5.
- Googe, James P., and John J. Brennan. "What Happened to Boards of U. S. Civil Service Examiners?", Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (July, 1950) pp. 16-18, and 31.
- Gray, Robert D. "Job Analysis As a Technique of Supervision," Personnel, Vol. 18 (March, 1942) pp. 296-303.
- Hogan, Ralph M., and Wallace M. Davis. "Finding Training Materials for the Hard-to-Fill Job," Personnel Administration, Vol. 5 (March, 1943) pp. 3-9.
- Hoskyn, F. P. "Five Rules for Work Performance Standards," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (March, 1950) pp. 22-26.
- "Ismar Baruch Awarded Second Stockberger Medal" (editorial), Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (March, 1950) pp. 1-2.
- Jack, W. D. "Describing and Rating Positions for a Salary Evaluation Program," Noma Forum, Vol. 19 (October, 1943) pp. 14-17.
- Kennedy, John J., and Frank J. Waldenfels. "The Responsibility Chart : A Classification and Administrative Analysis Tool," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 4 (October, 1943) pp. 254-259.

- Kosiak, Paul T. "The Case for Standard Position Descriptions," Personnel Administration, Vol. 11 (November, 1948) pp. 24-26.
- Leighton, Alexander. "Improving Human Relations : I. Applied Science of Human Relations," Personnel Administration, Vol. 9 (July, 1947) pp. 4-6.
- Lindholm, Elaine. "The Personnel Library," Personnel Administration, Vol. 11 (March, 1949) pp. 27-29.
- Litchfield, Edward H. "Organization Analysis Surveys in a Personnel Agency Program," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 4 (October, 1943) pp. 230-237.
- Lott, Catherine S., and John Boddie. "Background for Efficiency Rating Reform - I. What Employees and Supervisors Think of Efficiency Ratings," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (May, 1950) pp. 11-15.
- Mandell, Milton W. "The Current Status of Personnel Administration," Public Administration Review, XI (Winter, 1951) pp. 57-61.
- McGilvery, Francis E. "An Objective for Position Classification," Personnel Administration, Vol. 14 (January, 1951) pp. 32-36, and 41.
- McInnis, H. Donald. "Delegation of Classification Authority : Theory and Practice," Public Personnel Review, Vol. 12 (July, 1951) pp. 131-137.
- Mitchell, John W. "Personnel Turnover in the Federal Civil Service," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (September, 1949) pp. 10-11.
- Pickus, Morris I. "White Elephants in Business," Systems for Modern Management, Vol. 14 (July, 1950) pp. 5-6.
- Reed, Ogden C. "Getting the Most Out of Classification : IV. Streamlining the Classification Process," Personnel Administration, Vol. 14 (May, 1951) pp. 31-38.
- Society for Personnel Administration. "What They Are Saying at the Society Meetings : Job Evaluation and Pay Section," Personnel Administration, Vol. 12 (November, 1949) p. 37.
- Spates, Thomas G. "Getting Results Through People," Ad-

vanced Management, Vol. 15 (October, 1950) pp. 5-7.

Stockard, James G. "Take a Look at Supervisor Training,"
Personnel Administration, Vol. 10 (May, 1948) pp. 12-
18.

D. Newspapers

Kluttz, Jerry. "The Federal Diary," The Washington Post,
August 25, 1950, Sec. A, pp. 1 and 19.

-----, -----, -----, January 15, 1952, Sec. B, p. 1, Col. 1.

Lehman, Maxwell. "Why New York City Job System Must Be
Overhauled," Civil Service Leader, November 9, 1948,
p. 13.

APPENDIX

March 1, 1951

Dear Sir (or Madame):

As a part of the research on a Master's thesis at the American University, I am studying some of the work-relationships of the Federal position classification system to certain phases of government administration, and also of some of the attitudes of employees about position classification in general. The study has no official connection with any Federal agency.

A part of this study is being carried on through fact-finding and attitude questionnaires. You have been selected at random, along with a small number of others similarly chosen, to receive and complete one of these questionnaires, which is attached herewith. You are not requested to sign the questionnaire. Neither your name nor position title will be used in the study or disclosed to the public in any manner. The study will not reflect the attitude or conditions in your agency, but instead will represent the over-all picture resulting in the returns from a number of Federal agencies.

I sincerely hope that you will complete the questionnaire to the best of your knowledge and ability, and return it to me as soon as possible. Your cooperation will be earnestly appreciated.

Very truly,

Monroe F. Day

Appendix A - Covering memorandum which accompanied each questionnaire sent to general administrators

March 1, 1951

Dear Sir (or Madame):

As a part of the research on a Master's thesis at the American University, I am studying some of the work-relationships of the Federal position classification system to certain phases of budget, organization and methods, and personnel administration, and also of some of the attitudes of these staff and line officers about position classification in general. The study has no official connection with any Federal agency.

A part of this study is being carried on through fact-finding and attitude questionnaires. You have been selected at random, along with a small number of others similarly chosen, to receive and complete one of these questionnaires, which is attached. You are not requested to sign the questionnaire. Neither your name nor position title will be used in the study or disclosed to the public in any manner. The study will not reflect the attitudes or conditions in your agency, but instead will represent the over-all picture resulting in the returns from a number of Federal agencies.

I sincerely hope that you will complete the questionnaire to the best of your knowledge and ability, and return it to me as soon as possible. Your cooperation will be appreciated.

Very truly,

Monroe F. Day

Appendix B - Covering memorandum which accompanied each questionnaire sent to employees engaged in budget, organization and methods, and personnel administration

March 1, 1951

Dear Sir (or Madame):

As a part of the research on a Master's thesis at the American University, I am studying some of the work-relationships of the Federal position classification system to certain line and staff phases of government administration, and also of some of the attitudes of employees about position classification in general. The study has no official connection with any Federal agency.

A part of this study is being carried on through fact-finding and attitude questionnaires. You have been selected at random as a specialist in the field of position classification, along with a small number of others similarly chosen, to receive and complete one of these questionnaires, which is attached. You are not requested to sign the questionnaire. Neither your name nor position title will be used in the study or disclosed to the public in any manner. The study will not reflect the attitudes or conditions in your agency, but instead will represent the over-all picture resulting in the returns from a number of Federal agencies.

I sincerely hope that you will complete the questionnaire to the best of your knowledge and ability, and return it to me as soon as possible. Your cooperation will be earnestly appreciated.

Very truly,

Monroe F. Day

Appendix C - Covering memorandum which accompanied each questionnaire sent to position classifiers.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS

ON

THE POSITION CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND ITS RELATIONSHIP
TO CERTAIN PHASES OF GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

1. (a) Do you feel that position classifiers, before classifying existing positions, give the incumbents an opportunity to explain the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required?

yes, always
 yes, very often
 yes, often
 yes, but seldom
 no, never
 no opinion

1. (b) Do you feel that position classifiers, before classifying positions, give supervisors of the incumbents an opportunity to explain the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required?

yes, always
 yes, very often
 yes, often
 yes, but seldom
 no, never
 no opinion

2. Do you feel that administrators adjust an otherwise desirable organizational or procedural pattern in order to justify higher grade allocations?

Appendix D - Part of first page of questionnaire
sent to general administrators

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BUDGET OFFICERS

ON

THE POSITION CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND ITS RELATIONSHIP
TO CERTAIN PHASES OF BUDGET ADMINISTRATION

1. Official position class titles are established by the Civil Service Commission in published standards to "denote a group of positions which are sufficiently similar in kind of work, level of difficulty and responsibility, and qualifications required." Examples of such position class titles are: Procurement Officer GS-333-12 for one class, and Safety Engineer GS-803-12 for a different class. Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-11 of September 22, 1950 however, requires the use of operating titles in budget preparation. Both types of titles actually are found in the budget estimates. Therefore,

Do you feel that the use of official Civil Service titles contribute to a greater understanding in the budget process than the use of operating titles such as Chief, Procurement Division GS-12, or Regional Safety Engineer GS-12?

yes, greater
same
no, less
no opinion



2. To what extent are official class titles which have been established by the Civil Service Commission, and which are used by your agency in position classification and pay roll activities, also used in budget preparations?

always
very much



Appendix E - Part of first page of questionnaire
sent to budget officers

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PERSONNEL OFFICERS
ON
THE POSITION CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND ITS RELATIONSHIP
TO CERTAIN PHASES OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

Recruiting, Testing and Certification

1. The position classification system provides a source of information, which can be drawn upon by the Civil Service Commission, agency Boards of Examiners, and other employment officers for facts about the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required to perform the work of positions. Are such facts obtained from the classification system in order to form the basis for further studies:

(a) in preparing tests?

yes, always	□
yes, very often	□
yes, often	□
yes, but seldom	□
no, never	□
no opinion	□

(b) in informing prospective applicants about the basic qualifications to be rated?

yes, always	□
yes, very often	□
yes, often	□
yes, but seldom	□
no, never	□
no opinion	□

Appendix F - Part of first page of questionnaire
sent to personnel officers

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ORGANIZATION AND METHODS ANALYSTS
 ON
 THE POSITION CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND ITS RELATIONSHIP
 TO CERTAIN PHASES OF THE ORGANIZATION AND METHODS FUNCTION

1. (a) Do the processes of fact-finding and analysis the classification system involves (of duties and responsibilities of positions, their supervisory relationships, and the tracing of flow of work, etc.) disclose illogical organization situations, to your knowledge?

yes, constantly
 yes, very often
 yes, often
 yes, but rarely
 no, never
 no opinion

(b) If your answer to question #1(a) was "no" to any degree, a brief comment on the reason behind your reply will be appreciated at this point.

2. To what extent do you feel that position classifiers report what appear to be illogical organization situations, when found, to officials having the power to make, or recommend, corrections?

always
 very often
 often
 rarely
 never
 no opinion

Appendix G - Part of first page of questionnaire
 sent to organization and methods
 analysts

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR POSITION CLASSIFIERS

ON

THE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM AND ITS RELATIONSHIP
TO CERTAIN PHASES OF MANAGEMENT

1. To what extent do you feel that progress has been made in the last five years, as a result of published position classification standards, in the technical determination of the relative values of jobs subject to the Federal position classification system?

very much
much
little
very little
no opinion

2. Do you find that the position classification office is blamed for delays in consummating promotions and other personnel actions, whereas the real delay is caused in other service or operating offices by failure to draw up an approved organization chart, obtain funds, reconcile conflicts in duties, etc.?

yes, always
yes, very often
yes, often
yes, but seldom
no, never
no opinion

Appendix H - Part of first page of questionnaire
sent to position classifiers

ProQuest Number: 28766003

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality and completeness of this reproduction is dependent on the quality and completeness of the copy made available to ProQuest.



Distributed by ProQuest LLC (2021).

Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author unless otherwise noted.

This work may be used in accordance with the terms of the Creative Commons license or other rights statement, as indicated in the copyright statement or in the metadata associated with this work. Unless otherwise specified in the copyright statement or the metadata, all rights are reserved by the copyright holder.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code and other applicable copyright laws.

Microform Edition where available © ProQuest LLC. No reproduction or digitization of the Microform Edition is authorized without permission of ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346 USA