Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Federal Department of Home Affairs FDHA
Federal Office for Gender Equality FOGE

Logib pay system
Methodological approach
Federal Office for Gender Equality FOGE

Version 2024.1

1 Contents

2 Introduction

Through the Logib tool, the Swiss Confederation provides all employers with free and modern online applications to promote pay equality (www.logib.admin.ch). Logib offers two different approaches to the topic of pay equality:

■ **The Confederation's standard analysis tool Logib** allows for an **analysis** of gender **pay equality**. It consists of two modules: Both are designed as self-assessments that can be performed by users with the aid of the documents made available and without requiring any specialist knowledge. The method is described in more detail in the methodological approach to Logib Module 1 and 2 (see www.logib.ch).

■ The **Logib pay system** functionality enables companies to create the foundations for setting wages in a systematic and clear way based on the requirements and demands of job functions and current pay practices.

Logib pay system was developed by the Confederation in 2023 and made available as part of measures to promote equal pay: A clear and comprehensible pay system that uses the requirements and demands of job functions as the basis for setting wages can make a crucial contribution to enforcing the principle “equal pay for work of equal value for women and men”. Logib pay system also enables small and medium sized companies to independently create the foundations for systematic pay setting.

This document describes the methodological bases of Logib pay system. The methodological approach ensures transparency and traceability.

3 Overview

Based on current pay practices in the company, Logib pay system suggests a function-based pay system with pay grades and the corresponding pay bands. Data processed by the company on employees, functions and wages serve as the basis for the suggestions. It is also possible to directly use data issued from Logib Module 2 with Logib pay system. This also applies to data from analyses with Module 1 although in this case the function-specific factors must be re-evaluated.

The most important **bases** of Logib pay system are:

■ **Requirements and demands of work activities (functions)** form the basis for setting wages in Logib pay system. Requirements are skills that are required to carry out a function's tasks (e.g., expertise and methodological knowledge, communication skills, organisations skills, etc.). Demands are limiting factors that may be associated with carrying out tasks (e.g., being confronted with human suffering, working in extreme heat/cold, etc.). Using a job evaluation, requirements and demands can be measured and a “function value” can be defined as a measure for the sum of the requirements and demands related to each function (see chapter 4.2). This puts the functions in relation to each other. This creates a “functions landscape” in which the hierarchy of the functions in terms of their requirements and demands can be seen in relation to each other.

■ **Personal experience**: In addition to the function, the model underlying Logib pay system also considers employees’ personal experience (see chapter 4.3). Experience is approximated here through age and years of service.

■ **Current wage practices** (wages actually paid): Based on the function values, Logib pay system assigns all functions a pay grade and calculates a suggested pay band for each pay grade. A pay band is the specification of a wage range for a given age or years of service, within which the wage for a particular pay grade is expected to fall following the system. The form of the pay band can be adapted to the situation in the company whereby the bands have the same form for all pay grades (based on the wage development chosen by the company by age or years of service). The bands are calculated based on the wages currently paid (see chapter 4.3).

4 Methods

4.1 Data

The personal, wage and function-related data for the employees in a company are used as the basis for Logib pay system. Apprentices and interns are not included. The following information is required for all employees:

■ Unique identifier (ID) for each person
■ Age
■ Gender
■ Number of years employed in the company (years of service)
■ Function
■ Wage: Basic wage including a twelfth of the 13th monthly wage for a full-time position (converted to a full-time position in the case of part-time employees) plus (where paid) allowances.

If the data is read in using a Logib module 1 or module 2 export file, the wage data is standardised as follows:

■ for employees paid monthly:

$$standardised\ wage = (basic\ wage + allowances + 13th\ monthly\ wage) \times \frac{100}{activity\ rate} \times \frac{company's\ modal\ usual\ weekly\ working\ hours}{usual\ weekly\ working\ hours\ of\ the\ employee}$$

■ for employees paid hourly:

$$standardised\ wage = (basic\ wage + allowances + 13th\ monthly\ wage) \times \frac{52 \times company's\ modal\ usual\ weekly\ working\ hours}{12 \times paid\ hours}$$

4.2 Determining requirements and demands of the functions

4.2.1 Determining functions

Functions form the foundation of every function-based pay system. Functions are concrete work activities that can generally be separated from the people who perform them. To define the functions available in the company, jobs that essentially include similar tasks and duties are roughly combined into one function. This deliberately ignores the fact that persons within functions created in this way may have varying additional or auxiliary tasks. The definition of a function is separate from the function holder

or other aspects such as the activity rate. Generally, there are far fewer functions than employees in a company.

In Logib pay system, companies are given aids to manage and clearly determine functions and to recognise any chains of functions (functions which seem to be similar at first glance but which occur alongside various requirements and demands, e.g., senior/professional/junior).

4.2.2 Determining requirements and demands

Logib pay system uses the same basis as the standard analysis tool Logib Module 2 in order to define the requirements and demands of functions, i.e., the scientific job evaluation method (Schär Moser, 2019; Chicha, 2016, Katz & Baitsch, 1996). This enables the value of each function in the company to be determined compared to the other functions by measuring requirements and demands against different abstract factors. Logib pay system records requirements and demands based on six factors. These factors were chosen on the basis of the latest research findings on scientific job evaluation and have been shown to be both relevant and gender-neutral following in-depth scientific review (see Hirschi & Ghetta, 2020). The factors are:

- Education/training requirements
- Requirements regarding ability to work independently
- Requirements in terms of specific expertise and methodological skills
- Responsibility-related requirements and demands
- Psychological and social requirements and demands
- Physical requirements and demands

The first three factors fall into the intellectual domain, the other three each constitute a separate area in their own right. In other words, the four areas of characteristics confirmed as relevant in theory and practice (intellectual, responsibility-related, psycho-social and physical) are taken into account (see Humphrey, Nahrgang & Morgeson, 2007; Krell & Winter, 2011, International Labour Office, 2008, Chicha, 2016).

Each function is evaluated by the company in relation to all the factors using a standardised five-point scale. For the “education and training” factor, this scale corresponds to the level of education typically required for the respective function and ranges from 1 = “No special education and training” via clearly defined steps to 5 = “Master’s degree”. For the other five factors, 1 stands for low and 5 for high requirements and demands. Logib pay system provides various graphic aids and explanatory texts and supports the evaluation and allocation of functions in an iterative process. In this way known distortions in the evaluation of functions (e.g., influence of existing expectations about the function as a whole) can be effectively reduced and the quality of the job evaluation increased (International Labour Office, 2008). The aim is to depict the situation in the company as correctly as possible as a coherent “functions landscape”.

4.2.3 Calculation of the function values

Based on the evaluation of the factors, a function value is calculated for each function where a higher function value is associated with greater requirements and demands. The function values are scaled to a number between a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 50. The values are calculated by multiplying the evaluation of the requirements and demands carried out by the company for the six factors each by a weight, scaled to 10, added together and rounded up to the next integer. In concrete terms, the function value for function f, FW_f, is calculated as follows:

$$FW_f = round(\sum_{i=1}^{6} \frac{10\, w_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{6} w_j}\, B_{if}).$$

w_i or w_j represent the weight of the factor i or j. B_{if} is the evaluation of factor i of the function f.

There are two possibilities for the **weighting**:

■ A *default setting* of the weights for the calculation of the function values is integrated into the tool.
■ Companies can *define* the weighting *themselves within a specified framework* and thus customize it according to their preferences. It is necessary to set a specified framework to ensure that the four relevant areas of characteristics (see chapter 4.2.2) remain adequately considered.

The weightings and bandwidths have been defined as follows based on theoretical and methodological considerations and empirical experience together with specialists (see Hirschi & Ghetta, 2020, p. 50 et seqq.).

The default settings of the weights are as follows:

■ Education/training requirements: 2.5
■ Requirements regarding ability to work independently: 2.0
■ Requirements in terms of specific expertise and methodological skills: 2.0
■ Responsibility-related requirements and demands: 1.5
■ Psychological and social requirements and demands: 1.5
■ Physical requirements and demands: 0.5

The *bandwidths* within which the weights may be varied in steps of 0.25 points are as follows:

■ Education/training requirements: 2.0 - 3.0
■ Requirements regarding ability to work independently: 1.5 - 2.5
■ Requirements in terms of specific expertise and methodological skills: 1.5 - 2.5
■ Responsibility-related requirements and demands: 1.5 - 2.5
■ Psychological and social requirements and demands: 1.5 - 2.5
■ Physical requirements and demands: 0.0 - 1.0

The standard weighting and the weighting bandwidths ensure that the intellectual domain is given the highest weighting of all (first three factors). Within the intellectual domain, the first factor has the highest weighting bandwidth because the education and training required to carry out a function has established itself as an objective and comparatively reliable rateable factor. Responsibility-related and psychological and social requirements and demands have the same weighting bandwidth. It corresponds to the lower bandwidth of the remaining two factors in the intellectual domain. This serves to ensure that appropriate consideration is given to the areas covered relevant on the basis of theoretical deliberations. Physical requirements and demands have the lowest weighting bandwidth and constitute the only factor that can achieve a value of 0 (i.e., non-consideration). This reflects the fact that physical requirements and demands have hardly any influence on pay in many companies. In reality, analyses have frequently found a negative relationship with pay here, which can be attributed to the fact that those functions with the greatest physical requirements and demands are often the poorest paid (e.g., cleaners).

4.3 Calculation of the wage suggestions

4.3.1 Grouping of the function values

The function values are grouped as a basis for further calculations. Starting with the lowest function value, three function values are combined in each case and defined as a pay grade. Based on the grouping and the application of the present evaluation methodology, functions within a group are to be regarded as equivalent in a legal and labour-scientific sense (see Hirschi & Ghetta, 2020, p. 56 et seqq. and 68).

Based on the function values $10 \leq FW_f \leq 50$, a maximum of 14 pay grades are formed in this way with in Logib pay system. In higher pay grades – i.e., for functions with higher requirements and demands – higher or at least equivalent wages are expected than in lower pay grades (for calculation, see chapter 4.3.3).

4.3.2 Determining the form of the pay bands

For each pay grade, Logib pay system suggests pay bands which, within the same pay grade, allow for the inclusion of personal experience but also a certain pay bandwidth that is independent of experience. This non-experienced-based bandwidth also allows for consideration of additional tasks not taken into account in the function or recognition of key competences that are useful to the company or continuing education diplomas. The bandwidth has been defined based on experience and should be seen as a suggestion.

The pay bands have a lower and upper limit which can increase with age and thus provide for an increase for age or length of service. The percentage increase is identical for all pay grades. It is possible to choose between thirteen different pay band forms in Logib pay system. At age 20, all pay bands have a range of 4% between the lower and upper pay band limit. Further development with age and years of service differs to the extent to which increases in age and/or years of service are taken into account in wage development. If neither an increase for age nor length of service is desired, the band remains flat across the work-life. In the other twelve cases there is an increase for age and/or years of service. The different scenarios can be seen in Table 1.

The form of the lower pay band limit is defined as follows:

$$UL(age) = \begin{cases} 1, & age < 20 \\ (1+x)^{age-20}, & 20 \leq age \leq 40 \\ (1+x)^{20} \times (1+y)^{age-40}, & 40 < age \leq 57, \\ (1+x)^{20} \times (1+y)^{17} \times (1+z)^{age-57}, & 57 < age \leq 65 \\ (1+x)^{20} \times (1+y)^{17} \times (1+z)^{8}, & age > 65 \end{cases}$$

and the form of the upper pay band as follows:

$$OL(age) = \begin{cases} 1.04, & age < 20 \\ 1.04 \times (1+r)^{age-20}, & 20 \leq age \leq 40 \\ 1.04 \times (1+r)^{20} \times (1+s)^{age-40}, & 40 < age \leq 57. \\ 1.04 \times (1+r)^{20} \times (1+s)^{17} \times (1+t)^{Alter-57}, & 57 < age \leq 65 \\ 1.04 \times (1+r)^{20} \times (1+s)^{17} \times (1+t)^{8}, & age > 65 \end{cases}$$

x, y, z, r, s, t are the parameters which define the growth of the lower or upper pay band limit by age. Table 1 shows which parameters are used for each scenario.

Companies determine the form of the pay bands by answering two questions relating to wage setting and development: “(How) is personal experience from previous activities considered (age, question 1)? And (how) is experience gained in the company considered in wage setting (years of service, question 2)? The questions can be answered on a four-point scale from “not at all” to “a lot”. Table 2 shows the allocation of the answers to the various scenarios seen in Table 1. In the default settings, scenario 8 “medium increase” is configured.

Table 1: Pay band scenarios

			Age-related salary increase						Salary increase due to years of service		
			Lower pay band			Upper pay band					
Scenario	**Salary increase related to age**	**Salary increase related to years of service**	***x* (Age 20-40)**	***y* (Age 41-57)**	***z* (Age >57)**	***r* (Age 20-40)**	***s* (Age 41-57)**	***t* (Age >57)**	***m* (YS 1-10)**	***n* (YS 11-20)**	***o* (YS >20)**
0	None	None	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
1	None	Weak	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.25%	0.20%	0.00%	0.50%	0.40%	0.30%
2	None	Medium	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.40%	0.30%	0.00%	0.80%	0.60%	0.40%
3	None	Strong	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.50%	0.35%	0.00%	1.00%	0.75%	0.50%
4	Weak	Weak	0.30%	0.20%	0.00%	0.45%	0.30%	0.00%	0.50%	0.40%	0.30%
5	Weak	Medium	0.30%	0.20%	0.00%	0.45%	0.30%	0.00%	0.80%	0.60%	0.40%
6	Weak	Strong	0.30%	0.20%	0.00%	0.45%	0.30%	0.00%	1.00%	0.75%	0.50%
7	Medium	Weak	0.40%	0.25%	0.00%	0.65%	0.40%	0.00%	0.50%	0.40%	0.30%
8	Medium	Medium	0.40%	0.25%	0.00%	0.65%	0.40%	0.00%	0.80%	0.60%	0.40%
9	Medium	Strong	0.40%	0.25%	0.00%	0.65%	0.40%	0.00%	1.00%	0.75%	0.50%
10	Strong	Weak	0.60%	0.40%	0.00%	0.90%	0.55%	0.00%	0.50%	0.40%	0.30%
11	Strong	Medium	0.60%	0.40%	0.00%	0.90%	0.55%	0.00%	0.80%	0.60%	0.40%
12	Strong	Strong	0.60%	0.40%	0.00%	0.90%	0.55%	0.00%	1.00%	0.75%	0.50%

Remarks: The wage increase of the lower pay band remains the same in each of the individual age scenarios (e.g., 4, 5 & 6), however the respective increases by years of service and the upper pay band change. A slight increase by years of service is not always the same (the increase in scenario 4 is smaller than in scenario 10). Due to the increase in age, a minimum increase by years of service must also be ensured in each case.

Table 2: Mapping of the answers to the questions for companies with the pay band form scenarios

Question 1 (Age)	**Question 2 (Years of service)**	**Scenario**
Not at all	Not at all	0
Not at all	A little	1
Not at all	Somewhat	2
Not at all	A lot	3
A little	Not at all	4
A little	A little	4
A little	Somewhat	5
A little	A lot	6
Somewhat	Not at all	7
Somewhat	A little	7
Somewhat	Somewhat	8
Somewhat	A lot	9
A lot	Not at all	10
A lot	A little	10
A lot	Somewhat	11
A lot	A lot	12

4.3.3 Calculation of the pay bands

The pay bands are either calculated parametrically or with a simplified approach. Logib pay system automatically decides based on several criteria which method is used.

Starting wage at age 20

In both methods the "starting wage at age 20" is calculated – corresponding to the wage that an employee would earn at age 20 when entering a company. This is necessary so that the wage growth with age or years of service does not distort the result.

An employee's (theoretical) "starting wage at age 20" is given as: $wage^{age\ 20}(wage, age, DJ) = \frac{wage}{wage\ growth\ since\ age\ 20}$.

$wage$ is the employee's actual wage. The (theoretical) $wage\ growth\ since\ age\ 20$ is the wage growth that can be expected through the selected pay band scenario (see chapter 4.3.2) and is defined as follows:

$$wage\ growth\ since\ age\ 20(g^{DJ}, g^{age}) = \begin{cases} UL, & g^{DJ} \times g^{age} \leq UL \\ g^{DJ} \times g^{age}, & UL < g^{DJ} \times g^{age} < OL. \\ OL, & g^{DJ} \times g^{age} \geq OL \end{cases}$$

g^{DJ} is the years of service-based and g^{age} the age-based wage growth since age 20 and is defined as follows:

$$g^{DJ}(DJ) = \begin{cases} (1+m)^{DJ}, & DJ \leq 10 \\ (1+m)^{10} \times (1+n)^{DJ-10}, & 10 < DJ \leq 20 \\ (1+m)^{10} \times (1+n)^{10} \times (1+o)^{DJ-20}, & 20 < DJ \leq 45' \\ (1+m)^{10} \times (1+n)^{10} \times (1+o)^{25}, & DJ > 45 \end{cases}$$

and

$$g^{age}(age, DJ) = \begin{cases} 1, & age - DJ < 20 \\ (1+x)^{age-DJ-20}, & 20 \leq age - DJ \leq 40 \\ (1+x)^{20} \times (1+y)^{age-DJ-40}, & 40 < age - DJ \leq 57. \\ (1+x)^{20} \times (1+y)^{17} \times (1+z)^{age-DJ-57}, & 57 < age - DJ \leq 65 \\ (1+x)^{20} \times (1+y)^{17} \times (1+z)^{8}, & age - DJ > 65 \end{cases}$$

DJ are the years of service of an employee. m, n and o are the parameters that define wage growth by years of service; x, y, z are the parameters that define the wage growth by age. The values of these parameters depend on the selected pay band form (see chapter 4.3.2). The specific values can be found in Table 1.

Parametric method

If the company has at least 10 employees, the parametric calculation is used. Here the "starting wage at age 20" is logarithmised and regressed on the function value. In concrete terms, the following linear model is estimated with OLS:

$$LN(wage_i^{age\ 20}) = b_0 + b_1 FW_i + \varepsilon_i.$$

b_0 and b_1 are coefficients that are estimated with OLS. ε_i is an error term. The person's function value i is given as the function value of the function carried out by this person: $FW_i = FW_{j(i)}$, whereby $j(i)$ is the function j of person i.

For each pay grade, the lower limit of the corresponding pay band at age 20 is calculated (the starting wage at age 20 for a pay grade, $x_k^{parametric}$) using the estimated coefficients $\hat{b}_0$ and $\hat{b}_1$. For pay grade

k, $x_k^{parametric}$ is given as the exponential of the "predicted value" of the median functional value of this pay grade, $\overline{FW_k}$: $x_k^{parametric} = EXP(\hat{b}_0 + \hat{b}_1\overline{FW_k})$, with $k \in \{1, \dots, 14\}$.

> Example: The starting wage at age 20 of pay grade 1, $x_1^{parametric}$, composed of the function values 16, 17 and 18 is given as $EXP(\hat{b}_0 + \hat{b}_1 \times 17)$.

For pay grades with less than three function values, the highest function value is used instead of the median.

Based on the starting wage at age 20, the pay bands of all pay grades are defined through the pay band forms described in chapter 4.3.2.

Simplified method

If the company has fewer than 10 employees, the simplified approach is used. This method is also used if the R^2 of the regression of the logarithmised "starting wage at age 20" on the function value is smaller than 0.6 or if the estimated coefficient of the function value $\hat{b}_1$ is negative.

In the simplified approach, the slope parameter b_1 from the log-linear wage model is set to a value of $b_1 = 0.025$ as a first step[1]. The wage model is then estimated using the logarithm of the «starting wage at age 20» and the specified slope parameter. The following model is thus estimated using OLS:

$LN\left(Wage_i^{age\ 20}\right) = b_0 + 0.025 * FW_i + \varepsilon_i$.

The coefficient b_0 is such that the sum of the squared residuals $\varepsilon_i{}^2$ is minimized.

For each pay grade, the lower limit of the corresponding pay band at age 20 is calculated (the starting wage at age 20 for a pay grade, $x_k^{simplified}$) using the estimated coefficient $\hat{b}_0$. For pay grade k, $x_k^{simplified}$ is given as the exponential of the "predicted value" of the median functional value of this pay grade, $\overline{FW_k}$: $x_k^{simplified} = EXP(\hat{b}_0 + 0.025 * \overline{FW_k})$, with $k \in \{1, \dots, 14\}$.

For pay grades with less than three function values, the highest function value is used instead of the median.

Entry of a wage amount that should not be undercut

In Logib pay system, it is possible to define a wage for a full-time position that should not be undercut in your company for any person. This allows the company to define wage amounts that should not be undercut, for instance in order to respect collective agreements (minimum wages). If such an amount is defined, the starting wage at age 20 will not fall below this value in any pay grade.

If a minimum wage, x^{min}, has been defined, the adapted starting wage at age 20 of pay grade is k, $\tilde{x}_k$, given as follows:

$\tilde{x}_k = \max\left(\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{M} N_l x_l}{\sum_{l=1}^{M} N_l \dot{x}_l}\dot{x}_k;\ x_k; x^{min}\right)$,

whereby M is the number of pay grades. $\tilde{x}_k$ corresponds in this respect to the largest value of the following three terms: i.) to $\frac{\sum_{l=1}^{M} N_l x_l}{\sum_{l=1}^{M} N_l \dot{x}_l}\dot{x}_k$, an alternatively calculated starting wage at age 20, ii.) to x_k, the starting wage at age 20 without entering a minimum wage and iii.) to x^{min}, the minimum wage.

[1] A slope of $b_1 = 0.025$ in the log-linear wage model corresponds ceteris paribus to a wage increase of around 2.5% per additional unit of function value. The wage increase is considered plausible by experts in a comparison of wages from the Swiss Earnings Structure Survey ESS, broken down by professional position and skill level for 40-year-olds.

The following applies: $\dot{x}_k = EXP[LN(x^{min}) + b(\overline{FW}_k - \overline{FW}_1)]$, with $b = \frac{LN(x_M) - LN(x^{min})}{\overline{FW}_M - \overline{FW}_1}$. x_M is the starting wage at age 20 of the highest pay grade; $\overline{FW}_M$ and $\overline{FW}_1$ are the median functional value of the last and first pay grade. $\sum_{k=1}^{M} N^k x_k$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{M} N^k \dot{x}_k$ are the total wages of all employees if they receive as a wage the starting wage at age 20 and the alternative starting wage at age 20 respectively.

If the minimum wage is below the starting wage of the first pay grade $x_1 > x^{min}$ or if there is only one pay grade (M = 1), $\tilde{x}_k$ is given as follows instead:

$\tilde{x}_k = \max(x_k; x^{min})$.

4.4 Depiction of results

Logib pay system shows as a result the pay grades determined on the basis of the preceding explanations with the corresponding pay bands and employees allocated to the respective grades. It is shown graphically and in table form for employees whether their effective wage is situated below, within or above the pay band. Based on the principles created by Logib pay system, it is expected that employees' wages will fall within the band. Persons above the upper limit of the pay band earn more than expected based on the suggested system, while persons below the lower limit earn less. This means that wages are higher or lower than expected, if the requirements and demands of the function, the person's experience and the current total wages paid out in the company or organisation are taken into account. Wages set for new employees should be within the pay band of the respective function.

Appendix

5 Bibliography

Chicha, Marie-Thérèse (2016). Promoting equity: Gender-neutral job evaluation for equal pay. A step by-step guide. Berlin: International Labour Organization.

Hirschi, Andreas & Ghetta, Anja (2020). Entwicklungsbericht Logib Modul 2 Analyse der Lohngleichheit zwischen Frau und Mann für kleinere Unternehmen insbesondere mit weniger als 50 Mitarbeitenden. Im Auftrag des Eidgenössischen Büros für die Gleichstellung von Frau und Mann EBG. Bern: Abteilung für Arbeits- und Organisationspsychologie Universität Bern.

Humphrey, S. E., Nahrgang, J. D., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Integrating motivational, social, and contextual work design features: A meta-analytic summary and theoretical extension of the work design literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1332–1356.

International Labour Office (2008). Promoting equity: Gender-neutral job evaluation for equal pay: A step-by-step guide. Geneva: International Labour Office.

Katz, Christian & Baitsch, Christof (1996). Lohngleichheit für die Praxis. Zwei Instrumente zur geschlechtsunabhängigen Arbeitsbewertung. Eidgenössisches Büro für die Gleichstellung von Frau und Mann EBG (Hrsg.). Zürich: vdf.

Krell, Gertraude & Winter, Regula (2011). Anforderungsabhängige Entgeltdifferenzierung: Orientierungshilfen auf dem Weg zu einer. diskriminierungsfreien Arbeitsbewertung. In: G. Krell, R. Ortlieb & B. Sieben (Hrsg.). Chancengleichheit durch Personalpolitik. 6. Vollständig überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. München: Gabler. S. 343-360.

Schär Moser, Marianne (2019). Analytische Arbeitsbewertung: Eine zuverlässige, geschlechtsneutrale Grundlage zur Festsetzung von Funktionslöhnen. Eidgenössisches Büro für die Gleichstellung von Frau und Mann (Hrsg.). Bern: EBG.