NOVARA
CONSULTING GROUP

Decision Variance and the Mispricing of Labor Cost

Heather Grizzle · February 1, 2026

Headcount cuts trim the labor cost you can see. The hidden cost of inconsistent supervisor decisions drives turnover and legal exposure alike.

Sommaire

The standard efficiency intervention reduces headcount, and it does so for a reason that has little to do with strategy. Headcount is the portion of labor cost the accounting system can actually see. Wages, benefits, overtime hours, agency spend, and severance all resolve into line items that a finance function can model, forecast, and cut. The costs generated by inconsistent decision-making inside the workforce appear nowhere as a category. They surface later and disaggregated, as replacement hiring, vacancy lag, overtime absorbed by the employees who stayed, grievance handling, counsel time, settlement, and the productivity a new hire has not yet reached. An organization that cuts the visible line while leaving the underlying generator intact will book a saving in the current period and pay for it across the following ones. This is not a failure of managerial discipline, and treating it as one has produced a great deal of unhelpful advice. It is a measurement problem, and it recurs across sectors because the measurement system rather than the management team produces it.

Locating the Generator

The generator is worth locating precisely. In most organizations, the highest volume of consequential employment decisions is made not by executives or by human resources but by first-line supervisors: who is scheduled and when, whose absence is treated as excused, which performance problem is coached and which is documented, which documented problem escalates, who is told about the opening on the next shift. These decisions are rarely governed by an instrument. They are governed by an individual supervisor's judgment, tenure, risk tolerance, workload on the day, and relationship with the particular employee in front of them. Across a population of supervisors, the aggregate result is variance. That variance has two distinct outputs, and in nearly every organization those two outputs are assigned to different departments, reported through different channels, and carried on different budgets.

The Operational Output

The first output is operational. Inconsistent supervision is among the more durable findings in the retention literature as a driver of voluntary separation, and voluntary separation is what converts into requisition load, vacancy duration, overtime dependence among the remaining staff, and the interval before a replacement reaches full productivity. That interval is where most of the real money sits, and it is the number organizations are least likely to measure, because unlike cost per hire it does not fall out of an applicant tracking system.

The Legal Output

The second output is legal, and it is the same phenomenon viewed from a different angle. The evidentiary core of a disparate treatment claim is comparator evidence: the employee who was terminated for conduct that a similarly situated colleague was coached for, the accommodation that was granted on one shift and refused on another, the promotion conversation that happened for one person and not the other. Inconsistency is not merely a contributing factor to that exposure. It is the exposure. What this means, and the point deserves emphasis because it is routinely missed, is that a single underlying condition inside the organization is generating both the retention cost and the litigation risk, while being recorded in two separate places and priced correctly in neither. Neither owner sees the full quantity. Operations sees turnover it attributes to the labor market. Compliance sees claims it attributes to bad actors. The remediation that would address both has a return split across two cost centers, which is a reliable way to ensure nobody funds it.

The Implication for Headcount Reduction

> A single underlying condition is generating both the retention cost and the litigation risk, while being recorded in two separate places and priced correctly in neither.

This has a specific and uncomfortable implication for headcount reduction as an efficiency strategy. Reducing supervisory or administrative staff in a high-variance decision environment widens span of control, compresses the time available per decision, and degrades the quality of contemporaneous documentation, which is the only durable defense against a comparator argument. The reasoning here is straightforward, though it should be labeled as reasoning rather than as an established empirical finding, because the published work isolating decision quality effects from the many other consequences of a reduction in force is thin. Stated conservatively: an efficiency program executed without attention to decision structure is at minimum not neutral toward the generator of the cost it is meant to reduce, and there is a plausible mechanism by which it makes the generator worse.

Automation Compounds the Problem

The introduction of automated tools into this environment compounds the problem rather than resolving it, which runs against how these tools are typically sold. A system configured against an organization's historical decisions inherits the variance in those decisions as a pattern and then applies that pattern at a rate and consistency no individual supervisor could achieve, which is not the same thing as applying it correctly. More consequentially, the character of the record changes. A supervisor who makes an inconsistent decision leaves behind a human account that can be examined, tested, and if necessary corrected. A configured system leaves an output. Where the vendor treats the configuration as proprietary, the employer may find that it cannot reconstruct the basis for a decision it is nonetheless required to defend. The sequencing matters and it is not negotiable: decisions have to be standardized before they are automated, because automating an ungoverned decision does not govern it. It scales it and removes the interrogable account that would have explained it.

> **SEQUENCING**
>
> Decisions have to be standardized before they are automated, because automating an ungoverned decision does not govern it.

The Corrective Work

The corrective work is unglamorous and largely procedural. It begins by identifying the decision points that carry both operational cost and legal exposure, which in most organizations is a short list rather than a comprehensive one. It requires stating the criteria for those decisions in language a supervisor can apply under time pressure, requiring a contemporaneous record, and then, critically, measuring variance across supervisors as a standing operating metric rather than discovering it during a compliance audit or a deposition. It requires knowing which roles, if they destabilized, would interrupt production or client delivery, and treating those roles as a continuity problem rather than a recruiting problem. And it requires pricing the exposure, which is the step most organizations skip, because an unpriced risk cannot compete for capital against a priced one.

What Can Honestly Be Claimed

A note on what can honestly be claimed for this work. Public evidence does not support precise savings figures, and vendors quoting a fixed percentage return on workforce standardization should be read with suspicion, since the underlying counterfactual is almost never observable. What can be defended is directional and structural: the costs described here are real, they are currently unmeasured in most organizations, they share a common generator, and they are not addressed by the intervention most commonly deployed against them. That is a weaker claim than the market usually makes and a considerably more durable one.

Efficiency, Properly Defined

Efficiency, properly defined, is not reduction. It is predictability, in labor spend, in time to productivity, in continuity of critical roles, and in the defensibility of the decisions that produce all three. Workforce systems that deliver that are functioning as infrastructure. Most are not built that way, and the reason is rarely that the people inside them are not working hard enough.

Comment citer

Grizzle, H. M. (2026, February 1). Decision Variance and the Mispricing of Labor Cost. Novara Consulting Group. https://www.novaracg.com/fr/2026/02/01/decision-variance-and-the-mispricing-of-labor-cost/