

facts relative to individual performance, versatility and competence, upon which the merits of the individual employee's claim for advance in rate of compensation may be judged with much greater mutual satisfaction than under the alternative bases of personal favoritism, hazy impression, or length of service.

Each government employee, whether under civil service or not, is vitally interested in his or her prospects for advancement in rate of compensation; and a very considerable portion of these are employees anxious to be taught new work of the same and especially of higher grades. Not all government employees are indifferent to their work or unambitious. Many spend much of their leisure time and of their funds in study for self-improvement; I have personal knowledge concerning a number of such ambitious employees. It is very discouraging to these alert, intelligent, ambitious, energetic employees, after having, as they believe, brought their personal qualifications and accomplishments up to equality with those of their higher classed and more highly paid associates, to find that in the reclassification of personnel for a new year they have been left in the same old grade at the same old rate. I am personally acquainted with several government employees who have been so disappointed and so discouraged. In some cases at least it was my *impression* that they deserved higher rating. However, there were no standards of performance and no records of individual performance whereby either I or they could prove their contentions. These disgruntled government workers have agreed with me that it would have been much more satisfactory if there had been standards, records and other mechanisms whereby to *measure* their merits rather than to depend upon the *impressions* of even an examiner in charge who was in close daily touch with their work.

The accomplishment to be aimed at is to "sell" science in management to the great body of workers, —to make them understand thoroughly what science in management is and what it is not—to make them realize that science in management is their friend. Accomplish this, and they will press to have science applied to their management. Then when a department head does apply science in the management of his department, even though he give place to a political successor, the permanent body of employees will see to its continuity.

Miss Van Kleec, in discussing Miss Gilson's paper, asked whether the further growth in the application of

scientific management in private industry is to consist merely of the addition of one plant after another to the list of those which have installed it. It is obvious that, so long as the demand for science in management comes only from the proprietors of business establishments, this will be the case. The spread of science in the management of industry will greatly be accelerated, however, when organized labor comes to realize that science in management is beneficial, not detrimental, to the workers; when organized labor not only accepts the principle of science in management but makes it a very live policy of the labor unions. For then organized labor will demand its application in the establishments in which they work. Once its benefits are demonstrated by organized labor in the actual trial, the attitude of all workers, organized and unorganized, will become actively favorable. Not only will the spread of science in management be greatly accelerated, but, once installed, there will be fewer slip-backs to old methods.

The future of science in management will depend in very large degree upon bringing the great body of workers whether in private industry or in government service to a thorough understanding of what science in management is and of the benefit it can confer upon them. And, further, that organized labor in private industry and the body of civil service employees in government service are the bodies to which this understanding should be brought first.

T. W. MITCHELL.¹

A Labor Leader on Scientific Management

IN VENTURING a brief discussion of the paper by Mr. Henry H. Farquhar entitled, "A Critical Analysis of Scientific Management"² presented to the Taylor Society at its meeting in January, I hope no one will think my views should be taken as those held by the leaders of the trade unions, but merely as the opinion of one who is keenly interested in the subject and who wants to see a system established that will get the best possible results for both employers and employees.

I do not know that I can do better than to quote the first sentence of the second paragraph of Mr. Farquhar's paper: "It is a little curious in view of the very considerable literature on this subject that the

¹Associate Economist, Federal Trade Commission.

²*Bulletin of the Taylor Society*, Vol. IX, No. 1, February, 1924.

movement that we are discussing continues to be so persistently misunderstood." In the discussions I have had with any one on the subject of Scientific Management I have always emphasized that point, and I am afraid that many of us are still in the position of not knowing very much about the subject when we attempt to discuss it.

I have no hesitation in saying that the view is generally held among the legitimate trade unions today that the welfare of all depends on the workers' giving and receiving a fair day's work for a fair day's wage. The great difficulty in the past has always been to determine just what this day's work and day's wage should be.

Many employers charge that a labor union is merely a fighting machine and neither its members nor its leaders have any interest in trying to improve either quantity or quality of production. If there is any basis for the charge that the unions are merely fighting machines it seems to me that the responsibility for such a situation must rest heavily on those employers who have persistently misunderstood the whole philosophy of the trade union movement and who have forced it to fight for every inch of progress that has been made by the workers. We have had no option in the matter but it has not been our desire, nor is it now, to provoke or engage in industrial conflict. We believe modern industry is organized along such lines as to make it imperative that the workers should be organized for their own benefit as well as the benefit of the employers, because in the great majority of industries it is only through collective effort that industrial problems can be handled successfully.

It seems to me a great pity that Mr. Taylor when first bringing his system to the attention of the public gave so little consideration to the reaction which the workers in industry would have when he attempted to install his system in some particular plant. Whether rightly or wrongly it is nevertheless a fact that the workers became convinced that the human element in industry was totally ignored by Mr. Taylor.

I recall that during his examination at the time of the investigation made by the United States Senate, Mr. Taylor stated on the stand that his standard of requirement could be met on the average by only one out of five workmen, and his testimony along this line added to the convictions held by the workers that their personal welfare, both mental and physical, was regarded as of secondary importance in a speeding-up process that was designed to get the largest possible

production. This naturally led to the belief that individuals would be compelled to work under such conditions as would result in their quickly expending their whole physical and mental energy, after which they would be thrown on the industrial scrap pile. So far as I know practically no effort has been made to convince the workers or their chosen representatives that this is not now the policy of those who are carrying on Mr. Taylor's work.

Through my acquaintance with Mr. Farquhar formed several years ago I have learned more about the real purpose and methods of scientific management than I ever knew before and I have no hesitation in saying that if those who are generally engaged in installing or supervising systems of this character hold the same view as Mr. Farquhar, as expressed to me and in his paper, there is no doubt in my mind that we can work in whole-hearted cooperation to the mutual benefit of employers and employees. The statement made by the delegates representing the organizations affiliated with the American Federation of Labor at their last annual convention held in Portland, Oregon, to the effect that "It is not the mission of industrial groups to clash and struggle against each other" and that "Industry must organize for service . . . for justice to all who participate" truly represents the purpose and desire of the organized workers.

It seems to me that any plan of scientific management must involve the creation of complete confidence between employer and employee, and in my opinion this can only be done by having the workers feel they have a medium through which they can protect themselves at all times.

Some employers may feel that this would mean a constant state of armed neutrality and the constant threat of force or coercion in such a situation. But there are many examples to prove that a fear of this kind is not well founded. For more than thirty years the stove moulders, members of the International Moulders' Union, have been well organized and have maintained a written agreement with the Stove Founders' Association, representing the employers in the stove industry. The same is true of the members of the International Typographical Union employed in practically all the newspaper offices in the country. Other examples could be cited but unfortunately not as many as should be possible.

I was especially interested in the paragraphs in the fourth section of Mr. Farquhar's paper which refer to the question of personality in management. and man-