

ant phase of developing cooperation have resulted in submitting to groups matters which pertain directly to the interests of these groups. In this connection I would refer you to Mr. Feiss's paper on "Human Relationship as a Basis of Scientific Management" in which he stresses the fact that democracy does not consist of voting.

By a well worked out system of group representation there is an opportunity for thorough elucidation of all suggested innovations and changes and a chance for expression of management, foremen and operatives. The success or failure of such a plan, however, depends upon the earnestness of people in this great game of understanding each other, and that can be gained only by years of close contact and fair dealing. Its value lies in the publicity acquired by group discussion, the good will secured by group agreement and the sportsmanship which an organization governed by integrity can inspire in its members not only in the discovering of laws but in abiding by them. In some organizations disruption results from an insidious undermining of law by men, even in responsible positions, who are individualists and do not recognize the value of one law for all in developing group spirit and morale.

As a concrete example of such accumulating and codifying of material followed by group agreement on its method of application, I might mention what is known in most plants as "excuses." In our own plant excuses are granted (or refused) by a committee consisting of the shop representative (executive representative of the works council) and a member of the staff of the service department. Contrast the lack of method in the matter of granting excuses in the rule of thumb plant with the method in a scientific management plant. In the former a worker goes to his foreman and asks for a day off. Or, in many cases, he simply takes the time off and lies to his foreman on his return. In any case, the man is railed at or winked at according to the whim and nature of the foreman he approaches. One foreman may be rigid in such matters and another lenient. There is no plant policy. Decisions in such a plant are not arrived at by thoughtful examination of facts, agreement as to major methods, and a spirit of abiding by the law, but they are made according to different whims of different people on different days. We would resent our traffic conduct being regulated by traffic policemen in this way. What reason have we to believe it is more satisfactory in our work shops than on our

streets? Take, on the other hand, the method pursued where there is "system." The worker applies to the excuse committee through his foreman, and the request is granted according to the validity of the excuse and the absentee record of the worker. The workers know that there is no favoritism shown by the excuse committee, but that this committee acts according to a common law evolved out of long standing experience and history of work records. Thus law is substituted for personality in decisions of this sort, and a sense of fairness on the part of workers is the result.

Again let us consider the example of taking up collections in an organization. If all groups agree that this is a habit which involves workers in difficulties, it goes into Standard Practice that no collection will be permitted for any purpose whatever. When a particularly appealing purpose arises and some individual wishes to take up a collection, it is not necessary to spend time discussing the merits of the case. The majority of workers would resent the violation of standard practice or even the waste of time involved in discussing a special case, the wisdom of not permitting collection-taking having been already conceded as a policy.

There would be a clearer conception of the happy mean between centralizing and decentralizing shop discipline if such methods as I have been describing were employed more widely. As in the function of hiring, there is no feeling of "authority" in personnel workers whose duties include the consistent application of policies subscribed to by all. It was not until our Works Council recognized the need of a person who was freed from all other duties to serve as their executive secretary that its smoother functioning was brought about. It was like a committee without a chairman, or at least a chairman who had time and energy to devote the necessary attention to the business of the committee. Similarly an industrial organization's personnel work becomes sooner or later tangled up with loose threads unless it is someone's especial duty to tie them in. To me it seems the *reductio ad absurdum* to conceive of each foreman handling many matters which by their very nature should be insured consistent handling by the same people. I have never seen a plant where corroding fear did not eat out the latent good will of workers if any individual had it in his power to discharge without a hearing or even to threaten discharge. In many minor matters of discipline, likewise, consistent

practice must be assured. And I maintain that in a plant where every attempt is made to supplant personal policies by organization policies, the foreman is considered by his workers a real fellow and not a straw boss. But where there is fear of suspicion of unfairness (resulting from inconsistent practice) there is no room left for respect.

But it is not merely in matters which obviously fall within the range of the usual activities of a personnel department that employees gain respect for a management which stands for consistent policies based on honest investigation of facts. The work of every department in an entire plant affects the happiness and well being of employees. No one department may be said to have "personnel work" exclusively in its hands. Therefore, planning, machine maintenance, routing of materials and dozens of matters not usually regarded as affecting industrial relations are, in truth, at the very heart of such relations. Wavering and easily dispelled is the confidence of employees who are not convinced that their management does honest work in its practical school and stands at the head of the industrial class in all these matters which so affect their destinies at work and their prosperity at home. Here, again, one has only to listen to employees boasting of the advanced methods in their places of work to know that they appreciate a management which is earnestly dealing with facts and evolving just policies and methods from these facts.

It was Taylor's industrial creed that only by governing according to law based on facts could justice and fair play supplant favoritism and thus inspire confidence and cooperation in workers. Change for the sake of change, never. Change based on new light, thoughtful study, newly discovered facts and ever progressing ideas all of which result in bettering conditions and increasing the prosperity of him who directs and of him who is directed (both of whom must be conscientious workers), this is the keynote of the thing which Taylor calls "the development of a true science."

II. The Scientific Selection of Workmen

So much has been written concerning methods of selecting workmen that we shall step lightly over details of method and consider the philosophy underlying this second basic principle of scientific management. To those of us who have had much experience in selecting workers it becomes more and more evident that the selection can not be wholly scientific.

However, it can at least approximate the scientific and that is more than may be said for the old hit-or-miss methods. By careful physical examinations, by mental tests, by constantly improving methods of selection and placement through analysis and synthesis of experience, one can at least arrive at a fairly satisfactory process of selection. But we must avoid making too enthusiastic claims and we must be constantly on the alert to analyze and correlate our theory and practice. Here, too, our experience leads us to believe that an employment department with a "system" which is put into practice by someone who is applying conscientious thought and energy to his job is another factor in stabilizing the confidence of workers. If a man in a plant without a definite employment policy wants to get a job for his brother, he thinks he can worm him in by cajoling the hiring clerk or getting the favor of a foreman (where foremen do the hiring). But if all the workers in an entire organization know that requisitions for workers are carefully supervised on the basis of manning operations and departments according to demonstrated need, and if they know that people are selected on the basis of their fitness for the organization and for the job as evidenced by a procedure of selection which is applied to all applicants, they are again more likely to concede that "pull" does not count. This attitude of workers exists where employment supervisors are not tempted even by executives in an organization to make exceptions in favor of their relatives and friends. For in a scientific management plant it is an accepted and settled-for-once-and-all fact that in the policy of selection of workers as well as in other policies, whim and opinion are supplanted by law.

Oliver Sheldon says in his remarkable book, "The Philosophy of Management,"³ "There is little need to emphasize the necessity for employment work to be organized as a distinct department. The engaging of personnel alone is a highly specialized function. It cannot be regarded as incidental to supervision. The discharge of personnel, again, if we are to regard the worker as something more than a cog in the machine, cannot in justice be left wholly to the will of individual foremen." One must always allow for honest differences of opinion, but I wish I could feel that the opinions of men who have not yet come

³The reading of this book and the recently published *Life of Frederick Taylor* by Copley should be considered an inescapable duty and pleasure by every man who views his business as a profession.