

TABLE V

STENOGRAPHIC ABILITY RATINGS OF FLOOR STENOGRAPHERS BY THEMSELVES AS OF FEB. 4, 1919			STENOGRAPHIC ABILITY RATINGS OF FLOOR STENOGRAPHERS BY FLOOR DICTATORS AS OF FEB. 6, 1919			DICTATION ABILITY RATINGS OF FLOOR DICTATORS BY FLOOR STENOGRAPHERS AS OF FEB. 4, 1919		
NAME	NO. OF ESTIMATORS	AVERAGE ESTIMATE	NAME	NO. OF ESTIMATORS	AVERAGE ESTIMATE	NAME	NO. OF ESTIMATORS	AVERAGE ESTIMATE
Spooner	6	94.83	Lodge	6	93.17	Hale	3	96.67
Winston	6	94.83	Roberts	6	90.50	Thomas	2	96.50
Casey	6	94.50	Spooner	9	89.50	Moore	4	96.25
Cooney	6	94.50	Winston	9	88.89	Pryor	2	95.00
TOTAL AVERAGE	42	93.48	TOTAL AVERAGE	49	88.20	Babbitt	6	93.83
Murphy	6	92.33	Murphy	4	86.38	Upton	3	93.33
Lodge	6	91.67	Casey	6	86.00	Cheney	3	93.00
Roberts	6	91.67	Cooney	9	83.67	Bolton	6	92.50
						Wister	6	92.50
						TOTAL AVERAGE	48	92.15
						Smith	4	92.00
						Wilbur	3	90.00
						James	6	82.50

his self-rating under. Then each passed the ballot to his right-hand neighbor who wrote on the bottom his rating of Mr., folded it under, and passed the ballot on. When each ballot came back to the original owner, he added up all of the totals, exclusive of his own judgment of himself, averaged them, and read aloud his judgment of himself as compared with the crowd's judgment of him. We had quite a lot of fun over it!

I hope very much that no one here will consider that this is a finished product in mutual rating technic; or that this is a package of goods which you can take home now and thereby get all of your employees to rate each other on personality, ability and industry. Ratings can be successfully developed "at home," however, provided a few fundamentals are borne in mind. This game to succeed must first of all be a game of the crowd itself that is playing it, as any game must be. The crowd itself must be interested, must develop its own rules, must determine the qualities which it wants to rate. It must be in every way "their game" if it is going to have its fullest possibilities. The technic must be self-determined by the raters. That is the only democratic way and the only way in which it will hold continuously the interest of the raters.

Secondly, it must be inclusive. There must be no privileged exemptions, of bosses or anybody else. If it is going to be fair, it has got to be fair for all alike. By that I don't mean that the laborers in the shop are to rate the president's financial ability. I mean we must apply straight through the exception principle, as we know it in scientific management. The ratings should be by homogeneous groups who know each other, rating only those qualities which they know about. Then, because from a homogeneous group, the collective judgment will count for something. You can conceive of the rating plan in a large organization pyramiding up with one pyramid on top of another, each pyramid representing one homogeneous group rating itself, including the bosses in that group. Let each unit or group or gang, or whatever you may call it in your own organization, including the foreman, be a pyramid; let the various foremen in each department and their superintendent be a pyramid; let the various superintendents in each plant, with their manager, be a pyramid; finally, let the managers and the executive officers be the topmost pyramid. By using the exception principle with judgment on some such ascending scale, you can apply the principle of mutual ratings to any organization, however large.

One of the weaknesses of these charts I have shown you is the fact that there are different numbers of people judging single individuals. I would personally rather have a rating of 79.50 by thirty people than 80 by fifteen people. If you stick to your homogeneous group you will get a greater unity of judgment. Of course, as in any balloting, a person is free to withhold his judgment about any person or quality.

Another point is that it must be impersonal. That is why, when you have only two persons in a group, you omit their vote on each other. We don't want to know what one individual thinks about any other individual. There have to be two or more to strike an average, which is impersonal.

It should be simple,—so simple that the qualities are easily comprehended. We all of us have some idea of personality, of industry and of ability. Other qualities might just as well have been chosen. But they must be simple to be successfully rated. Therefore, start with too few rather than too many qualities. Remember you are playing one-o' cat. Someday you may grow to professional baseball. If so, it will not be at one leap, but by slow, gradual growth. Let the growth come naturally.

Another vital point that I have already suggested is the publicity of the results. If any employer here tries to work a rating scheme and keeps the tabulated records locked in his private safe, it will fall flat. The effectiveness of this thing as a game is the same as the effectiveness of the baseball score,—the greater the publicity the greater the fun and the interest.

And finally: I have already spoken of the periodicity; that no one rating is final. Have your ratings often enough to record any significant change of fact or judgment, and then you will get the rating functioning properly with its inherent property of self-correctiveness. Human beings, in common with all forms of life, must be free to grow, and growth involves self-correction through experience.

In regard to improvement in technic and possible lines of further development, don't forget for a minute that this is only one phase of sizing-up the individual. This isn't the whole man represented on the chart. We already have the production records of cost and quantity and quality of output. Those are fine. As a matter of fact, it may interest you to know that when we started these ratings in this particular group, after the first tabulation the crowd itself began to devise more effective production records than they had ever had in order to give them more facts on which to judge each other. When you get your own crowd working for scientific production records of its own output, you are getting somewhere with constructive organization! Out of this will grow the desire to define and weigh the qualities needed for different jobs. That, of course, leads to job-analysis and is educational, illuminating, and helpful to each employee in getting a broader vision of the organization and a feeling of contact with and understanding of the other

MR.				
IS RATED AS FOLLOWS				
IN				
ABILITY				
SCORE BASIS				
	HIGHEST	25		
	HIGH	20		
	MIDDLE	15		
	LOW	10		
	LOWEST	5		
TOTALS	To let George do it	To blow his own horn	To pass the buck	To raise the ante
WHOLE AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE
WHOLE TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL
INDIVIDUAL TOTALS	INDIV. RATINGS	INDIV. RATINGS	INDIV. RATINGS	INDIV. RATINGS

FIG. 3