

ideas acquired from other people or from reading. The active experience of initiating new policies and methods growing out of the willingness to try out new ideas brings with it the actual change of purpose.

In other words, a purpose is not an actuality until it has really affected one's behavior. The actual grip of motor experience upon the individual is the only method by which purposes are changed, for only thus are they wrought into the fabric of the individual rather than being held merely as an opinion.

Indeed, in many cases, the new experience is that which creates the new purpose. As one writer puts it, "On a basis of what has been already experienced, things are desired; on the basis of what has been desired and experienced, new things become desired. This extension and growth of desire take place through the influence of similarity and analogy."⁵

The experience of a considerable number of corporations with safety committees of their employees well illustrates this point. A few years ago many plants undertook to cut down their accident load by appointing safety committees of their employees as points of contact through whom education and preventive work was to be done on the safety question. The purpose of the managers was to reduce accidents. But they soon found that they were discussing not only accidents and contributory causes with the employee groups, but other common problems. The committee idea was thus naturally extended to the consideration of general grievances and shop problems. From this it was a natural step to the creation of a shop committee which was elected departmentally rather than appointed. Meanwhile the purposes of the managers had come a long way from the initial aim of accident prevention.

Another example is that of a well-known plant in which the managers believed that the inclusion of a certain few key employees in an employee stock-ownership arrangement would be beneficial to company morale. This company had a shop committee which eventually requested the extension of the plan to make all employees eligible. The request was granted. In the course of several years of experience the purposes of the managers

as to the holding of stock employees was considerably changed and broadened.

In short, specific purposes do change and evolve, and the manner in which fundamental purposes manifest themselves can be substantially modified. Because people have minds and reflect on experience, and even more because external conditions modify, redirect and restrict experience, their purposes *must* change. There is an innate craving in human beings for economy in the choice of means to fulfill desires as well as in the choice of desires which can be fulfilled. Purposes, because they help to control activity, help to alter situations and surroundings; and these, in turn, help to re-shape purposes. Thus it is that there exists for human groups which are in conflict the possibility of "integration"—of evolving new purposes to which different groups can subscribe, and in striving for which the genuine desires of all will be realized.

This brings the discussion to a point where it is possible to attempt to answer the next question:

VI. The Integration of Purposes

What is the possibility of establishing and giving effect to purposes which can be shared in and worked for by the different groups participating in industry? The first answer to this question is that there are already some purposes which can and are being shared in and might be shared in more fully by the groups in industry if they had a full appreciation of the oneness of their interest on these particular matters. A good example here is that of accident prevention work within industry, which, by the creation and introduction of the device of Workmen's Compensation has made it to the definite interest of all groups to work for the lessening of the accident rate. By the simple device of putting upon the employer the burden of paying the premium on accident insurance, efforts at accident reduction have been made a real purpose of managers and investors no less than of the manual workers, because of the possibility of reducing the premium with the reduced accident rate.

Another example is the common interest of investors, managers and manual workers in a proper program of training within the factory or store. As soon as the management understands that it is common experience for plants which have such a program to cut down the length of the training

time by half, to cut down the wear and tear on equipment, the amount of spoiled work, etc., they realize that it is a valid purpose for them to introduce a training procedure. Such a training procedure is highly desirable also from the employee's point of view, since it enables him more quickly to attain a maximum earning power, it shortens the period of awkward inefficiency, it enables him to carry on his work in the least fatiguing and most acceptable way.

These are examples of matters regarding which the same purposes are shared by different groups just as soon as the value of the purpose is clearly realized.

The real problem, however, is in regard to issues where such a commonality of interest does not seem so obvious. Take, for example, the question of the possibility of employees becoming interested in high productivity at low unit cost. It would seem that the only attempt to make the employees adopt this purpose which has any likelihood of being successful is one in which all the contributing conditions make the employees realize that they have more to gain than to lose by working harder.

They have more to gain than to lose if they earn enough more, if they are not over-fatigued, if they do not more quickly work themselves out of a job, if they can share in the greater gain accruing in profits, if their sense of accomplishment is enhanced, etc. Any plan which will give them assurances on these points has a good chance of their accepting it.

In practice, this realization is actually being obtained by a combination of methods. (1) Some type of incentive payment method is adopted either with or without some differential piece rate under which the employees' rate increases both relatively and absolutely as the productivity increases and as unit costs decrease. (2) Some assurance of regular work or regular income is given so that the employees will not feel that by working hard they are working themselves out of employment. (3) Another requisite is assurance that there will be no rate-cutting unless the character of the job is radically altered.

Given these several procedures for protecting the employees, it has been found possible to bring employees into agreement with the management's purpose of increased productivity. If, however, the employees come, with their new experience, to the

point of making a careful analysis of the entire economic situation of the company which employs them, they may find that despite all these provisions there is still a rate of profit being made for the stockholders which seems to them unduly high. If, and when, employees feel that by the outlay of their energy on behalf of productivity, even if it is relatively well repaid, they are making unduly large profits for managers and investors, it may still be hard to retain their cooperation—that is, hard to get them to adopt the purposes of these other groups.

Indeed, it is in part because of a sense that such a questioning feeling may possibly arise among employees that certain companies have been led to experiment with the method of stock sale to employees or with profit sharing. Both of these devices aim by the use of somewhat different legal means to effect an identical psychological result, namely:—to make it worth the employees' while to interest themselves in the creation of profits, because they are in turn to be sharers of them.

Another possible step in the employees' experience with an extension of knowledge and power in shop affairs would be (and is already in a few companies) a desire to share in decisions about the major policies of the company because of a realization that such decisions must inevitably affect their group destinies more or less directly. If the logic or pressure of this purpose leads a company to allow the election of one or two employee members to the Board of Directors, this may constitute another step in the direction of integrating and harmonizing purposes. For once a corporation has, for example, a shop committee with some power, an incentive payment plan which is felt to be fair, guaranteed employment or compensation, a sharing of profits by employees through a substantial minority stock ownership, a sharing of ultimate direction by employees,—the result will be that the employees are in a position where they may naturally share in forwarding the same purposes as the investors and managers to a degree, which would not today be possible or be safe.

What happens however is not, strictly speaking, that the employees adopt the purposes of investors or managers. For these two groups have at the same time had to modify their typical purposes in order to bring the employees into working agreement. They have had to modify desires to the

⁵B. M. Laing, "A Study in Moral Problems," page 218.