

On the periodicity of the ratings depends their self-correctiveness. If the crowd on seeing this tabulation feels that Mr. Kuntz is too low or someone else is too high, they will correct it next time.

Mr. Benson, you remember, was third in personality in the first rating of March 4. In the rating five weeks later he is nineteenth (Table 2). I can't tell you just why that occurred. That is only illustrative of a great many ups and downs in the ratings. It may be that Mr. Benson felt a bit "peevish" that the crowd rated him so low in ability and industry, and showed it. Anyhow, you see what the crowd did!

Let me give you another case that is a little more cheerful. In industry, we see Mrs. Wall in thirtieth place (Table 1). On April 10th, five weeks later (Table 2), Mrs. Wall has risen to eighteenth place in the judgment of her fellow-workers of all ranks. You see this thing has the elements of a fine sort of game. An individual can improve his score at will by simply getting busy and improving himself and showing his fellow-workers what he has in him, letting the best come out, instead of keeping it concealed.

I want to show you a consistent rise right through. Comparing the two tabulations (Tables 1 and 2), Mr. Winslow rose from tenth to second in personality; from eighth to second in ability, and from fifth to first in industry; whereas Miss Morgan dropped from seventh in personality to eighteenth, from seventh in ability to nineteenth, and from nineteenth in industry to twenty-fourth. I am ohly picking out some high spots, but you can see that a crowd of forty knowing each other would find a great deal of illumination in these judgments. The above illustrations are summarized in Table III.

TABLE III

SPECIMEN ANALYSES OF TABULATION

P—Personality; A—Ability; I—Industry

DISCRIMINATING JUDGMENTS MARCH 4

Mr. Benson 3 P, 25 A, 29 I
Mr. Zollers 37 P, 18 A, 22 I

CONFLICTING JUDGMENTS BY DIFFERENT RANKS MARCH 4

Mr. Kuntz 30 P, 35 A, 33 I High by superiors.
Mr. Butler 19 P, 11 A, 14 I Low by superiors.
Mr. Winslow 10 P, 8 A, 5 I High by superiors and subordinates.

SELF-CORRECTIVENESS

	MARCH 4		APRIL 10
Mr. Benson	3 P	drops to	19 P
Mrs. Wall	30 I	rises to	18 I
Mr. Winslow	10 P, 8 A, 5 I,	rises to	2 P, 2 A, 1 I
Miss Morgan	7 P, 7 A, 19 I,	drops to	18 P, 19 A, 24 I

Once you start any game which you enjoy, you want to improve your game. I have never seen a golfer yet who wasn't consistent in that respect. I believe it is inherent in human nature. The beginnings of this rating game were rather crude and the three qualities chosen were picked more or less at random. When the crowd saw the first tabulation (of March 4), they began to question in their own minds and of each other: "What did we mean by personality, ability and industry?"

It was *their* game; what did they do? They appointed their own committee to draw up definitions. The following is a copy:

The Advisory Committee of the Group Organization of the Branch Employees met Tuesday afternoon, April 1st, 1919, in the Basement File Room and adopted the following definitions of the terms:

INDUSTRY	Habitual diligence and attention to work, including regularity and punctuality.
ABILITY	Skill displayed in performance of your job and in obtaining results.
PERSONALITY	That which constitutes a person's individuality; his everyday disposition toward his work and his co-workers, superiors or subordinates. (Signed) C. M. HOLDEN, Secretary Pro. Tem.

These are not dictionary definitions, but working definitions, drawn up by the group itself and distributed to each member. They are an indication of the desire to refine and improve the game, a desire to which I know no limit.

You will recognize that we have been dealing with absolutely impersonal averages. Where there is only one estimator in a particular rank, as in Group 1, the average estimate is not shown in the tabulations. It takes two or more estimates to make an average and so keep the ratings impersonal. It might be embarrassing, if not actually unsafe for me, to have you know exactly what I think of you. Perhaps you feel much the same way! Moreover, a collective is probably truer than an individual judgment, because prejudices, which play a part in all of our individual judgments, would tend to neutralize each other.