

Significant, too, is the growing conservatism. The average of all votes cast for all qualities March 4 was 80.50; five weeks later it was 78.60, a drop of nearly two per cent. Such growing conservatism is typical, I believe, wherever men are allowed actual participation.

The relative severity of judgments is interesting. Many people like to picture the executive as harsh in his judgment of subordinates. As a matter of fact, these figures show the executives as the most lenient of all. Those of all ranks on April 10 averaged 78.60; those of higher rank 80.24, those of lower rank 79.69, and those of equal rank 76.87, or almost three and one-half per cent below those of higher rank. In explanation I might suggest that those of higher rank when called upon to express themselves definitely about their subordinates think pretty well of them after all. They feel they would not keep subordinates unworthy of their confidence, therefore they rate them high. Those of lower rank closely approximate those of higher rank, perhaps out of a certain awe of the exalted higher positions and the qualities required for them,—an awe which upon more intimate acquaintance with those positions and their holders, generally fades away. And those of equal rank are the most severe. I believe it is true that our compeers of equal rank have fewer illusions about our jobs and our capacities than either those above us or below us. You can fool the boss easiest of all; you can't fool your subordinates as easily, and you can't fool your equals in the least!

TABLE IV  
MUTUAL RATINGS  
TOTAL AVERAGES

	MARCH 4	APRIL 10
ALL THREE QUALITIES	80.59	78.60
Personality	79.83	78.35
Ability	80.72	78.96
Industry	81.32	78.51

TOTAL AVERAGES RATING OF APRIL 10

	OF ALL RANKS	OF HIGHER RANK	OF EQUAL RANK	OF LOWER RANK
ALL THREE QUALITIES	78.60	80.24	76.87	79.69
Personality	78.35	79.81	77.12	78.89
Ability	78.96	80.63	76.53	81.18
Industry	78.51	80.28	76.95	79.03

In regard to the qualities there is another noteworthy point. Personality is the quality judged most

severely by those both of higher and of lower ranks (79.81 and 78.89, Table IV), and ability by those of equal rank (76.53, Table IV). We seem to be most severe in our judgment of the personality of our subordinates and our superiors, but of the ability of our equals.

In thinking of the effects of these various facts on the members of the group and on the executives, please remember that the figures were absolutely open and available to all. Anyone could draw from them any conclusion he chose. There was no obligation incurred to abide by the results of the ratings in making promotion because, as I said before, they were "experimental!"

I have already alluded to the difficulties under which they were carried on. Perhaps the chief difficulty was a knowledge on the part of the force that the scheme was bitterly opposed by a number of superior executives who didn't want to have started any such ideas of participation, or of the right of subordinates to judge their superiors in any way. It was called "Bolshevism" and a few other pet names we nowadays give to ideas which we don't want to see grow. Many of the employees had reasonable grounds to fear that, if they participated in the ratings, it would be held against them by certain officials who some day might come into a position to exercise reprisals. In view of all this, do the results I am showing you not carry an added significance?

Table V shows you the same principle applied to a group of stenographers who, as a central group, served a number of individuals interchangeably. The first section shows a rating of stenographic ability by the stenographers themselves. Each of the seven stenographers was rated by the other six. The second section shows the stenographic ability of those same stenographers as rated by the dictators. Finally, in order to be completely fair and democratic we have in the third section the dictation ability of the dictators as rated by the stenographers. If you want to improve both your stenographic and dictation efficiency in your organization, start something like that! You'll be astonished at the results.

One more slide (Fig. 3) will show you the flexibility of mutual ratings. Mutual ratings was made a game, pure and simple, played at an informal dinner. Each participant is rated by the other participants in ability "to let George do it," "to blow his own horn," "to pass the buck," and "to raise the ante."

Each man had a rating ballot, signed his own name at the top, rated himself at the bottom and folded