

EFFECTIVE MANPOWER MANAGEMENT

27 October 1953

827

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION--Lieutenant Colonel W. R. Norman, USAF, Member of the Faculty ICAF.....	1
SPEAKER--Mr. Earl Brooks, Assistant Dean, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.....	1
GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	11

NOTICE: This is a copy of material presented to the resident students at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. It is furnished for official use only in connection with studies now being performed by the user. It is not for general publication. It may not be released to other persons, quoted or extracted for publication or otherwise copied or distributed without specific permission from the author and the Commandant, ICAF, in each case.

Publication No. I54-49

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington, D. C.

Mr. Earl Brooks, Assistant Dean, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University was born in Bloomdale, Ohio, on 7 March 1914. He was graduated from Bowling Green State University, Ohio, with B.S. and A.B. degrees in 1935 and received his A.M. degree from the American University in 1938. After graduation, Professor Brooks held the following positions: personnel assistant, U. S. Department of Labor, 1936-39; training director, U. S. Forest Service, 1939-41; coordinator of training, Army Air Force, Wright Field, Ohio, 1941-43; active duty as U. S. Naval Reserve Officer, 1943-46 engaged in personnel training and industrial relations work; personnel director, National Housing Agency, 1946-47; professor of industrial and labor relations, 1947 to the present date. Professor Brooks also serves as labor arbitrator and consultant on personnel and executive development with various companies, including Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, Corning Glass Co., Continental Oil Company, Greenbrier Hotel, and the N. Y. Central Railroad.

## EFFECTIVE MANPOWER MANAGEMENT

27 October 1953

COLONEL NORMAN: General Greeley and gentlemen: We have heard it stated many times this year from this platform, and we read it nearly every day, that the United States economy is increasing at an annual rate of about 3 percent. We know there are many factors that contribute to this fact--better work methods, improved techniques, better material, better plant layout, and a host of others.

Many of us, I feel, too frequently attribute this increase in productivity to only the technological factors. While I don't want to diminish the importance of technology in our increasing rate of productivity, I think it is very important that we give consideration to a factor that enlightened management is thinking of and considering as being a primary factor in increasing productivity; and I have in mind "improved human relations," or any name you want to apply to it--"better personnel management."

If we do accept the philosophy that management is the organization of both material and human resources to accomplish an objective, then I think we must give true recognition to the personal and human relations factors.

We have with us this morning Professor Earl Brooks, Assistant Dean of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, who has spend a great deal of time in this field, with private and public organizations, as well as in the teaching field. He will discuss with us this morning "Effective Manpower Management."

Professor Brooks, I am pleased to welcome you back to the Industrial College and to present you to this class.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you, Colonel.

Gentlemen, you won't need to take notes here, because much of what I have to say will be handed out to you following this talk. I believe it will be left in your mail boxes. There are two things which are going to be given you. One is a mimeographed paper, "Effective Manpower Management," and the other is a printed bulletin, "Essays on Human Aspects of Administration," by Dr. Temple Burling. There are two articles in this publication that you will find of interest. One is entitled "You Can't Supervise an Individual" and the other is "Problem People."

Now, today, on the subject of effective manpower management, whether you are engaged in industrial business or the armed forces, there are certain principles which apply. During the past several years there has been psychological research by industry, universities, and the armed forces into some of the principles of manpower management. Some of these research findings have confirmed things we have already known. Some have raised questions concerning our practices.

Mr. Kettering of General Motors commented on our knowledge of management as follows, "The trouble with it is, we are not so ignorant about it, but so many of the things we 'know' just ain't so." What I would like to do today is to try to present some findings of recent research on manpower management. These findings are the result of several attitude surveys which we have made in studying management.

First, a substantial percentage of the causes of employee dissatisfactions are outside the job. We are convinced that of the dissatisfactions that show up on the job, at least half of them are from causes outside the job.

Second, employees are often more dissatisfied concerning anticipated happenings than they are over past or present events. In other words many of employees' dissatisfactions which result in lower production are caused by concern of things that they anticipate may happen instead of over things which are happening or have happened.

Third, the application of human relations training by supervisors is primarily dependent upon the attitude and example of the immediate supervisor. There has been research that has proved that, no matter how well you train people in management, no matter how good their personnel or human relations people are, the factor that is of primary importance in how they feel is the attitude of the immediate supervisor.

Fourth, little things cause more human relations problems than major happenings. I think that is probably true in the armed forces. An executive of a large utility told me that the company didn't have any broken pipes in its management, but had a lot of leaky faucets, a lot of little, irritating things, that were affecting production and service. If it had broken pipes in its management, somebody would do something about it, but "little things" are ignored.

Another finding is that employees desire to know who their supervisor is, and prefer one supervisor to several. In six well-managed companies where we have made surveys, at least 20 percent of the employees thought they had more than one supervisor.

Many employees believe that their actual supervisor is one to three levels higher than the one shown on the organization chart. In our opinion that is a very significant cause of dissatisfaction, because many times the immediate supervisor doesn't have the authority, or doesn't think he has the authority, necessary to carry out his responsibility.

On fringe benefits, employees have the highest preference for those which affect their family, like hospitalization, for example.

A substantial number, probably at least four out of every five persons who fail on the job, have the knowledge and skill required, but fail because of attitude, interest, or work habits. We are convinced that probably at least 80 percent, and probably as high as 90 percent, of people who fail in industry have or could get the knowledge and skill to do that job; but they are discharged or separated for reasons such as insubordination, poor work habits, bad attendance, drinking on the job, and many others. When we analyze the causes of discharge, we find that only about 10 percent of the employees who are discharged are fired because of inability.

Another finding: Employees are more interested in understanding by their supervisors than they are in advice. I was talking to an engineer this summer who said he had been keeping bachelor hall for six weeks while his wife was away taking care of her brother who was dying of cancer. He said it had affected his work. I asked him, "Did you talk to your boss about it?" He said, "My boss said he didn't have time to listen to such things." He said, "You know when I will go in and talk to that fellow again."

Another one: Many employees, supervisors, and executives that we talked with did not believe they were getting sufficient recognition for their work. This summer I talked with a man who had forty years' experience, who said he had never received a written commendation of any kind. In every survey which covered railroads, hotels, textile factories, utilities, retail stores, and oil companies, we have never found less than 50 percent of the employees or supervisors who felt that they were getting sufficient recognition for both good and poor work.

The families of employees--and I think this would apply to the military service--and particularly of supervisors, often have a poorer opinion of the company than does the employee. In one large retail chain we asked the managers about 50 questions, and the next to the last one was, "Would you prefer to work for this company or another company?" Only 1.4 percent of the managers said they preferred to work for another company. But when we asked, "What does

your wife think of this company?" 12 percent of them said their wives would prefer that their husbands work for another company. We think that is a factor in manpower utilization and manpower management; many companies are beginning to do some things about it.

Nearly two out of three supervisors whom we interviewed said they did not have sufficient authority to carry out their responsibilities. For example, many supervisors told us they couldn't grant an employee a day off without checking with their immediate supervisors. A large percentage told us they could not hire an employee. He was hired by somebody on some other level, somebody above them. They told us they had no participation in making the vacation schedules. They had no real disciplinary authority, and many other things. The authority to make these decisions really affects manpower management.

As good as the "golden rule" is, it is not good enough for getting results through others in effective manpower management. That may sound like heresy to some of you. But we believe that many of our human relations problems arise because we treat others as we would like to be treated and not according to their individual needs, desires, motivations, and values.

For example, a friend of mine, a personnel director for a very large company, likes to wear bow ties. Some of his field personnel men send him bow ties. He reciprocates by sending them bow ties. In this particular company you can recognize a personnel manager by the fact that he wears a bow tie, whether he likes it or not. I think that is an example of some of the human relations activities where we treat others as we would like to be treated, rather than according to their own set of values.

From our surveys we made a list of employer wants and one of what the employee wants. We classified these expectations of the employer under five headings: first, willingness; second, interest; third, ability; fourth, enthusiasm; and fifth, to have the confidence and respect of others.

First, employers tell us they want employees who are willing to work regularly, to follow instructions, to accept responsibility, and to learn.

Second, they want people who have an interest in service, selling, production, customers, fellow employees, and improvement of himself and the company.

Third, they want ability to work intelligently with and for others, to develop himself for increased responsibility, to meet physical requirements, to adapt to changes and emergencies, to understand and observe policies and rules, and to exercise good judgment.

Fourth, and very important, they want employees to have enthusiasm for the employer's aims and objectives, and for the employer's commodities and services.

Fifth, they want people to have the confidence and respect of others, with honesty, courtesy, and all the other things that go along with respect.

The surprising thing, as I mentioned earlier, is that not too many people fail because of lack of ability, but because of unwillingness to do some of these things--lack of interest, lack of enthusiasm, or inability to work with and for others, or inability to adapt to changes or emergencies. They are the ones who are the more common causes of employee failure of performance or failure to perform effectively.

I would like to have you look at the other side of this, at what the employee expects of his employer. We have made up a list of 14 things which employees want. They are not ranked in order of importance; and for different employees at different times there would be varying ranks.

We have asked employers, managers of companies, to take this first list and for each employee who reports direct to them to rate the employee on the extent to which the employee is meeting those expectations. We have then asked them to take this second list of what the employee expects, and for each supervisor, each staff person, each employee reporting to an immediate supervisor, to have that supervisor rank the importance of these expectations for each employee.

Here are the 14 employee expectations: First, All employees, including supervisors, want an understanding of their problems, both on and off the job. Note that we say "understanding." We feel that employees want their boss to have some understanding of the problems which they face--not necessarily advice on them, but the ability to listen to their problems, both off and on the job. One large company has a program not only of public speaking, but one of effective listening; that is very important.

Second, employees want clear directions. They want to know what is expected of them. They want to know who their boss is. That sounds like a very simple thing, but you know from experience how often it is violated.

Those are some points we all know. But in getting better management, the observation of these simplest of things is more important than some of these high-flown theories.

Third, all of us are interested in adequate pay. We are particularly interested in our pay in comparison with others.

We have conducted attitude surveys and found that two-thirds of the employees who show dissatisfaction with pay are not dissatisfied because their pay is too low in absolute terms. The thing they are dissatisfied about is that their pay is too low in comparison with others. People in industry tell us: "We don't understand the pay system. We don't know the difference between the merit increase and the general schedule increase. What we want to know is, How does our pay compare with others?"

The fourth expectation of employees is opportunity to learn, develop, and use skills and knowledge. Not all employees want an opportunity for promotion. Our guess is that about 15 percent of employees wouldn't take a more responsible position if offered to them, or wouldn't want to. But all employees want an opportunity to learn, to develop, and to use their skills and knowledges.

Fifth, each employee wants recognition; that is, being told how he is doing; being able to check himself and know whether he is doing a satisfactory job; being told of his own outstanding pieces of work--not being told only of his weaknesses. No one wants to hear about his weaknesses, but how can his performance be improved.

There is one other point: recognition of accomplishments off the job, recognition of accomplishments in the community, even recognition of what some families of employees do. We feel that is a very important point in developing better morale and thereby better manpower management.

The sixth expectation, you may disagree with this, is that we feel employees at all levels expect friendly, firm, and fair treatment. We really mean "firm." They want consistent and dependable supervision--no buck passing. They don't want to be told: "We would like to see you get your promotion, but you know how the people in Washington are." They want their supervisor to meet situations and be firm about it, be consistent, to avoid a charge of favoritism.

Seventh, employees expect information concerning the why of their jobs and participation in decisions affecting them. Most employees, at least a third of them, including supervisors, tell us they are not given sufficient information. They aren't given the why of changes in policy which affect their work. They aren't asked nearly often enough for their ideas. They would like further participation in decisions affecting them.

Eighth, employees want interesting and worthwhile work. We feel that is a very important point in effective manpower management. Even a messenger's job can be worth while. We think it is the responsibility of administrators and executives to point out the worthwhileness of that job.

The ninth is freedom of expression, including suggestions and complaints, with assurance that they will be considered fully and promptly. At least 15 percent of employees, probably more, feel that they don't have freedom of expression. The higher up in an organization, the less freedom is felt, particularly among the middle managers. Unfortunately, some companies have an unwritten creed: "Keep your nose clean and you will get along. Don't spout off any ideas." If there is going to be really effective manpower management, you need to develop freedom of expression.

Two years ago I worked for the New York Central Railroad observing some of its operations. It had a retarder tower where cars were humped. Humping a car means to push it up an incline, and then a man sitting in the tower decides to which track he is going to switch it. He pulls a brake called a retarder, which brings some metal pieces against the flanges of the car wheels.

It was a hot August day. This fellow was sitting in this tower with the sun shining brightly. I said, "What is it you don't like about your job?" "These d--- blinds. See how the sun is boiling in the window." "Have you asked anyone to get blinds put in? Why don't you speak to somebody about it?" He pulled out an old envelope and said, "Here are all the people I talked to. They even came out here and measured them. I still haven't gotten the blinds."

Then he said: "Do you see that car? It has 60 tons of explosives on it. I've got the brake clear back to the fourth notch and I can't stop the car. Every once in a while a car goes off the track and ties up the whole yard." "What is wrong?" "It is this retarder brake. It just doesn't work." "Have you asked anybody to fix it?" "H---, no. Why should I? They didn't do anything about the blinds. Why should I bother them about the retarder brake?"

You fellows in your organization probably have some blind problems, which are very insignificant to you, but highly important to the employee. By not taking action on that, giving some recognition to the problem, you are not finding out about some much more significant thing which would help you in your manpower management. Twenty-two percent of the employees said their supervisor would listen to suggestions, but then nothing happened.

Tenth, employees expect protection from humiliation; that goes without saying.

Eleven, employees want safe and pleasant working conditions, both physical and social. By "social" we mean the group. In addition to expecting certain things for himself as an individual, an employee expects certain things for his group. That is brought out much more clearly in that article, "You Can't Supervise an Individual."

Thirteen, each of us expects consideration as an individual.

Finally, fourteen, consideration of the employee's family.

Now, those are things you all know, but I would like to have you think about them in their relation with others. I would like to tell you a few answers to some of these specific questions that we got in our survey.

Twenty percent or more of the employees had never been told how they were doing and 30 percent more said, "not often enough."

Twenty-two percent of the employees in this company said they received conflicting orders frequently or most of the time.

Thirty-six percent said they believed that they did not get nearly as much instruction as they needed.

A very important responsibility of all supervisors and all managers is to develop people. We have talked with executives and asked them, "What is your responsibility for developing people?" One executive said: "Now, look--we executives and supervisors are like jugglers. We've got a lot of balls to juggle. Some of the balls are heavier than others. We have schedules, customers' contracts, costs, safety, and public relations. If you drop one of these heavy balls, it is going to hurt your toes. Developing people, human relations, and training personnel are the lighter balls--we don't have to watch them nearly as closely."

I believe that in the armed forces and in industry we as managers are going to have to emphasize the fact that the development of people is a heavy ball, but that it is a real responsibility of supervision at all levels; that they are going to catch h--- on that just as much as they do on high costs, a poor safety record, bad attendance, and a lot of other things.

Thirty-one percent said their manager did no planning at all or did not do it well.

Twenty-seven percent said they were never told why a policy or procedure was changed which affected their work.

Half the employees felt that the best-qualified persons were not selected for promotion when better positions came along.

Those are some of the findings. There are a lot of others here that might be of interest to you. But I just would like to go over some of these.

I want to assure you that industry has the same problems you do; probably no more and no less. But they have problems of career development, problems of discussing how people are doing, problems of transfers. If you think you are transferred a lot, the same thing is true in industry. We have talked with people in industry whose children had been in 16 different schools during the father's career in an industry. We have talked to others who have had the same boss and worked at the same desk for 27 years in the same company. Certainly there should be a lot better balance between them.

In some cases supervisors don't even know the pay of their employees. I would guess that in a majority of the companies the staff people and executives don't know the range of pay, don't know the maximum of the range.

In many companies supervisors are not allowed to decide who among the new employees are to be retained.

There is a whole list of things here that I could give you. Many of them I have already mentioned. We feel that all these things that are mentioned here you have known before, but not all of us are carrying them out.

I would like to conclude this talk before the discussion period with certain human relations principles. One large company has a course for all its executives and supervisors, which is thicker than a telephone directory, but it is all based around these 16 principles.

1. Show sincere interest in and appreciation of the other fellow.
2. Take time to get the facts.
3. Be considerate and constructive in your approach. The instructors stress that when something goes wrong, not to look so much for who is wrong, but what is wrong. In their research, and in other companies, they have found that the effective supervisor is one who takes the responsibility for the work of his group. When something goes wrong, he takes the blame for it, instead of trying

to say, "Well, it was somebody down the line who did it." He refers to that group in its relationship with others. He gets participation from the group. Instead of being only production minded, he is human relations minded. That is important, and their research supports it.

4. Maintain an open mind. Be a good listener.
5. Be adaptable to change and help others adjust to change.
6. Be reasonable in what you expect of others.
7. Treat complaints as suggestions. I think that is a very important point. Every complaint is a potential suggestion. Every complaint is an opportunity for improvement. Even complaints over imaginary grievances can be very useful.
8. Make only promises you can fulfill and then keep them. You have all heard that before.
9. Keep others informed on matters affecting them.
10. Admit your mistakes. That is one you have all heard. When a mistake is made by a manager or a supervisor, most employees know about it. If you admit it, you probably gain face rather than lose face.
11. Make the individual feel, whether above or below you or on the same level, that the solution is his own idea. We all know the importance of that.
12. Follow up to determine progress in a situation.
13. Give commendation when deserved.
14. Develop freedom of expression on any subject concerning the company's welfare.
15. Take prompt action on problems.
16. Set a good example.

Now, these principles are not magical. But, applied with understanding, we feel, they will do a lot to give your employees the will to do something.

There is one quotation that I would like to end up with here. This is from a very successful businessman. He says:

"The asset which towers above all others in business is not money, not buildings, not land, but men. Men inspired by confidence in one another. Men who see their own success in the success of their business associates. Men who are not working for one another, but with one another.

"Money is not, and never can be, the one principal object of our business. We place the greatest stress and give the foremost place to the training of men and the giving of service. This is the business insurance of producing producers. The essential duty of the manager is clear. He becomes a manager not alone because he gives evidence that we can trust him to conduct the affairs of a store, but, beyond that, because he has proved to us that he can build another man to take his place. Once a business is wise enough to do this, the financial income of that business is assured."

I think you could say the same thing for the armed forces-- that you accomplish these things only through people. One of your primary jobs is to build people. We feel that the application of some of these principles is the answer to effective manpower management.

COLONEL NORMAN: Mr. Brooks is ready for questions.

QUESTION: Mr. Brooks, to what extent do you think the United States Civil Service System meets these principles of management which you have outlined?

MR. BROOKS: Probably the system basically is all right, but it isn't always administered the way it was intended. One man in a large utility told me this summer: "There is nothing basically wrong with the company's personnel policies and procedures except that about 10 percent of the supervisors operate as though they never heard about them."

There are certain provisions in the Federal Civil Service that make manpower management difficult. But I feel that, in the Government over the years, there is probably just as good personnel management as there is in industry generally. That may be hard for some of you to believe. There are certain limitations on some of these things, but we feel that probably 85 or 90 percent of the problems of manpower utilization can ordinarily be solved by first- and second-level supervisors if they are given the opportunity.

You may not all agree with that. But I think that, no matter what the system is, no matter how good or how poor it is, if you do have good line people, working with the assistance of the staff

people so they can solve these things, it is going to be hard to find excuses for why you can't do some of these things.

QUESTION: How does a skillful manager utilize unions in meeting these objectives?

MR. BROOKS: I think certain unions, and certain representatives of unions, have been very helpful. The American Velvet Company, at Stonington, Connecticut, has a strong union, the Textile Workers. They are a northern textile manufacturing company which is operating in competition with strong southern employers. Yet their unit costs are less and their profits are higher; and the president of the company gives the union a lot of credit for it.

I think that a union that has some good objectives can be of assistance to an employer in getting better management.

QUESTION: My question is, What does the manager do? You have passed the buck to the union.

MR. BROOKS: Once there is a union and it has been recognized--realizing that unions are something that are likely to be here to stay--rather than spending all or a large part of a manager's efforts in fighting the union, he should ask for its suggestions and provide it with information about things which are of concern to the union, rather than things he wants it to know. I think that would be helpful in getting its backing, support, and willingness--I stress the word "willingness"--to carry out its employer's objectives.

Being specific, I feel that the first point is providing information to the union on things which its people really want to know.

The second thing is even to consult them while informing them; trying to put them to work on something constructive, rather than just arguing over little things. There are many things that they can do that are constructive. They can help on the safety program, reducing waste, and constructive suggestions. There have been some real programs conducted by the manager working with the union. During the war they did a lot of that, in cutting down the waste, in avoiding scrap. Many joint labor-management committees, which evaporated in many cases after the war, were very useful during the war where they worked together on some of these problems.

Would you agree that there is a possibility of the manager working with the union on it?

STUDENT: Yes. I would agree that there is some indication of that being done.

QUESTION: You intimated that, rather than fighting the union, there should be an active policy on the part of management to make use of the union. My question was, What can the skillful manager do to make use of unions in gaining the objectives of the business?

MR. BROOKS: In one company they even have an advisory committee, which has multiple membership, of the former presidents of the union. It is called the "Pops Committee." It is like a junior board of directors in effect, where all changes in policies or procedures are tried out on this particular committee of former union presidents and officers. That is another small movement on that question of using the union.

QUESTION: Mr. Brooks, can you tell us what you have found to be the most effective means of communication between supervisors and employees?

MR. BROOKS: I think the answer to that is "face to face conversation and word of mouth." With all the other communication devices, that is still the best. There are many things involved in communication, but face-to-face communications, it has been proven time and time again, are the most effective ones between supervisors and employees; also between other groups.

You have all had courses and conferences on the advantages and disadvantages of oral versus written communications. But we feel very strongly that face-to-face communications are probably far more effective than all the others together.

There is another very important point involved. When you communicate, there is feeling involved. In addition to information, you communicate feeling. If you don't have the man in front of you, you can't communicate feeling to him.

QUESTION: You spoke about off-the-job dissatisfactions being a high cause of poor morale. What can the supervisor do about a nagging wife at home?

MR. BROOKS: Let us imagine a case in off-the-job causes. A fellow comes in and you say, "What is bothering you?" He will give you some evasive answer. Usually you don't get the true answer. If you ask him the simple question, "Is it a nagging wife?" he may say, "Yes. My wife is an old so-and-so. Should I leave her or put up with her?"

There is point number one. Our opinion is, don't give the man advice on those off-the-job problems. Get him to talk about them. Listen to him. Ask him some questions. Get him to try to see things

a little bit differently. Try to refer him to the proper people, who can give him advice on that problem. Many times right in the organization there is some executive who is better equipped than you are.

But the first point is listening to that problem, trying to show some understanding--not sympathy. Not saying, "If I were you, this is what I would do. Here is the way I would do it if I were you." Using some questions but avoiding cross-examination, I would try to get him to think about his problem and solve it himself. You have all had the experience after a "listening" conversation of the man thanking you for your advice, when you haven't told him anything--just listened to him.

Another important approach is getting to know the man. We have a conference with management groups and employee groups, using 10 major headings--things every immediate supervisor should know about the people who report directly to him. We ask each supervisor, "How many of these things do you know? How can you get to know them? Why should you know them? How can you use them?"

So in talking to this fellow about his problem, first, he has to have access to you; second, he must want to come to you; and, third, you must be willing to listen. Fourth, your responsibility is to make the individual active in solving his problem.

QUESTION: Let us say that in an organization or a company there are two unions competing with each other, or one is very weak and the other one is strong. How can he use the union to bring out some of these grievances? Is there any way that a manager can deal with a situation like that?

MR. BROOKS: In many cases there are more than two unions, but let us say there are two; and one is trying to show that it is doing more for the workers than the other, trying to get membership from the other union. I don't know the answer to that.

The electrical industry faces it very severely. In that industry there are at least three unions competing with one another. Each is promising more than the other. That is the only way they can get members--to promise them more. Unfortunately, one of the unions which has some questionable leadership is making less demands than the other two; this makes a real problem.

Where unions are bringing up a lot of grievances, I think the thing to do--this is borne out in companies that have had a lot of experience--is to try to meet them at the source. We learned from our experience with one company that there were 300 grievances on

file from a union membership of only 800; many of these grievances were being raised because the union thought the management was fighting it. Once the union realized the management was not fighting or trying to break the union, but was trying to work with the union, willing to let the supervisors work on the grievances, and would give them authority to work on them at the lowest level possible, most of the grievances disappeared. I think that is the basic answer to your question.

If you have more than one union in a particular plant, then whatever you give to one union you eventually will have to give to the other. The top of what you give one union becomes the floor for the next one.

QUESTION: Does discipline enter into your ideas on personnel management? If so, what value would you place on it, and how is it achieved?

MR. BROOKS: I would say yes. "Discipline" is an interesting word. If you study the derivation of "discipline," it comes from the same word as "disciple." It implies teaching.

But we think of discipline as a very important tool in effective manpower management. And by discipline we mean helping others to improve their conduct. You might even consider a code of employee conduct--or, better yet, of supervisor-employee relationship.

By "discipline" we think of it principally as a constructive phase of management. We used to have conferences for management groups which we called "disciplinary action." We then changed it to "reprimand." That sounded even worse. We call it "corrective interview" now. There probably is a still better term. We feel the term "corrective interview" is a very important point in trying to bring about better discipline. You show the man that you have confidence in him; that you can help him improve or help himself.

Another part of your question was, How should it be used? We feel it is a responsibility of line management. We feel very strongly on this--that it is not the responsibility of the personnel or industrial relations office; that its staff groups assisting the line people should carry it and see, first, that the policies are right; and, second, that they are consistent in training people and helping them do this effective discipline, thereby getting better manpower management. The staff personnel office should be a clearing house for what happens.

We would not recommend that the personnel office be the second, third, or even the fourth step in the grievance procedure or the disciplinary procedure. We feel that the line management should handle it. If somebody has to be disciplined, the immediate supervisor should be the first step.

QUESTION: That wasn't the sense in which I meant the word "discipline." I mean willingness of the worker to accept the situation, to subjugate his own personal feelings to the good of the cause.

MR. BROOKS: You mean more the motivation, the willingness, the desire of the worker, to be a member of a work team--that type of thing?

QUESTION: Well, largely. But that isn't it exactly.

MR. BROOKS: Where a man would rather be out fishing this afternoon than operating a lathe? Is it that type of thing?

QUESTION: No. Not that type. And I don't care what his wife thinks either. It isn't that sort of thing.

MR. BROOKS: Well, your question is, How important is that? How to develop it?

QUESTION: Yes.

MR. BROOKS: I think it gets back to these things, of what the employee expects from the employer. It is a rare individual who works in a factory who subjugates his ambitions and desires to those of the company. Maybe there was a day when people did that. But I think it is a sort of trading proposition. Here are the things the employer expects, and here are the things the employee expects, as an individual and as part of a group. By attaining some of these expectations, he is going to give you something in return.

There is one thing about it. A man lives 24 hours a day, but he works only about 8. He doesn't leave all his home problems at home or all his work problems in the factory. He is working in the whole community.

I think there are some things that won't work that way. I think giving lectures on economic education is a very questionable way of doing it--telling him that the harder he works, the harder he applies himself, the more dollars he will make, and so on. I think it has to be tied back to what are his expectations, his

values, and his needs, both as an individual and as part of a group; and how by attaining those on the job, he gives something in return.

I don't think it would do a darn bit of good to run a course in loyalty, willingness, desire to work, and so on, without thinking about some of these basic things.

COLONEL NORMAN: Mr. Brooks, I would like to ask you a question that is very closely related to your original talk. You mentioned somebody having done research and gave some of the findings. How much basic research is going on in motivation, in what motivates people, and what incentives we should apply to trigger these motivations? What is being done in that field? What are we finding out?

MR. BROOKS: There are some studies in progress on motivation. The University of Michigan's Survey and Research Center at Ann Arbor is doing a lot of work in what motivates people, particularly in what kinds of supervisory practices motivate people. Ohio State University is doing a lot of study, under Navy sponsorship, on leadership; on what types of leadership are more effective in certain situations. MIT has prepared some studies.

At Michigan University some of the things they have found out are these: that the more informal a supervisor-employee relationship is, the better results they get and the better motivation.

They found that you can't rank these things. I have 14 things listed that in my opinion motivate people to do things. You could say that understanding the problem is number one. A lot of people would put that first. But, as Dr. Burling, the psychiatrist, points out in his paper, different things motivate a person at different times. If you are hungry, something relating to food might have strong motivation for you. However, if you just had a banquet, that motivation for the moment might not be nearly so strong as some others.

I believe that the real findings are that there is a different pattern for each individual and a different pattern for different situations. We need to understand some of the things which motivate people, the things that really make them tick. We all know what these basic things are. In any book on psychology, we can read these basic motivations--both physical and psychological. They are all in there.

It is then applying those things to each situation. How acute is that motivation? How can you use it in your work situations? What we need is not more research on what is motivation, but how to utilize it to motivate people in individual situations.

QUESTION: From your discussion and some other lectures that we have had on this subject it seems to me that labor-management relations have been looked at mostly from the point of view of management--how you can improve them for the benefit of management, how you can use the workers to better advantage. I would like to ask a couple of questions in that connection. Is it true that they have been mostly management inspired? Do you think the answers that are coming out do have that flavor? Is there any research being started by labor unions? If they looked at these things from an impartial point of view rather than from management's point of view, do you think the answers would be any different?

MR. BROOKS: You asked several questions there. The first one was, Is most of the approach from the management viewpoint? My answer to that is that the research which companies do is mainly from a management viewpoint. And that is a lot of research.

The universities do a considerable amount of research in this field, and I think they try to be impartial to both sides. They have had quite a few studies at Yale. We at Cornell have done several.

There is considerable union research on union problems. We recently had a grant of money to study human relations within unions. Two of our professors have written a book, which Harpers have published, on human relations problems within a union.

The local union has a hierarchy all up and down the line. It has basically the same problems as you have in the armed forces or an automobile manufacturer does. In fact there are unions within unions. Here in Washington there is one pilot group which is represented by another union.

There is more and more research, particularly with Ford Foundation money, coming along, which is more the impartial type of research. I think you will find that there will be much more research on what unions do.

We have another study, with Ford Foundation financing, on unions and community affairs, on the activities of unions, helping them with their problems. All the major unions have a research department. Most of their research is economic research rather than human relations research.

QUESTION: We have talked a lot this morning about how to get the employer to understand the employee. Has there been any research conducted on trying to get the employee to understand some of the employer's problems.

MR. BROOKS: I am glad you raised that question. There has been some research on that. The initiative in having the employee understand some of the employer's problems usually comes from management, as you would well expect.

There are probably 20 different types of economic education programs going on--everything from HOBSON on through to the Harding College approach. There is one at the University of Chicago, developed with Republic Steel, trying to show the workers how the business is operated, showing them the balance sheet, the profit and loss statement, and all the other financial statements of Republic Steel. That is a very interesting and worthwhile project.

Now, we have sampled the attitude of some of these employees to get their reaction to this economic education. About 50 percent say, "All right"; about 25 percent say, "Wonderful"; and about 25 percent say, "It is a bunch of propaganda." They say, "We don't want to hear about inflation, taxes, cost of living, return on invested surplus. We want to know something more related to our own jobs. We want to know, How does the salary plan work? What do I do to get a raise? How much does this piece of equipment cost?" They want to get right down to specifics.

They are not particularly interested in the major, overall problems that their managers have. They say: "19 million, 30 million--that doesn't mean anything to us. Those are the sort of problems that we can leave to the executives or the president of the company. Let him worry about those. We are worried more about how the equipment in my department works, my relationship with it on costs, and so on."

QUESTION: Have there been any studies made, or do you have any findings as the result of independent studies, on occupational satisfactions in the military service?

MR. BROOKS: You mean by that, varying occupations? Which is more satisfactory?

QUESTION: You see, we are in a peculiar position, of not being able to speak for ourselves, either by law or by having no voice in politics or in the situation whereby we can control our own destiny; and yet we are required to manage and keep a large family happy.

MR. BROOKS: There are some studies on that. I can't quote them specifically. But I have read in the "New York Times" within the last two months some reports that have been made on the morale of officers, where they classified them under three headings as to what their expectations are from the material viewpoint, from the

psychological viewpoint, and the third I have forgotten for the moment. Some of it was published in the "Army and Navy Journal." There was some publication of research findings, which were played up in magazines and the metropolitan newspapers--I am sure they must have been in the Washington papers too--of what they like and what they don't like.

There have also been some studies of noncommissioned officers, as to what they like and don't like about their jobs, compared with what they were during the war. But, unfortunately, a lot of those don't get published.

QUESTION: You gave us a long list of principles or ways of handling people. I was just wondering how that goes in college. How do you teach that? Is it effective as taught to college students? Can you give us some of your experience in universities teaching these kinds of principles?

MR. BROOKS: I wish I knew the answer to that question. But we try--let us say that. If we could get the students to memorize all these principles, it wouldn't do them a bit of good.

We try to have them get experience. Our students are told, on coming in from four years of undergraduate work, that we require them to work each summer. The first summer they have to get a job where they get their hands dirty. We feel that it teaches them something. We give them a list of things to look for when they are on that job.

We give them their appropriate paper assignments for the sophomore year, so they will be working on some of these things and gathering information; so that when they take the course in personnel management in their sophomore year, they will have some work experience for three months during the summer.

We get a report from the employer of each one of these boys during the course of their work. The student also makes a report. Each student year they have another experience, try another company that they think they would like to work for. They do that for three years.

We present these things in courses. We have case studies from companies. We try to have them do planning in these situations. We give them different roles to play. We say, "You are the supervisor" and "You are the employee." He states how he would handle the situation. Then the others tell how it could be improved. They go on that way for several minutes, and then we change the role.

843

In some of these negotiations we take a large company's contract. We get the head negotiator of that company and the head negotiator for the union, and also the impartial umpire. Each one comes to Cornell on following weeks.

Now, that, plus case studies, plus readings, plus this experience, will give them some appreciation of the problem.

If any of you can suggest how we can do a better job, we would like to hear from you.

QUESTION: I may have misunderstood you a while ago to have stated in your lecture that the attitude of the supervisors is never any better than the attitude of the employees. At the time I thought I misunderstood you. But I am beginning to wonder if it was a misunderstanding. Would you mind telling me what you meant?

MR. BROOKS: What I meant to say was this: The attitude of the employees and supervisors at all levels of management varies directly with the attitude of their immediate supervisor to a large degree. That won't be completely 100-percent true. But if the division manager has a sour attitude and reflects it in his work, it is going to affect the sectional manager and even down to the fellow that sweeps the floor.

Now, there are exceptions to what, of course. But there was an experiment that was done by a well-known industry. Its people sent their middle-level supervisors to Chicago for a program in human relations. They measured their attitude before they went, they measured it in Chicago, and they measured it when they got back.

At Chicago their attitudes improved considerably. Their human relations values went way up, as shown by tests. But when they got back in the plant, the ones who worked for supervisors who were of the strong, domineering type, the type that had no use for this school learning--those middle-level management people who worked for that type of boss became even worse supervisors than they were before they went to Chicago. They weren't going to be spoiled by all this "hog wash" they got in Chicago. They even became worse than they were before. But the ones who came back and were working for a more understanding type of supervisor were much better. The point I am trying to make is that we do a lot of things by example within an organization.

QUESTION: Mr. Brooks, I am a little dissatisfied with your list of basic motivations. You also referred us back to the psychology book on motivation. Yet I think if you run down that list of 14 motivations, they deal in some way with the possibility of

dissatisfactions; and if you remove all of those dissatisfactions, presumably the employee would be completely motivated.

And yet I doubt if that is true. One psychologist here told us that in addition to some of these psychological basic so-called motivations, most of them go back to some more or less basic animal reasons. But that isn't the answer, I know. The first settlers of America did not come over here to find food or to put a roof over their heads. They had those things already. They didn't come because of any motivation that you listed in that group.

Perhaps I should point up this question by referring to the scientist who has been told by the doctor that he has 11 months more to live, and he says: "I have got to finish this job before I go." He is not motivated by any of those things there, I don't think.

I am a little concerned about this basic research that is being done at the University of Michigan, Ohio State, MIT, and other places, all dealing with an examination of how people will react. I wonder if there isn't somewhere a basic motivation that we ought to discover that in part takes the place of the satisfactions and the accomplishments that we have lost since the craftsman days when we went into the industrial age. Is there anything of that type being done?

MR. BROOKS: Let me first clarify one point. When I listed those 14 points, I listed employee expectations and supervisor expectations, not basic motivations. We all know the basic motivations--hunger, thirst, and all the others; also the psychological ones. But I presented those 14 as those which employees expect from their boss, and I tried to make them positive, like better understanding, clear directions, opportunity, recognition, firmness--positive things rather than negative. In the violation of these principles you get some of the negative reactions.

But so far as accomplishment is concerned, all of us want to feel we are doing something worth while, making the world a little better place in which to live. Even the fellow who is working on a grinding machine wants to feel that he is contributing something. He ought to feel like saying: "I ground out 45 more parts for these trucks." The only reason we don't say that is that we need information on why our job is important.

In this list of what we expect from the employer, I think we have a right to know why we are running this grinding machine. Our supervisor has the responsibility of telling us that. We ought to

have some participation in decisions affecting us. We know how we can improve the retarder brake operation. We ought to be getting it perfected. But in the railroad there is a boss who should tell that man about his accomplishments, so that man can get a real feeling of participation.

I agree with you that this basic thing of accomplishment is something like the fellow working on an assembly line. It is no use telling him that if he works just twice as hard, there will be twice as many automobiles turned out. He knows that isn't true. He knows there are lots of other things involved, and that his efforts are not the controlling factor.

So I think this: As industry becomes more mechanized and you get further away from this old idea of the craftsman turning out a pair of shoes, the writer turning out a book with three more weeks to go, you don't have the same relationship and it is going to be more difficult to do that. What a lot of companies are working on is through their line supervision to show where each of these fellows is making a contribution.

I would say I agree with you completely. I don't think there is a whole lot of research being done.

COLONEL NORMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Brooks, for sharing your experience and philosophy in this area of manpower management. I know we have all enjoyed it and it will help us a lot.

(3 Feb 1954--750)s/fhl