UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_160724

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

Public Personnel Administration

Public Personnel Administration

FOURTH EDITION

By O. GLENN STAHL

Adjunct Professor of Public Administration
The American University

Fourth edition of the previous work
by Mosher, Kingsley, and Stahl

HARPER & BROTHERS · PUBLISHERS · NEW YORK

PUBLIC PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION, FOURTH EDITION

Copyright, 1936, 1941, 1950, 1956, by Harper & Brothers
Printed in the United States of America
All rights in this book are reserved.
No part of the book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews. For information address Harper & Brothers 49 East 33rd Street, New York 16, N.Y.

C-L

Library of Congress catalog card number: 56-8604

Contents

PREFACE vii

Part I. Development and Significance of the Public Service

1. THE EVOLUTION OF MODERN BUREAUCRACY 3
2. AMERICAN BUREAUCRACY AND THE MERIT SYSTEM 12
3. SCOPE AND STATUS OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT 40

Part II. Staffing

4. RECRUITMENT 59
5. METHODS OF EXAMINATION 83
6. SELECTION: FROM OUTSIDE THE SERVICE 119
7. SELECTION: FROM INSIDE THE SERVICE 143

Part III. Career and Pay Concepts

8. CAREER SYSTEM PATTERNS 169
9. THE CLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS 183
10. COMPENSATION 208

Part IV. Motivation and Productivity

11 LEADERSHIP AND THE WILL TO WORK 245
12 EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION AND REPRESENTATION 275
13 EVALUATION AND INCENTIVES 314
14 STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING 335

15. Health, Safety, and Welfare 381

16. Hours and Leaves 402

Part V. Conduct

17. Public Service Ethics in a Democracy 415

18. Employee Conduct in the Community 427

19. Discipline, Removal, and Appeals 451

Part VI. Separation

20. Tenure and Turnover 463

21. Retirement and Disability 480

22. Staff Reductions 503

Part VII. Personnel Machinery

23. The Central Personnel Agency 511

24. The Operating Personnel Office 541

25. International Personnel Administration 561

Part VIII. General Conclusions

26. The Horizons of Public Personnel Administration 577

A Bibliography on Personnel Administration 585

Index of Names 619

Index of Subjects 620

Preface

The most important change in the concept of public personnel administration, as it has evolved particularly over the past twenty years, has been its development from an antidote to the spoils system to a significant aspect of the management of public enterprise—that phase of governmental service that is concerned with the marshaling, the husbanding, and the energizing of the human resources of administrative organization. It is this broadened role of personnel policy and operations that this book seeks to portray.

As in so many fields of public management, the evolution of the personnel function has been especially dynamic during and following the war and emergency years of the forties and early fifties. An effort has been made to reflect in this volume the principal trends and continuing problems pointed up by the experience of many jurisdictions and by modern social science research. Many of these developments are essentially similar to those expressed in the preceding edition by the three authors. However, there have been a number of new subjects that have deserved emphasis, or a fresh slant has been needed on an old one. In addition, there is an extension of the discussion of principle and philosophy at many points with an attendant decrease in some of the encyclopedic reference data. Current practices of individual public agencies and jurisdictions are described only to the extent that seems necessary for illustration and to make principle meaningful in realistic terms. Hence the book has been completely rewritten. The author hopes that in its present form it will have more enduring qualities as an educational tool for practitioner and student and be less burdened with the "yearbook" type of reference material.

There are three new chapters—"Career System Patterns," "Public Service Ethics in a Democracy," and "The Horizons of Public Personnel Administration." Entirely new sections have been inserted in other chapters on such subjects as executive development, incentive systems, security of the state, tenure, and appeals. Each chapter has been thoroughly and extensively revised in the light of current experience and professional thinking. Those chapters relating to matters of "conduct" and of "separation" have been reorganized and regrouped into more logical relationships. In addition to the substantive revision in all chapters, a good deal of retitling and internal reorganization has taken place. Finally, bibliographical

material has been brought up to date, many of the older references being replaced by publications appearing since 1950.

A great deal of credit for developing background for this volume is due to Mr. Wilton H. Dickerson, in view of his careful spadework while serving as my part-time research assistant to ferret out many facts, details, and ideas. He was particularly helpful in revision of the chapter on "Methods of Examination." I am indebted to Miss Ida F. Fugett for painstaking and accurate preparation of the manuscript for the printer. Thanks go to the U.S. Civil Service Commission Library—housing the most formidable collection of materials on personnel administration in the world—for its unfailing coöperation in making available or securing needed publications. For their forbearance in excusing me from many family activities and responsibilities while engaged on this task, I must, in conclusion, express my gratitude to my wife and children.

O. GLENN STAHL

January, 1956

PART I

Development and Significance of the Public Service

Our peculiar American difficulty in organizing administration is not the danger of losing liberty, but the danger of not being able or willing to separate its essentials from its accidents. Our success is made doubtful by that besetting error of ours, the error of trying to do too much by vote. Self-government does not consist in having a hand in everything, any more than housekeeping consists necessarily in cooking dinner with one's own hands. The cook must be trusted with a large discretion as to the management of the fires and the ovens.

—Woodrow Wilson, "A Study of Administration," first appearing in *Political Science Quarterly*, June, 1887. Reprinted in *Political Science Quarterly*, December, 1941, p. 498.

1

The Evolution of Modern Bureaucracy

Democracy, if it knows its business, has no reason to fear bureaucracy.
—*Sir William Beveridge*[1]

No condition so clearly differentiates the modern state from its predecessors as the development of its administrative system. Everywhere today the government is a bureaucracy. It is characterized by a hierarchical administrative structure in which each official fits like a cog in a complex machine. In this organization nothing is left to chance. All important relationships are defined in advance, and the pyramid of authority is divided horizontally into levels of responsibility. There is a sense, therefore, in which a bureaucracy is supraorganic. It is a plan on paper, a pattern fashioned of lines of authority in the architectural form of a pyramid. But it is more than this; for it is composed of men, and they are by nature dynamic.

Even though, as H. G. Wells claimed, the rule of life of the civil servant be the "acceptance of precedent and the refusal of risk," he cannot be merely a cog in a machine. This is particularly true under the complex conditions of today. For in the present state of the world, civil servants are forced to think, and this is also a mark of bureaucracy. But no amount of thinking can be effective in a large-scale undertaking if the framework within which such activity takes place is improperly conceived. It is the purpose in this chapter to enumerate some of the forces which have shaped the modern bureaucracies, and to examine briefly some of their characteristics.

The public service is an ancient institution. Long before that period of world history when all roads led to Rome, well-organized groups of public officials were making possible the cultural developments of Egypt and the Orient. But in the Western world it was the Roman Empire that first ex-

[1] *The Public Service in War and Peace* (London: 1920), p. 68.

plored the possibilities inherent in a hierarchical administrative system. Other parts of the ancient world neglected administration. In Athens, democratic traditions served to emphasize the orator-statesman rather than the administrator, and despite the unexcelled development of political speculation, little attention was devoted to administrative problems. This was in part due to the small size of the Greek city-state and to the relative simplicity of governmental activities, as well as to the dogma that every citizen was equally the servant of the state. But in the Roman Empire the complexity of administrative problems forced both thought and energy into different channels. The Romans were administrators, and their philosophers often speculated upon administrative questions.

But the Roman interlude passed, and the order that had characterized the Empire was transformed into the relative chaos of feudalism. Relationships which had been public and juristic gradually became personal, grounded upon a system of private land tenure. In general, the state was destroyed by feudalism, and for a time a public service, in any strict sense of the word, ceased to exist in the West. If any institution fell heir to the Roman administrative tradition, it was not the feudal principality, but the medieval Church. During the Middle Ages it was there that the most completely organized bureaucracy was to be found. Gradually, however, the feudal world coalesced, until here and there a principality developed sufficient strength to enter the lists against the Church. Thus, in the course of the struggles over investiture, certain temporal powers again undertook the building of a distinctly temporal service. Well-constituted bodies of public officials existed at an early date in some of the city-states of the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Germany, while in the Italian peninsula the affairs of state came to provide scope for the abilities of a Machiavelli.

The evolution of a quasi-professional public service in western Europe was closely geared to the growth of large armies, and the compulsory military service which characterized the rising national states added momentum to the movement. The military needs of the new states in many ways affected the development of a royal public service. The widespread practice of hiring substitutes to serve in the armies stimulated the professionalization of the military forces. Moreover, the very existence of large armies made inevitable the creation of an extensive royal service devoted to the collection of revenue for their maintenance. Finally, closely allied to the military ends of the State, and subservient to them, were its commercial ends—the fostering and strict supervision of industry and trade. The extension of the public service and the rapid evolution of bureaucracy were inextricably interwoven with these developments. As the State extended its sphere of functioning, a corresponding enlargement of the public service occurred.

In the modern sense, the civil service dates from the rise of the great national monarchies from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. As Leonard D. White has indicated, "Richelieu in France, Henry VIII and Elizabeth in England, and the Great Elector are among the chief architects who reconstructed the concept of the State, of office, of civil life, and of permanent officials out of the debris of the feudal system."[1] Under their tutelage, the functions of the State were expanded and coördinated, and administration began to emerge as a definite aspect of governance. Yet these were not the immediate forebears of the modern civil service. In all the first national services, as they evolved out of feudal relationships, the personal element was paramount; they were distinctly *royal*, rather than *public*.

The history of the civil service since the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is essentially a matter of the gradual transformation of the royal into the public service. As parliaments gradually whittled away the powers of monarchs, the new realities were reflected in the allegiance of the civil servants. Bureaucracies, like other governmental institutions, are sensitive to changes in the pattern of power, and in the general political history of a State is to be sought the key to the character of its administrative system. Thus it was that this gradual transfer of allegiance from king to parliament, this revolution which completely transformed the character of the public service, awaited always the outcome of the recurrent struggles between parliament and king. The civil service was one of the stakes in this colossal game. As the monarch gradually lost ground, its control passed from his hands to those of the legislature. In the process the bureaucracy became identified in the public mind with oppression, a historical association which is still of influence.

In almost every case the transfer of control to the legislature decreased the efficiency of the service and brought with it abuses which are still notable in various countries, including the United States. Astute monarchs had, to be sure, long employed patronage as a means of insuring their own power. But they always had a personal interest as well in a reasonably efficient administrative system. The same could not be said for the new masters of the State. Indeed, for historical reasons, the members of parliaments tended to look with apprehension upon efficient administration, while their personal interests led them to regard the offices at their disposal as private possessions or as political currency. Thus the first effect of the development of parliamentarianism was the demoralization of the civil service, and one of the most perplexing and troublesome problems of democratic government has been to secure a public service owing allegiance not

[1] *The Civil Service in the Modern State* (Chicago: 1930), p. xi.

to the politicians, nor to any narrow segment of the public, but to the whole. Although evolution does not permit a final solution to such problems anywhere, even a relatively enduring solution is still being sought in America.

It is impossible to fix exact dates for any of the historic shifts in the allegiance of the public servant. In England the evolution from a royal to a national civil service took place in the years between the Revolution of 1688 and the adoption, as a result of middle-class pressure in 1870, of the principle of open competition for entrance.[3] During most of these years the British service was treated as the special preserve of the aristocracy and suffered acutely from personal and political favoritism. Indeed, so serious were the abuses that the very existence of the Empire was endangered, as such incidents as the Indian Mutiny and the mismanagement of the Crimean War suggest. Finally, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, favoritism was abandoned as a basis of recruitment and a professionalized, impartial civil service created.

In France, the development of a bureaucracy responsive to the whole nation was begun by the middle-class Revolution of 1789, but the separatist character of French thought, together with pervasive control by the political officers, has in a measure prevented its consummation.[4] To a certain extent the history of the civil service in the United States, ~~more fully explored in the next chapter~~, has been similar. Contact with the frontier resulted in an extreme individualistic philosophy which long militated against the creation of a professionalized bureaucracy, and for many years the public servant rendered allegiance not to the State but to the party or the politician. Over large areas today that situation is changing or has already passed away.

The first German experiment with a liberal democratic State was too brief to make certain what effect popular government would have had upon the competent and disciplined body of officials inherited from the imperial regime. Perhaps the leaders of the republic made a mistake in attempting to govern with such an instrument out of the past, rather than revolutionizing it. But these are moot and academic questions. With the advent of totalitarianism, the liberal notion of an impartial public service was abandoned in favor of complete party control. The situation since World War II is too young to be fully appraised, although similar questions are again being raised.

[3] The extent to which middle-class ideas and aims underlay the reform of the British civil service has been quite inadequately recognized. This question is fully explored in J. Donald Kingsley, *Representative Bureaucracy* (Yellow Springs, Ohio: 1944).

[4] It has been maintained by some scholars that the French Revolution occurred when it did largely because French monarchs had failed to develop an adequate administrative organization. See Herman Finer, *The Theory and Practice of Modern Government* (New York: 1949), pp. 747–750.

In summary, the years since the eighteenth century have witnessed the emergence of the great Western democracies and the development in them of a distinctive type of bureaucracy, of a public service marked by allegiance not to one or to the few but to the nation as a whole and composed of a professional and expert group of employees. The evolution is not yet complete, but the direction of the trend is unmistakable. Democratic government cannot operate under the complex conditions of the modern world without an impartial, expert civil service. To the development of such a service a number of factors have contributed, in addition to those already discussed. Among these are the scientific revolution, industrialization, the growth of great cities, and the rapid advance of socialization, which has been both a result and a cause of the others.

THE MODERN BUREAUCRACY

The bureaucracies of the twentieth century differ from those of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries largely because the character of the State and of governmental problems has changed. The bourgeois-democratic State gives rise to a different set of governmental institutions from those of the aristocratic or the proletarian State. That fact, as we have suggested, conditions the character of modern bureaucracies. But there are other conditioning factors as well. Recent years have seen a bewildering increase in the complexity of civilization. Large-scale industry, the division of labor, the headlong pace of applied science, the concentration of economic power, and the increasing recognition of the responsibility of the State toward the underprivileged have all contributed to determine the character of modern administrative systems.[5] In general, the effects of these forces upon the bureaucracies have been twofold—they have resulted in a tremendous expansion in the numbers of civil servants, and they have made imperative a professional and well-trained body of officials. A world remade by technology demands technically competent public servants, and the administrative arrangements which might suffice for a State committed to "laissez faire" constitute a threat to the very existence of a State engaged in regulatory and social service activities.

Moreover, these principles have numerous corollaries. The marked increase in the numbers of officials has necessitated more careful attention to the organization of the bureaucracy. In the United States there has been manifest for some time a drive for integration, culminating in the reorganization of numerous state governments and of the Federal Government as well. At the same time, the striking increase in the degree of centralization, which has been a feature of recent years, has enhanced the power and

[5] For a brilliant discussion of the forces affecting the behavior of the American civil service at the Federal level, see Paul Appleby, *Big Democracy* (New York: 1945), especially Chaps. 1, 3, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, and 16.

thus the significance of the administrative hierarchy.[6] In the minds of a majority of contemporary scholars, the dangers of an uncoördinated administrative system loom larger today than the possible abuses which may arise from bureaucracy *per se.*

Contemporary civilization has contributed to a type of organization in which offices and authority are systematically distributed and in which specialized knowledge is required of its members—in other words, a bureaucracy. This is true not alone of the governmental field but of other institutions as well. The bureaucratic character of the organization of the medieval Church has been previously mentioned, and similar tendencies are manifested by business corporations, trade unions, political parties, universities, the contemporary Church—all the large-scale organizations in the modern world. In the words of one observer: "Whatever the virtues, whatever the sins of *bureaucratic* behavior, they are by no means confined to the organization of political government. It may be that the soil of politics is more fertile than that of industry for the development of bureaucratic pathology, but this does not imply that the latter condition may not be removed from the administrative organism by which the modern state operates any less than from the structure of private industry."[7]

All the problems of personnel administration today, whether in the public or the private sphere, are conditioned by the fact of bureaucratic organization. Given that fact, the task of the executive and more specifically of the personnel administrator becomes one of stimulating flexibility and adjustment to changing conditions, on the one hand, and, on the other, of providing such incentives and outlets for employee initiative as "bureaucratic pathology" tends to smother.

DIFFERENCES FROM PRIVATE ADMINISTRATION

Although common organizational tendencies are apparent in both governmental and private spheres, there are certain things which still differentiate governmental bureaucracies from other types. For the most part these differentials arise directly out of the characteristics of public business

[6] Because of differing meanings it is essential to define the sense in which the terms "integration" and "centralization" are employed. Whenever they appear in this work, their meaning is that given to them by Leonard D. White in his *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* (New York: 1955), pp. 37–38. The term "integration" refers to the establishment of a hierarchical system of superior-subordinate relationships at the same governmental level—i.e., national, or state, or local. On the other hand, "centralization" is used to characterize superior-subordinate relationships existing in different governmental levels. The effect of integration is to perfect the hierarchy at a single level of government; that of centralization, to weld into one hierarchical system the administrative organizations of different levels.

[7] Walter R. Sharp, *The French Civil Service: Bureaucracy in Transition* (New York: 1931), p. 432.

which distinguish it from private activity. For our purposes the more important of these may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The services performed by the State are more urgent than those performed by private institutions. In fact, this is frequently the basis for the assumption of services by the State. The degree of urgency is, of course, relative to the times. The inspection and certification of milk may not be urgent under simple agricultural conditions, but it becomes eminently so in an urban society. This fact of urgency influences both the organization of the governmental bureaucracy and the status of the civil servant, and, accordingly, the problems of personnel administration. It makes necessary a continuity of service which is less mandatory in most private activities.

2. The services performed by the State are generally of a monopolistic or semimonopolistic character, a fact which springs from the very urgency of the functions undertaken. Because of this fact it is much more difficult to gauge the efficiency of the conduct of public business than of ordinary private business, which is subject to competition and forced to balance its books from year to year.

3. The conduct of public services is governed by legal provisions, so that it is frequently difficult for the civil servant to change procedures or expand activities. This distinction is of diminishing importance, for the development of large-scale industry and great corporations has considerably reduced the possible range of initiative for the average worker in the private field as well.[8]

4. The supply of services by the State is not governed by market price. For the most part, the aim of the democratic State, at least, is to supply its services to all who need them and to treat all consumers equally. This is of sufficient importance to merit further consideration below.

5. The business of government, particularly in a democracy, is conducted very much in the public eye. As Paul Appleby has said:

> Government administration differs from all other administrative work to a degree not even faintly realized outside, by virtue of its public nature, the way in which it is subject to public scrutiny and outcry. An administrator coming into government is struck at once, and continually thereafter, by the press and public interest in every detail of his life, personality, and conduct. This interest often runs to details of administrative action that in private business would never be of concern other than inside the organization. Each employee hired, each one

[8] The position of such quasi-public agencies as public utilities is similar to that of purely governmental agencies, and these characteristics also describe them to a degree. There are several interesting questions involved in the status of public utility employees. Their position certainly differs from that of ordinary private employees, although they are not classed as public servants in the United States. At present, however, there is a notable tendency in the direction of wiping out the line which separates public servants from private employees.

demoted, transferred, or discharged, every efficiency rating, every assignment of responsibility, each change in administrative structure, each conversation, each letter, has to be thought about in terms of possible public agitation, investigation, or judgment.[9]

Growing out of conditions 4 and 5 above, certain subsidiary but important characteristics differentiate governmental bureaucracies and bureaucrats from their nongovernmental counterparts. Chief among these is the impartiality of the civil servant. Although there is some indefiniteness about the law of public officers in most countries, the general practice may be summed up in the words of the French jurist Jèze: "All individuals fulfilling certain conditions, fixed in a general and impersonal manner by the organic law of the service (law, rules, general instructions), have the legal power of demanding the service which is the object of the public service: this is the principle of the equality of individuals in relation to public administration."[10] Thus the ethical environment pervading the public service is of a more exacting order than that in private enterprise, as we shall see further in Chapter 17.

The necessity, in a democracy, of treating all persons equally imposes upon the civil servant the duty of neutrality. Unlike the member of a nongovernmental bureaucracy, he cannot take sides publicly on issues which divide the nation. In these things, strict impartiality, or at least its appearance, is essential. Moreover, unless this convention is observed, permanence in the civil service is not to be expected. Democratic government presupposes an alternation of parties, and the civil servant must be prepared to serve with equal grace whatever party is in power. Upon no other basis can rotation in office be avoided. This fact further complicates the personnel problem in a democracy.

Finally, because of its relationship to the political officers, the bureaucracy performs its work with anonymity. Indeed, Sir William Beveridge once suggested that the civil servant be bound, like the Franciscan, to the "triple vow of poverty, anonymity, and obedience." In the United States during the 1930's the President's Committee on Administrative Management successfully called for additional assistants to the President with "a passion for anonymity."

It is the small group of political officers who are responsible to the electorate, and to them goes the credit or the blame both for policy and for its execution. The bureaucracy, as such, works in relative obscurity, even though its members make the basic studies contributing to policy

[9] Reprinted from *Big Democracy* by Paul H. Appleby by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Copyright 1945 by Paul H. Appleby, p. 7.

[10] *Les Principes généraux de droit administratif*, 3rd ed., Vol. III, p. 20; quoted by Finer, *op. cit.*, p. 718.

development and even recommend policy. This fact makes more difficult the development of incentives. It therefore conditions the whole problem of public personnel administration.

SUMMARY

Modern bureaucracies are the products of many of the same profound forces which have shaped our whole civilization. Under present-day conditions they are indispensable adjuncts of government. For this reason, the trend toward the development of highly integrated administrative machines is one which has been accelerated in recent decades. As the complexity of civilization increases, the activities of the State expand. This occurs both in the field of services and in the regulation of existing private activities. The facts of such expansion and of the increasingly complex and technical nature of administration determine, to a large extent, the size, organization, and character of the public service. Large-scale activity forces a hierarchical organization, and large-scale activity is a distinguishing mark of the modern State. There seems little doubt that the process of bureaucratization, which has been notable since the nineteenth century, will continue. Such being the case, it is the task of the public personnel administrator to develop norms and procedures within this framework.

In early times, as Woodrow Wilson so aptly said:

> The functions of government were simple, because life itself was simple. . . . There was no complex system of public revenues and public debts to puzzle financiers; there were, consequently, no financiers to be puzzled. No one who possessed power was long at a loss how to use it. The great and only question was: Who shall possess it? Populations were of manageable numbers; property was of simple sorts. There were plenty of farms, but no stocks and bonds: more cattle than vested interests.[11]

Technical problems in such fields as health, sanitation, industrial relations, and conservation inevitably demand a different type of civil servant from that required a century ago. In Machiavelli's Florence, the only expert civil servant was the diplomat, but we have journeyed far from that period when the State found its chief expression in diplomatic intrigue or war. The modern government demands the services of scientists and experts in every field of human endeavor.

In the chapters which follow we shall consider the development of bureaucracy and the merit system in the United States, as well as the character and problems of modern personnel administration.

[11] "A Study of Administration," first appearing in the *Political Science Quarterly* for June, 1887. Reprinted in *Political Science Quarterly*, December, 1941, p. 488.

2

American Bureaucracy and the Merit System

Our governmental problem today lies in the question: "How can we be a complex society and yet be a democratic society?"

—*Paul H. Appleby*[1]

Several movements have contributed to the development of bureaucratic organization of public personnel in the United States: (1) the drive for civil service reform, a major effect of which has been to stimulate the process of professionalization; (2) the "economy and efficiency" movement, which has led to the elaboration and integration of the administrative hierarchy; (3) the long-time trend toward centralization, which, in the period since the Civil War, has operated to increase the power and enhance the significance of the bureaucracy; and (4) emphasis on personnel management of a positive character.

An early chapter in the story of the civil service of any government will be devoted invariably to some aspect of patronage.[2] Public positions have been and all too frequently still are treated as properly within the gift of the controlling authority, whether for personal or for political purposes, or both. The first lien on appointments to such positions was historically held by relatives, the second by personal friends, and the third by political supporters. With the development of democracy and of party government, political considerations gradually eclipsed all others in importance. The exercise of patronage became the road to power. But the ultimate consequences can be read in the overturns of government from the fall of

[1] *Big Democracy* (New York: 1945), p. 118.

[2] The term "patronage" is of broad implications. As here used it will denote the appointment of persons to the public service for reasons other than, or in addition to, merit. It is obvious that political considerations may not be the only ones involved here. Blood ties, friendship, obligations of one sort or another, also play their parts.

Louis XVI to that of Tammany Hall or the Vare, Pendergast, or Hague machine.

In all democracies today the conflict between patronage and merit is being resolved in favor of the latter. This is due not only to popular pressure for equality of opportunity in the public service but also to the rapidly expanding and increasingly technical functions of government, which call for special abilities and capacities. The effect of this has been twofold. Although the competence of every party man is still assumed in many quarters, it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain this fiction in a technological age. In the second place, the importance of the many functions now within the province of public administration leaves no room for a civil service with divided loyalties—a service owing allegiance first to a party and secondarily to the whole people.

Among existing liberal states, the United States stands almost alone in its acceptance of the present status of part spoils and part merit. In many jurisdictions we have still our "oligarchy of stipendiaries," to use George William Curtis' telling phrase, which under the highly competitive conditions in Europe could scarcely be tolerated. But with our immense resources, on the one hand, and our relative isolation, on the other, we have long been able to bear the inevitable inefficiencies and wastes which flow from the practice of compensating professional politicians with public offices. These arise not only from the conflict of loyalties inseparable from a system of political favoritism but from the losses occasioned by an intermittent turnover in which officials of more or less experience give way to a new crop of novices. This is particularly serious in the case of administrative officers—that group which should supply the directing intelligence and determine the character, the pace, and the objectives of the great body of civil servants.

Happily, this indictment must be qualified in certain directions. The steady growth of the council-manager type of city government is bringing with it a career service system in many municipalities. In other jurisdictions there is a notable tendency to retain from administration to administration those officials who are engaged in technical and professional activities. Finally, there is a continuing wave of opinion favorable to a career service system, as various public opinion polls have clearly revealed. This continues to bear fruit in extension of state and local merit system laws and in repeated vitalization of Federal personnel administration.

But we have still a considerable distance to traverse before the end of the spoils system is in sight. Both spoilsmen and merit system leaders frequently call attention to the many Federal positions for which selection is still governed by party politics—positions such as U.S. marshals, attorneys, chief customs collectors, and, to a certain degree, postmasters and rural mail carriers, which by no stretch of the imagination can be considered

essential to policy control of the bureaucracy. More serious are the vast provinces of patronage still surviving in state and local jurisdictions. The thesis sometimes advanced that a reasonable amount of patronage is necessary to nourish the particular kind of party machinery existent in this country is based on the false premise that motivation for party work can come only through winning jobs. As a matter of fact, this kind of reward in the past may account for the caliber of workers too often found in party hierarchies. A change in the incentive system can also improve the quality and motivation of party workers. The improvement that has gradually taken place in recent decades may be due in large part to the fact that most party workers must of necessity look to other satisfactions, rather than to jobs, as their reward.

For our purposes, the history of the American civil service is conveniently divided into five broad periods:

1789–1829: the period of relative administrative efficiency
1829–1865: the period of unmitigated spoils
1865–1883: the period of agitation and rising resentment against the spoils system
1883–1935: the period of reform and bureaucratic evolution
1935–present: the period of positive personnel administration

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to an analysis of the main tendencies revealed in each of these periods, although the last two will be discussed as one.[3]

I. THE PERIOD OF RELATIVE EFFICIENCY: 1789–1829

Colonial America grew up under a spoils system. At the hands of the British aristocracy public office was treated as the special preserve of a privileged class, and it was partly for this reason that colonial legislatures attempted, wherever possible, to restrict the appointing power of the royal governor. With the Revolution this monopoly of office was destroyed, and the revolutionary leaders turned to the framing of measures which would prevent its reappearance. This is the meaning of the provisions in various state constitutions for the election of administrative officers. "Where annual elections end," observed John Adams, "there tyranny begins." The Revolution was, among other things, an attack on the privatization of public office.

In this respect it soon miscarried, and the devices which had been invented to eliminate the special privilege of a class became themselves the

[3] A more extensive but comparatively recent treatment of the history of American civil service will be found in Herbert Kaufman's brilliant paper, "The Growth of the Federal Personnel System," appearing in *The Federal Government Service: Its Character, Prestige, and Problems*, The Sixth American Assembly, Columbia University, final ed. (New York: 1954).

instruments of a new type of favoritism. Rotation in office, legally embedded in the Articles of Confederation and in a majority of state constitutions, was soon a major governmental evil.[4] In New York, for example, the Council of Appointment, established as a check on the appointing power of the governor, early came under his dominance and after party lines were definitely drawn, in 1800, developed into an instrument for the ruthless proscription of officeholders of the opposing party. It is small wonder that Aaron Burr and other New Yorkers were later prominent in the introduction of the spoils system into the Federal Government and that some of the worst abuses under it were practiced in New York City.[5]

It is not necessary to multiply illustrations of the ways in which the application of democratic dogmas in the states and cities served the ends of party patronage. By 1821, in every state throughout the North and West, the spoils system "either was established or there existed an element eager to introduce it."[6] A similar comment could be made upon the cities, and not even the Federal Government escaped unscathed in these early years. The finest flower of the rotation theory was the enactment in 1820 of a measure known as the Four Years Law.[7] That measure relieved the executive of the embarrassing necessity of dismissing competent officials by providing for their automatic retirement at the end of four years.

Yet despite the Four Years Law and the growing chaos in the states and cities, this was a period of relatively good administration so far as the Federal Government was concerned. The government at Washington resisted the erosion of the spoils system more effectively than the states and cities for at least two reasons. In the first place, the Federal Constitution was drawn up in a period of reaction against the democratic excesses which had followed the Revolution. It was, in many respects, a reactionary document, and it contained none of the usual provisions for short terms and rotating officers. In the second place, from the election of Jefferson in 1800 to that of Jackson in 1828 there was, in the Federal Government, no fundamental change in party control. The mantle of the presidency fell with majestic regularity upon the shoulders of incumbent Secretaries of

[4] Rotation in office is said to have been an old Dutch custom brought over to New Amsterdam and continued in New York. It was incorporated in the "Frame of Government" of 1682 by William Penn. See Carl R. Fish, *The Civil Service and the Patronage* (Cambridge: 1904), pp. 80 ff.

[5] To Senator Marcy of New York also goes the credit for the notorious formula "To the victor belong the spoils."

[6] Fish, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

[7] This was introduced into the Senate by Mahlon Dickerson of New Jersey, although John Quincy Adams charged William H. Crawford, the Secretary of the Treasury, with its authorship. Crawford defended the act as a means of destroying the permanence which was coming to characterize the Federal service, and which he maintained led to inefficiency. See United States Civil Service Commission, *A Brief History of the United States Civil Service* (Washington: 1933), p. 6.

Special privilege of any sort is antipathetic to the democratic ideal and in relation to public office is wholly subversive. The spoils system places a premium on more or less continuous participation in partisan activities by the incumbents of public offices. But these officials are also the servants of the whole community and, as such, committed to the principle of impartiality in the performance of their work. This dual relationship to the community and the party leads to a conflict of loyalties that is most frequently resolved in the interest of the latter. But when that occurs, that equality in relation to public administration which is a *sine qua non* of democratic government disappears, and we approach a situation more nearly characteristic of totalitarian regimes. The rewards of success at the polls then include not only the right to make partisan appointments to lucrative and influential positions but also the privilege of carrying on the functions of government in the interest of a part rather than the whole of the public served. This is a perversion of democracy.

Following the stimulus of Jacksonian democracy the spoils system was extended and became deeply entrenched in every government in America, flourishing almost unchallenged for thirty years. During that period partisan activity was nearly the sole test for public office, the ends of government were perverted to those of party and personal aggrandizement, and public service came to mean party service. With every turnover in party control, the public offices were swept clean.[14]

As time went on, such a situation became directly chargeable to the indifference of the great body of citizens, who were too busy exploiting the resources of a continent to devote much attention to problems of party management. The burden of party affairs therefore fell wholly upon the shoulders of professional politicians who labored in the party vineyard in season and out and, reasonably enough, demanded their due reward for such efforts. This took the form at one time or another of straight-out embezzlement, bribery, pay-roll padding, contract graft, and position graft. All were aspects of the spoils system. The crasser forms of dishonesty were gradually eliminated, but position graft remained. Even today, despite the progress of recent years, it is one of the most prolific sources of governmental waste. It leads to a disastrous turnover, in which experience is systematically scrapped; it places in responsible positions men and women

---

the small scientific establishments such as the Smithsonian Institution, and certain accounting and auditing functions (Chap. 18, pp. 347–362).

[14] This argument for the merit system for the great mass of public jobs should not be taken to mean that there is no place for political appointments short of "cabinet level" posts. The nonparliamentary system of government furnishes some justification for the use of patronage as a form of liaison between the executive and legislative branches. See the discussion under "Political Influence" in Chapter 3, below.

who are not only inexperienced but often incompetent as well; it brings about stagnation in administrative policies; it gives rise to favoritism and partiality in the ordinary conduct of the public business; it places a taboo on public service as a desirable and satisfactory career for young people of capacity and promise.

III. THE BEGINNINGS OF REFORM: 1865–1883

The progressive degradation and degeneration of public life under the spoils methods called forth a movement in the late sixties which demanded a reform of the civil service[15] in the name of governmental efficiency and public morals. This movement was inaugurated and carried on by a small group of high-minded and public-spirited men, most of whom were characterized as "intellectuals" or "idealists." Indeed, for a short time the professional politicians refused to take them seriously. They were widely termed "snivel service reformers," and Conkling contemptuously referred to the group as "the dilettantes and carpet-knights of politics." Yet within a surprisingly short time they succeeded in persuading the platform-makers of the major parties to incorporate civil service planks, and in a few years reform was well under way.[16]

A number of spasmodic efforts were made to improve the character of the public service, before the reform wave culminated in the establishment of the Federal Civil Service Commission. Such efforts had to do with: (1) the selection of employees in certain departments by a scheme of examinations; (2) controlling the removal power of the chief executive; and (3) limitations upon the system of political assessment. Each of these will be treated briefly.

A. EXAMINATIONS

The initial step in setting a limit to the free play of the "patronage-mongers" with respect to the nonpresidential offices was the enactment of laws in 1853 and 1855 whereby the clerks of the five major Federal departments were divided into four groups upon the basis of their duties, distinguished by specific salary rates, and appointed upon the basis of examinations given by boards representing the bureau or office to which appointment was to be made. At this time, as later, English experience served as a model. Such examinations took the form of "pass" examinations; there was no real competition, and they served at best the single purpose of keeping the

[15] For an excellent history of early civil service reform see United States Civil Service Commission, *History of the Federal Civil Service, 1789 to the Present* (Washington: 1941).

[16] See, for example, the leaflet containing excerpts from platforms of the Republican party from 1872 to 1920 inclusive, published by the National Civil Service Reform League under the title *The Merit System and the Party: A Dozen Planks from Republican Platforms.*

Special privilege of any sort is antipathetic to the democratic ideal and in relation to public office is wholly subversive. The spoils system places a premium on more or less continuous participation in partisan activities by the incumbents of public offices. But these officials are also the servants of the whole community and, as such, committed to the principle of impartiality in the performance of their work. This dual relationship to the community and the party leads to a conflict of loyalties that is most frequently resolved in the interest of the latter. But when that occurs, that equality in relation to public administration which is a *sine qua non* of democratic government disappears, and we approach a situation more nearly characteristic of totalitarian regimes. The rewards of success at the polls then include not only the right to make partisan appointments to lucrative and influential positions but also the privilege of carrying on the functions of government in the interest of a part rather than the whole of the public served. This is a perversion of democracy.

Following the stimulus of Jacksonian democracy the spoils system was extended and became deeply entrenched in every government in America, flourishing almost unchallenged for thirty years. During that period partisan activity was nearly the sole test for public office, the ends of government were perverted to those of party and personal aggrandizement, and public service came to mean party service. With every turnover in party control, the public offices were swept clean.[14]

As time went on, such a situation became directly chargeable to the indifference of the great body of citizens, who were too busy exploiting the resources of a continent to devote much attention to problems of party management. The burden of party affairs therefore fell wholly upon the shoulders of professional politicians who labored in the party vineyard in season and out and, reasonably enough, demanded their due reward for such efforts. This took the form at one time or another of straight-out embezzlement, bribery, pay-roll padding, contract graft, and position graft. All were aspects of the spoils system. The crasser forms of dishonesty were gradually eliminated, but position graft remained. Even today, despite the progress of recent years, it is one of the most prolific sources of governmental waste. It leads to a disastrous turnover, in which experience is systematically scrapped; it places in responsible positions men and women

---

the small scientific establishments such as the Smithsonian Institution, and certain accounting and auditing functions (Chap. 18, pp. 347–362).

[14] This argument for the merit system for the great mass of public jobs should not be taken to mean that there is no place for political appointments short of "cabinet level" posts. The nonparliamentary system of government furnishes some justification for the use of patronage as a form of liaison between the executive and legislative branches. See the discussion under "Political Influence" in Chapter 3, below.

who are not only inexperienced but often incompetent as well; it brings about stagnation in administrative policies; it gives rise to favoritism and partiality in the ordinary conduct of the public business; it places a taboo on public service as a desirable and satisfactory career for young people of capacity and promise.

III. THE BEGINNINGS OF REFORM: 1865–1883

The progressive degradation and degeneration of public life under the spoils methods called forth a movement in the late sixties which demanded a reform of the civil service[15] in the name of governmental efficiency and public morals. This movement was inaugurated and carried on by a small group of high-minded and public-spirited men, most of whom were characterized as "intellectuals" or "idealists." Indeed, for a short time the professional politicians refused to take them seriously. They were widely termed "snivel service reformers," and Conkling contemptuously referred to the group as "the dilettantes and carpet-knights of politics." Yet within a surprisingly short time they succeeded in persuading the platform-makers of the major parties to incorporate civil service planks, and in a few years reform was well under way.[16]

A number of spasmodic efforts were made to improve the character of the public service, before the reform wave culminated in the establishment of the Federal Civil Service Commission. Such efforts had to do with: (1) the selection of employees in certain departments by a scheme of examinations; (2) controlling the removal power of the chief executive; and (3) limitations upon the system of political assessment. Each of these will be treated briefly.

A. EXAMINATIONS

The initial step in setting a limit to the free play of the "patronage-mongers" with respect to the nonpresidential offices was the enactment of laws in 1853 and 1855 whereby the clerks of the five major Federal departments were divided into four groups upon the basis of their duties, distinguished by specific salary rates, and appointed upon the basis of examinations given by boards representing the bureau or office to which appointment was to be made. At this time, as later, English experience served as a model. Such examinations took the form of "pass" examinations; there was no real competition, and they served at best the single purpose of keeping the

[15] For an excellent history of early civil service reform see United States Civil Service Commission, *History of the Federal Civil Service, 1789 to the Present* (Washington: 1941).

[16] See, for example, the leaflet containing excerpts from platforms of the Republican party from 1872 to 1920 inclusive, published by the National Civil Service Reform League under the title *The Merit System and the Party: A Dozen Planks from Republican Platforms.*

utterly incompetent out. Indeed, as administered, they were closed to all except applicants with adequate political backing, and in the course of time became largely *pro forma* affairs.[17] However, they constituted an opening wedge, and throughout the sixties and seventies the reformers agitated for an extension of the examination system.

B. THE REMOVAL POWER

The removal power of the President was considered by Madison and his successors to be unrestricted, since no reference to this power appears in the Constitution. It was assumed, and later recognized by the courts, that the power to appoint carried with it the power to remove. Members of the Senate, however, held on various occasions that the confirmation of appointments on the part of that body involved by implication the right to approve or disapprove removals. The issue was sharply drawn during the Johnson administration when the President indulged in sweeping removals, at the same time recommending for appointment names that were highly offensive to the controlling forces in the Senate. In order to defend its alleged right, a Tenure of Office Act was passed in 1867 and amended in 1869, requiring the advice and consent of the Senate for the removal of any official whose appointment had been confirmed by that body.

The President flouted the law to such an extent that impeachment proceedings were undertaken. In its failure to convict, the Senate virtually conceded the President's authority, although it could and frequently did block him by refusing to confirm the appointee to the vacancy created by the removal. The right to confirm or to reject nominations to presidential positions has always been jealously guarded by the Senate. It is naturally more frequently exercised when the chief executive and the majority of the Senate belong to opposing parties.[18]

Despite the failure of the Senate to put an effective curb on presidential discretion or arbitrariness in the matter of removals, it was not until 1886 that the Tenure of Office Act was repealed. In the meantime, the very attempt to scrutinize the use of the removal power had given added impetus to the drive against purely partisan removals.

[17] For fuller treatment see White, *The Jacksonians*, Chap. 19, pp. 363–376, and Lewis Mayers, *The Federal Service* (New York: 1922), pp. 41 ff.

[18] Ninety-two of Hayes's nominations were contested, fifty-one of them being fully rejected. See Fish, *op. cit.*, p. 204. This author gives a fairly detailed account of the above issue, pp. 186 ff. The whole question of the right of the Senate to participate in presidential removals was considered in the case of *Myers* v. *U.S.*, 264 U.S. 95, 44 *Sup. Ct. Rep.* 272 (1924). So far as the Myers decision appeared to recognize the right of the executive to exercise the power of removal without restriction, this doctrine was revoked by the Humphrey decision handed down in 1935, *Humphrey's Executor* v. *U.S.*, 295 U.S. 602. In this case the court held, in effect, that appointees to quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial bodies could be removed only for cause.

C. LIMITATIONS ON POLITICAL ASSESSMENTS

One of the major and most dependable sources of party funds has been and, to an appreciable extent, still is the amounts levied on the pay checks of those appointed to public office. Levies are frequently made even though party influences have presumably played no part in bringing about the appointments. In such cases, payments have been enforced through the threat of removal by partisan appointing officials.

The spoils system brought with it the custom of levying assessments on officeholders. It seemed entirely logical that, if political debts were to be paid by appointments, those favored by appointments should discharge their obligation to the party by contributing to campaign expenses. According to Fish, a regular system of assessments had been established in a number of localities by 1840 and was the accepted rule throughout the forties, fifties, and sixties.[19] By such means the public treasury could be regularly, even though indirectly, tapped to perpetuate the control of the party in power.

Owing primarily to the agitation of the reformers, who by every conceivable means publicized the abuses of the spoils system, Congress enacted a law in 1876 for the purpose of checking the evil of political assessments. The act provided that "all executive officers or employees of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, are prohibited from requesting, giving to, or receiving from any other officer or employee of the Government, any money or property or other thing of value for political purposes."[20] The substance of this act was embodied in the United States Civil Service Act which became a law in 1883 and was later extended by the Hatch Act of 1939. Here are to be found the most sweeping and comprehensive provisions that could be devised to prevent the solicitation, acceptance, or payment of money or any valuable thing for political purposes. These prohibitions were imposed on both elective and appointive officials, extending even to actions or threats of actions with regard to the status of those who acquiesced in or refused to acquiesce in requests for contributions. The Civil Service Commission has consistently aimed to enforce this statute, with the result that the bulk of Federal employees, except those who are elected or appointed through presidential action, are today relieved of the necessity of paying tribute to the controlling party.

With respect to political levies, the Federal Government is almost in a class by itself. In only exceptional jurisdictions has any effort been made to relieve public employees of this type of informal and unofficial taxation.

[19] Fish, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

[20] 19 *Stat.* 169 (1876), 44th Cong., 1st sess.

Even in states where there are legal prohibitions against the assessment system, "voluntary" contributions are still evident. These are paid and collected without any effort toward concealment and cases of noncompliance penalized to the point of dismissal.

IV. THE PERIOD OF REFORM AND BUREAUCRATIC EVOLUTION: 1883–1935

THE PERIOD OF POSITIVE PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION: 1935 TO PRESENT

For the past eighty years there has been a fairly constant trend toward the development of a governmental bureaucracy in the United States. During this period the seed of civil service reform was sown; the plant flowered and brought forth fruit in the form of the partial professionalization of the service, of the partial elimination of partisan allegiance, and of a growing emphasis upon the positive functions of personnel administration.

Moreover, beginning about 1909, the efficiency and economy movement began to stress integration and the development of an administrative organization possessing well-defined lines of responsibility, while the years since the Civil War witnessed the gradual encroachment of the Federal Government upon the sphere formerly reserved to the states and of the states upon the areas of former local competence. This resulted in a further extension of the hierarchical principle across differing levels of government, in the closer coördination of the administrative system, and in the consequent furtherance of bureaucracy.

The civil service reform movement, the pressure for efficiency and economy, the trend to centralization, and the development of a constructive purpose in personnel administration came to fruition largely in this century, and each in its own way contributed to the evolution of the American bureaucracy. Although the intensive examination of these developments is beyond the scope of this book, brief consideration is given to each.

A. THE CIVIL SERVICE REFORM MOVEMENT

1. The Federal Service. Throughout the seventies and eighties the movement for civil service reform gained momentum, until it culminated in the passage of the Civil Service Act of 1883, which still stands on the statute books. The real father of the movement was George William Curtis, who, with a small band of like-minded idealists, pressed the problem and the proposed solution on the public in season and out.[21] Upon this group

[21] Among Curtis' associates were Dorman B. Eaton, Charles J. Bonaparte, Richard H. Dana, and Talcott Williams. For a sympathetic but discriminating account of this movement see Frank M. Stewart, *The National Civil Service Reform League* (Austin: 1929).

fell the burden of so enlightening opinion and arousing feeling that its demands might penetrate the walls of the Capitol and force Congress to an action that ran counter to what it considered to be its own interests, as well as to the firmly rooted customs of nearly four decades.

The New York Civil Service Reform Association, the first in the country, was organized in 1877. By 1881 there were at least thirteen similar associations, scattered from Massachusetts to Missouri, when the time seemed propitious for affiliating them with a national organization. The National Civil Service Reform League was accordingly formed and has continued in existence to the present day.[22] It has been a potent force in the struggle for a merit system.

One other important factor in this development was the report on the British civil service prepared by Dorman B. Eaton, who had been commissioned by President Hayes, a champion of reform, to survey the British service, with special reference to the applicability of British methods to the conditions in the United States. He produced a volume which was a powerful eulogy of the merit system as it had been developed in Britain. Its influence was widespread.

It is doubtful, however, whether the known wastes of patronage, the denunciations of the system by a few enlightened members of Congress, and the general campaign of education and propaganda carried on by the reformers, all combined, would have brought action at the time action was taken if it had not been for the assassination of President Garfield at the hands of a disappointed office seeker. This sorry happening, indirectly chargeable to the spoils system, brought about a crystallization of sentiment for reform that would tolerate neither temporizing nor compromise. The result was the Pendleton Act of 1883.

In its major features this law was based upon the English system, and it has served as a model for most of the legislation passed in lesser jurisdictions from that time to the present.[23] Its outstanding characteristics are the following: (1) administration is vested in the hands of an independent bipartisan commission, appointed by and responsible to the chief executive; (2) selection is by open competitive examinations, practical in character; (3) a probation period is prescribed as a part of the selective process; (4) disabled veterans are to enjoy the advantages already accorded to them; (5) employees are freed from any obligations to make political contributions, and officers are strictly prohibited from receiving or soliciting such funds for such purposes; (6) the commission is authorized to make investigations on its own initiative and is required to submit an annual

[22] Now the National Civil Service League.

[23] As the British personnel system has developed, the similarities have been partially lost. At present the British Civil Service Commission is no more than an employment agency, while control of personnel administration has gravitated to the Treasury.

report to the President for transmittal to Congress; (7) the rules are to apply to the departments at Washington, and to custom houses and post offices elsewhere with more than fifty employees, but it is within the discretion of the President to extend the classified service as well as to prescribe exemptions from it.

Thus was a first step taken toward the creation of a professional bureaucracy. The prime effect of the civil service law has been to stimulate the professionalization of the service by providing conditions under which a career may be possible, and by setting up instruments for the recruitment of competent persons. The Civil Service Act of 1883 is the matrix of present civil service law. In the course of nearly seventy-five years it has been continuously strengthened. The basic features have been the independent commission, designed to secure that neutral area already mentioned as essential to the proper functioning of the bureaucracy, and, secondly, the consistent emphasis upon competitive examinations as the gateway to the Federal service. Through this system patronage has been dealt a severe blow, although for many years the victory was far from won because of the number of positions that had been exempt from the operation of the civil service laws. However, there has been rather steady progress in the direction of covering hitherto exempt positions. This will appear from Table 1.

Such extensions have come about largely through executive orders rather than through legislative action. Congressional antipathy to extension of the merit system has been revealed on numerous occasions. Even as late as the 1930's Congress repeatedly killed amendments which would have placed the employees of one or another New Deal agency under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission, and in several instances Congress exempted groups of employees from the merit system. But it did pass the Ramspeck Act of 1940 enabling the President to bring many additional jobs under the regular civil service. Also, in view of experiences in the scandal-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue, it did extend the merit system to the former collector (now district director) positions in 1952.[24]

[24] Another partial exception is the case of the Ramspect-O'Mahoney Postmaster Act of 1937, which brought under the Civil Service Act 14,800 postmasters of the first, second, and third classes. This requires competitive examinations but, by calling for Senate confirmation, leaves much room for political influence. The revenue collector jobs were brought under the merit system by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952. Under the Constitution, Congress has the authority to determine the methods of selection of the nonpresidential employees, constituting the great body of technical, clerical, and labor groups. Under the Civil Service Act, it formally ceded a considerable part of this authority to the President, as has already been pointed out. For the naval and military branches, as well as for the commissioned staffs of the Public Health Service and the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Congress has prescribed the methods of selection in some detail, but as to the other presidential appointments, the chief executive enjoys a free hand.

TABLE 1. Proportion of Positions Subject to Competition in the Federal Service, 1884–1955

Year	Number of Positions in Executive Civil Service[a]	Number of Positions Subject to Examinations	Percentage of Positions Subject to Examinations	Total Population of U.S.
1884	131,208	13,780	10.50	54,419,760
1900	208,000	94,893	45.62	74,689,889
1914	435,000	292,460	67.23	96,551,717
1930	580,494	462,083	79.60	122,775,046
1940	1,014,117	726,827[b]	71.67[b]	131,669,215
1948	2,090,732	1,750,823[b]	83.74[b]	146,571,000
1950	1,934,040	1,641,876[b]	84.89[b]	150,697,361
1955	2,371,405	1,991,506[b]	83.98[b]	164,799,000[c]

[a] Includes positions in the General Accounting Office and the Government Printing Office which are actually within the legislative branch.

[b] Does not include those positions in the excepted services which are covered by independent merit systems such as found in TVA. The actual number of positions subject to merit systems is, therefore, about 4% higher. Final figures were not available at the time of this publication, but it was estimated that approximately 30,000 positions were also being added to the group covered by competitive examination as the result of action in 1955 and 1956 extending coverage to Federal positions in Alaska and at various overseas posts.

[c] Estimate provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

SOURCE: Figures obtained from the *Annual Reports*, United States Civil Service Commission and the commission's staff.

Certainly the merit system idea in the Federal service can hardly be said to have gained a very substantial hold in the first two decades of this century. Note, for example, the reminiscences of the distinguished public servant and administrative philosopher Louis Brownlow, recalling experiences when he first came to Washington as a young newspaper correspondent in 1904. Meeting many civil servants of the day who congregated in the capital's numerous boarding houses, he was impressed by how they referred to being "in office" and how they anxiously retained jobs under the "protection" of Senator so-and-so or Congressman such-and-such.

In 1938 President Roosevelt, by extending the competitive service to all the previously exempt positions with which he had the power to deal by executive order, took the greatest single step taken by any President up to that time for coverage under the merit system—affecting some 45,000 positions. With this action, for the first time since 1883, further extension depended entirely on Congress. Congress met the challenge in the Ramspeck Act of 1940,[25] under which it granted the President's request for authority to cover the thousands of other positions still outside the scope of

[25] 54 *U.S. Stat.* 1211 (November 26, 1940); amendments through 1946 are covered in 5 *U.S. Code* 681–4. This important piece of legislation was piloted through Congress by Representative Robert Ramspeck of Georgia, who became distinguished for his sincere interest and work in civil service reform in the Federal Government.

the Civil Service Act. Executive orders by President Roosevelt under the Ramspeck Act authority brought the jurisdiction of the competitive merit system to its current all-time high. This was interrupted only in form by the "war-service" system of appointments during World War II, but has not been disturbed in proportion of coverage. Clearly, then, the jurisdiction of the U.S. Civil Service Commission extends not only to all routine positions but to most high-level professional and administrative positions as well.

Also, it must be remembered that well over 80,000 positions in the Federal service, though not under the regular civil service, are subject to various other independent merit systems. Among these are positions in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Public Health Service, and the Foreign Service. This fact must be considered in conjunction with Table 1.

Meanwhile the Civil Service Commission was gradually changing character from a mere recruiting and examining agency to a central personnel organization charged with leadership or control over many personnel functions. Initial authority in 1912 to prescribe a system of efficiency ratings, although soon after transferred to the Bureau of Efficiency and then to the Personnel Classification Board, was restored to the commission in 1932. Likewise in 1912 an act providing an orderly removal procedure gave the commission certain interpretative authority. In 1922 the commission was made the recording agency for the employment and salary experience of all employees subject to the new Retirement Act. Then in 1923, with the passage of the Classification Act, the commission was represented on the new Personnel Classification Board and later (1932) was given the full functions of that board for classifying positions on the basis of their duties and the qualifications requisite for their performance. The President, in 1931, also established within the commission the Council of Personnel Administration (later the Federal Personnel Council) with representatives of all departments to advise on personnel problems. This was incorporated more closely in the bosom of the Civil Service Commission in 1953 when the same advisory group of personnel officials was set up as the Interagency Advisory Group, through which the Civil Service Commission conducts its consultation on personnel policy and methods with professional personnel people throughout the Federal establishments. By executive order (7916) in 1938 the commission was given authority to establish "practical training courses for employees" and also responsibility for approval of in-service training programs and grievance procedures in the agencies. Much of the commission's work in the field of employee training was emasculated by the failure of Congress to provide funds for the work.

The comprehensive order of February 24, 1947 (9830), which revoked the order of 1938, not only set forth a much improved version of the Civil Service Rules and redefined personnel responsibilities of the departments but also required that the commission "exercise and provide leadership in personnel matters throughout the Federal service." In 1948 another executive order (9980) added the special responsibility for supervising the application of nondiscriminatory employment practices so far as race, color, religion, and national origin are concerned, which was superseded in 1955 by another order (10,590) that placed such responsibility in an independent President's Committee on Government Employment Policy. The most recent general revision of the Civil Service Rules appears in Executive Order 10,577 of November 22, 1954 (effective January 23, 1955). This defined merit system appointments as "career" and provided for conditional tenure during a period (currently set by commission action at three years), including and beyond the probationary period, during which competitive appointees have more restricted tenure privileges than those who show their interest in continued employment by serving the full period. It also contains an interesting provision permitting agreements for easier movement of personnel between the general civil service system and other separate merit systems—such as those of the Foreign Service, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.[26]

Although the details of some of these newer duties will be discussed later, their mention here is sufficient to show the transformation of the Civil Service Commission that has taken place from a recruiting and appointment policing agency to one having broad concern with Federal personnel administration. The commission has had too little financial support for constructive activities in training or human relations and is still weighted too heavily with a control type of function. Nevertheless, it has made notable strides in recent years, particularly since its reorganization in 1953 establishing a planning, research, and developmental arm by creation of its Bureau of Programs and Standards.[27]

2. The States. The "cloud on the horizon," as White refers to the ominous beginnings of the spoils system, actually gathered in such state governments as New York and Pennsylvania before spilling over heavily on the Federal scene.[28] However, some of the states followed close on the heels

[26] Rule VI, sec. 6.7.

[27] For a handy summary of the broad characteristics of the Federal civil service system, see the excellent booklet: U.S. Civil Service Commission, *The Government Personnel System*, A Guide for Federal Executives and Supervisors, Personnel Management Series, No. 4 (Washington: September, 1954). This pamphlet is available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, in Washington, for a price of 15 cents.

[28] *The Jeffersonians*, pp. 394–398; also see Fish, *The Civil Service and the Patronage*, *passim*.

of the national government in passing basic merit system laws.[29] The states of New York and Massachusetts have the distinction of leading off, in 1883 and 1884 respectively. They found no imitators until 1905, when Wisconsin and Illinois fell in line, to be followed by Colorado (1907), New Jersey (1908), Ohio (1912), California and Connecticut (1913), Maryland (1920), Michigan, Arkansas, and Maine (1937), Alabama, Minnesota, New Mexico, Rhode Island, and Tennessee (1939), Louisiana (1940), Kansas and Pennsylvania (1941), Virginia (1942), Oregon (1945), Missouri (1946), Vermont (1947), Arizona (1948), New Hampshire (1950), Georgia (1952), Nevada (1953), Montana and Florida (1955)—a grand total of thirty-one which at least made a start. But two of these laws are no longer in effect (Arizona and Arkansas), and Montana's is not implemented with funds. Also, the laws of New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and Missouri really apply only to their health and welfare agencies, and Georgia and Florida do not as yet have complete state-wide coverage. Therefore, only twenty-one states at this writing have genuine state-wide merit systems functioning with some degree of effectiveness: Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin. The territorial governments of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands also have general civil service coverage.

A few of the state laws fell far short of the Federal model. Most have been strengthened as time passed. Connecticut began well, weakened its law, repealed it (1921), and finally, in 1937, started out once more with a new and more comprehensive act. Arkansas repealed its law in 1939 and Louisiana in 1948, but the latter was restored by constitutional amendment in 1952. State courts invalidated the Arizona law shortly after it was passed. Kansas and Colorado, for a period, made their laws ineffective by refusing to vote appropriations, but since 1953 both have had active programs. Michigan, which began with an excellent statute and one of the best personnel systems in the country, soon repealed its law; then a short time later it adopted a constitutional amendment placing a merit system in effect again in 1941. Vermont's system was not really effective before 1950. Alabama strengthened its situation in 1951 by a constitutional amendment.

On January 1, 1940, all states receiving Federal grants under the Social Security Act were required to place their unemployment insurance and public assistance employees under a merit system. Similar requirements apply to grants for public health, child welfare, public employment, and

[29] Information in this section is based on data compiled from various sources by the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada and by the State Merit System Services of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. See the latter's publication, *Directory of State Merit Systems* (1954).

vocational rehabilitation activities. Thus, a total of twenty-seven states have limited merit systems applying to all or most of their agencies receiving Federal grants, even though their other departments continue for the most part under party patronage. The setting up and guidance of special merit system councils in the states lacking state-wide merit systems have been supervised by the Division of State Merit Systems of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the direction of A. H. Aronson.

The significance of this Federal influence can hardly be overestimated. As Lewis Meriam has aptly stated:

> It is doubtful whether at any previous time in the nation's history more rapid advance has been made in the introduction of sound techniques than that which occurred after the Social Security Act was amended in 1939 to the effect that state plans to be acceptable to the national board must provide "methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis." It was little short of amazing that several states where conditions approached a public scandal should in a few months become the field for great technical advances. It is also doubtful whether any group of administrative personnel has ever made greater contributions to merit system techniques than has the professional group concerned with welfare administration.[30]

Referring to this merit provision of Federal laws for grants-in-aid, which carried out a presidential recommendation, Leonard D. White has cited it as "one of the two or three principal contributions of Franklin Roosevelt to a better public service."[31] Even the Council of State Governments, which is often critical of Federal controls, credits the "generally high caliber" of state administration under these laws to the Federal supervision of the personnel program of the state departments involved.[32]

On the other hand, certain state civil service commissions, without Federal pressure, have held high the banner of civil service reform, improving the methods of selection and functioning as all-round personnel agencies. The most recent and perhaps the most significant developments are the adoption of classification and pay plans and the installation of a single personnel director endowed with broad powers for the whole employment policy. This latter innovation was first adopted in Maryland and has since been followed in ten or more other states.

The reader must be struck by the slowness of state governments to break with the discredited patronage system. The reason for this is obvious. Initial action looking toward the introduction of a personnel system must

[30] Lewis Meriam, *Relief and Social Security* (Washington: 1946), p. 829.

[31] White, "Franklin Roosevelt and the Public Service," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1945, p. 145.

[32] In its report to the first Hoover Commission, published as Sen. Doc. No. 81, 81st Cong., 1st sess., *Federal-State Relations* (1949), p. 66.

originate in the legislature, and there has not been sufficient organized citizen pressure in many states to bring about such action. This is not to suggest that the public is not interested in the merit system. If legislators consulted the preferences of their constituents, there would be no doubt as to the outcome. That the voting public is well aware of the advantages of curbing the spoilsmen has been evidenced by the overwhelming majorities favorable to the reform of the civil service when the issue has been squarely put. But more is needed if recalcitrant legislators are to be forced into line. There is still need for vigorous organizations operating on a state-wide basis. Even where the functioning of the merit system is on a high level as to integrity, technical operations, and public relations, there still remain difficult recruitment and salary problems in many state services.

3. The Counties. Comparatively little headway has been made by the merit system in the 3049 counties in the United States. Among this vast group of jurisdictions only about 40 counties maintain their own personnel agencies independent of a state system. This includes 18 in the state of California alone. In general it is the urban-type, heavily populated county that falls in this class, such as Mobile County in Alabama, Los Angeles County in California, Fulton County in Georgia, Baltimore and Montgomery counties in Maryland, Wayne County in Michigan, Arlington County in Virginia, and Milwaukee County in Wisconsin. New Jersey and New York typify the states in which county personnel systems are required by the state or come under the jurisdiction of the state civil service commission. Such coverage applies to 16 of the 21 counties in New Jersey and all 62 of those in New York. In the latter case 52 operate through their own civil service commissions or personnel officers. Thus, probably not more than 130 of the country's counties (about 4 percent) can be credited with having a thoroughgoing merit system.

In addition, there are four programs which cover a combined city-county personnel operation: Denver, Honolulu, Montgomery (Alabama), and San Francisco. Also, note should be taken of the fact that state civil service commissions of a number of states administer merit systems for particular classes of county personnel, usually in the health and welfare fields, a practice stimulated by the Federal merit system supervision referred to above.[33]

In spite of the size of the counties that are well covered, the overwhelming majority of the nation's 750,000 county and township employees (not including public schools) are nevertheless still subject to patronage methods

[33] The author is indebted for the above data on counties to the Civil Service Assembly, and particularly to Robert J. Batson of its staff. Mr. Henry J. McFarland, Director, Municipal Service Division, New York State Department of Civil Service, provided information on New York. For the California story see Harry W. Graham, "County Personnel Administration," *The Tax Digest*, California Taxpayers' Association, March, 1955, pp. 99–105.

of selection and dismissal. In personnel administration the county is still the "dark continent of American politics."

4. The Cities. When we turn to the cities, the picture is considerably brighter. Particularly in the larger municipalities the merit system has made steady progress since its inception. At the present time almost every large city in the country operates under some sort of civil service system, and 85.6 percent of the cities of 100,000 or more population select most of their employees either through their own personnel agencies or through a state commission. Indeed, Table 2 clearly indicates that there is a direct relationship between a city's size and the likelihood that it will have a merit system. However, even in the smaller cities the movement is gaining.

The number of city personnel agencies has grown steadily since the first ones were established in New York State in 1884. As in the case of the states, however, there has been a sharp acceleration of growth since 1930. In contrast to the counties, undoubtedly a substantial majority of the 1,220,000 city employees outside the public schools are under a merit system. For the future, the most fertile field for improvement is the small municipality, although the most backward jurisdictions generally are the counties.

TABLE 2. The Merit System in Cities of Different Population

Population Group	Number of Cities Reporting	Number of Cities Without Civil Service	Number of Cities with Civil Service			
			Total	All Employees Covered	All Except Limited Groups[a]	Police, Fire, Others[b]
Cities over 500,000	17	0	17	12	5	0
250,000 to 500,000	20	0	20	10	9	1
100,000 to 250,000	53	4	49	17	24	8
50,000 to 100,000	112	17	95	40	22	33
25,000 to 50,000	230	54	176	70	29	77
10,000 to 25,000	544	233	311	109	25	177
All cities over 10,000	976	308	668	258	114	296

[a] Civil service coverage not extended to one or more employee groups: library, unskilled laborers, police, fire, and utilities.

[b] Civil service coverage for one or more employee groups only: library, unskilled laborers, police, fire, and utilities.

SOURCE: *Municipal Year Book, 1955* (Chicago: 1955), p. 157.

B. THE DRIVE FOR ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY

The turn of the century brought with it a renewed faith in the ideals of democratic government. While Theodore Roosevelt was sounding the trumpet call for a "Square Deal," the movement for popular control of

government through the initiative, referendum, and recall was getting under way. This wave of democratic reform appeared just at a time when events were making it increasingly difficult for the people to deal by direct methods with the problems of government. But the new century also produced a movement which became of increasing significance as the machine age advanced: that for the improvement of administrative management. This was known in the early years as the "economy and efficiency" movement.

In the absence of planning and under the influence of the American policy of the separation of powers, there had grown up in the state and local governments, but less so in the Federal, a completely disintegrated and chaotic administrative structure, which both interfered with the performance of the ordinary service functions of government and prevented the proper exercise of such staff functions as purchasing or personnel administration. As function after function was added to those already exercised by the State, their administration was entrusted to independent and uncoördinated agencies. The size of the public service expanded unbelievably under such circumstances, and the confusion of lines of responsibility and the neglect of the principles of integration further aggravated a situation which Tocqueville noted a century ago when he wrote: "There is no point which serves as a center to the radii of the administration." The economic and social developments demanded the perfection of the organization of the public service, and the reform wave took a new turn.

The Federal Government and state after state created commissions to investigate and recommend improvements in the various administrative systems, while in the municipal field the commission movement and subsequently the city-manager movement were leading in a similar direction. Even since 1950 several states have had "little Hoover Commissions" study and urge improvement in administrative and personnel structures. There is today scarcely a state in which the movement has not left its mark.

Almost without exception the recommendations of the investigative commissions have agreed on these points: (1) increased power of the executive; (2) proper coördination of the terms of office of administrative officials; (3) functional departmentalization of administrative activities; (4) fixing definite lines of responsibility; and (5) abolition of many boards and commissions as administrative agencies.

Of these the most significant has been the emphasis upon the perfection of the bureaucratic hierarchy through the establishment of clear lines of responsibility, an enhanced executive power, and the reduction of administrative boards. This has influenced the handling of personnel administration as well as the character of the personnel agency. The movement has resulted in a more closely knit administrative system, although there is

still a considerable distance to go before a completely integrated organization exists anywhere, with the possible exception of some of those municipalities which have adopted the city-manager plan.

In the Federal Government the years since World War I have witnessed a steady advance toward integration. One of the earliest and most important steps on this route was the adoption of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, providing the President with a staff agency of great significance. More recently, the several Reorganization Acts from 1938 through the fifties have vastly extended the possibilities of integration. Already, as the result of executive orders issued under these laws, considerable reorganization and integration have taken place. Another indication of the trend is that one of the assistants and advisers to the President is charged with general supervision of personnel matters, currently a post filled ex officio by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission.[34]

Finally, the greatest attention yet given by any study to problems of structure and functionalization in the Federal Government has been shown by the two Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in their several reports to Congress issued in 1949 and 1955. These reports reiterate the administrative principles previously stated, with the addition of emphasis on decentralization of management and staff functions.[35] The reports of the commissions (popularly referred to as the "Hoover Commissions," because ex-President Hoover was chairman) included, among other significant proposals, a recommendation that the Civil Service Commission chairman have administrative authority to direct the activities of the commission and to serve as head of an Office of Personnel in the President's Office, both of which plans have been achieved.[36]

Although little attention was devoted to personnel problems in the reports of the earlier efficiency and economy commissions in the states, the integration movement is of far-reaching significance from the standpoint of the public service. The rationalization of the administrative structure has provided a framework within which personnel management may develop as a staff function. Finally, an integrated administrative system is one of the outstanding characteristics of a fully developed bureaucracy.

[34] By Executive Order 10,452, May 1, 1953.

[35] Cf. the earlier reports: President's Committee on Administrative Management, *Administrative Management in the Government of the United States* (Washington: 1937) and *Studies in Administrative Management in the Government of the United States* (Washington: 1937); Select Committee to Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government (Senate), *Preliminary Report*, pursuant to Sen. Res. No. 217, 74th Cong. (Washington: 1937).

[36] See the reports *General Management of the Executive Branch*, February, 1949, p. 25, and *Personnel Management*, February, 1949, p. 41. Action came under Reorganization Plan No. 5, effective August 20, 1949, made possible by the Reorganization Act of 1949 (P.L. 109, 81st Cong., June 30, 1949), and by Executive Order 10,452, previously cited.

The pressure for economy and efficiency has, therefore, played a prominent role in bureaucratic evolution in the United States.

C. THE TREND TOWARD CENTRALIZATION

When the American nation was born, it inherited a colonial tradition of dependence on local units of government growing out of difficulties of transportation and communication. The westward trek of the frontier, together with the doctrines of Jacksonian democracy, combined to perpetuate the reliance upon autonomous local institutions until the time of the Civil War. The change to centralization has been grounded in the events following the Industrial Revolution; in the growth of science and the application of scientific methods to administration, necessitating the employment of talent often beyond the resources of the local units; and in the practical shrinkage of the areas embraced within any particular jurisdiction, owing to the rapid progress of transportation and communication. These and many other factors led to the steady expansion of the administrative functions of the major governmental agencies at the expense of the lesser.

The progress of centralization has possessed dual characteristics. It has involved, on the one hand, a marked extension of administrative control over local authorities—in other words, a tendency to transform the local authority into a field office under the supervision and control of the central agency, either state or national.[37] This aspect is apparent at every turn, as, for example, in the fields of health, highways, finance, and conservation of natural resources. On the other hand, the process has involved the complete assumption by the major jurisdictions, state or Federal, of functions previously administered by the local areas. The New Deal and World War II further stimulated this trend. But the movement has gone steadily forward in the states as well.

In the personnel field there has been less centralization than in many others. This may be explained by political factors and by the fact that personnel is a staff function. Even here, however, there has been a clear trend. For instance, in a number of states the jurisdiction of the state personnel agencies has been extended over large areas of local jurisdiction. Throughout recent years there has also been a continuous extension of personnel services provided by state governments to their municipal and county governments.[38] The New York and New Jersey laws, previously

[37] A somewhat similar tendency in the direction of an international administrative hierarchy is noted in such developments as were represented by the Universal Postal Union, International Labor Office, etc., connected with the League of Nations, and later by the various organizations connected with the United Nations, such as the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization.

[38] See *The Book of the States 1954–55*, pp. 179–180; and National Civil Service League, "Cooperative Personnel Administration" (mimeographed) (New York: 1952).

referred to in connection with counties, apply equally to cities. Examining, position classification, and other techniques are provided to local units in these two states without cost. Massachusetts provides such services to its cities and towns. Other states—such as Alabama, California, Connecticut, and Minnesota—make similar assistance available on a reimbursable basis. In many states there is a good deal of voluntary coöperation between the state and its subdivisions and among municipalities, especially in the conduct of examinations and mutual use of registers of eligible candidates. Some states, such as Illinois, permit transfer of merit system status on the part of appointees among state and local levels of government. These developments, while desirable in almost every respect, do demonstrate how the gulf between localities has been shrunk by the ease of modern communication and transportation even in a managerial field like public personnel administration.

D. POSITIVE PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

The notable feature of the period from 1883 to the thirties was the negative aim of limiting the spoils system by establishing competitive entrance requirements for public jobs and by placing independent control agencies in a strategic position to check any cheating on this objective. Although progress toward this goal has been substantial, it is still incomplete. Only in the Federal Government, the large cities, and less than half of the states has the patronage become confined for the most part to policy-making and confidential posts. We can add to this, however, the increasingly rigid requirements for filling teaching positions in the public schools and the necessity in many fields, such as road building and running medical and psychiatric institutions, for employing professionally trained people. Certainly, by the merit system movement and by force of technology, the major battle to "keep the rascals out"—to achieve some reasonable measure of competence for filling the bulk of public positions—has been won. What remains of this negative function is—to borrow a military phrase—a series of "mopping-up operations," largely in state, county, and small city governments.

Only since the thirties has attention been directed, by those with some vision and imagination in the public personnel field, to a more positive role for the merit idea and to an aggressive and comprehensive program for management of public enterprise that gives continuous attention to the human factors. Some of the milestones that mark the beginning of this era as falling during the few years before and after 1935 are the following:

1. The report *Better Government Personnel*, with its attendant monographs, by the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel (1935), which stressed the need for a career service that would attract and hold the best minds and

would be geared to careful selection from graduates of our educational institutions.

2. The establishment by the President, in 1931, of the Council of Personnel Administration (from 1947 to 1953 called the Federal Personnel Council), which in a few years became an important force in the improvement and extension of personnel administration as a positive phase of management, a leadership role now assumed more directly by the U.S. Civil Service Commission itself.
3. The development of a comprehensive personnel program and, in 1933, a professional Office of Personnel in the Department of Agriculture—the first Federal agency to recognize the new profession.
4. The bold program of democratic employee-management relations and innovations in hiring and personnel evaluation initiated by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which developments had a good start by 1935 or 1936.
5. The well-staffed and top-supported personnel organization in the Social Security Board during its early days, which gave strong impetus to the recognition of training and employee counseling.
6. The report *Personnel Administration in the Federal Service* by the President's Committee on Administrative Management in 1937, which deplored the tendency of the Civil Service Commission to concentrate on "the negative and restrictive activities attendant upon the enforcement of the civil service laws and rules"; proposed a central personnel administrator in place of the commission; advocated policies for the handling of grievances and for recognition of employees' right to organize and designate representatives; pointed out the use of personnel techniques in approaching problems of organizational structure; and urged "increase in the number, improvement in the quality, and addition to the responsibilities of existing departmental personnel offices."
7. President Roosevelt's Executive Order 7916 in June, 1938, which, in addition to expanding the scope of responsibility of the Civil Service Commission as described earlier in this chapter, directed the setting up of divisions of "personnel supervision and management" in each department, each to be headed by a director of personnel with definite responsibilities in establishing training and grievance adjustment programs as well as in the more traditional processing activities of "chief clerks."

This skeleton list is by no means comprehensive in revealing the developments that took place during the early part of this period. It is significant, of course, that all the above landmarks relate principally to the Federal Government. If we were dealing exclusively with state and local public services, we could probably say that this last era of positive personnel administration is well under way at this writing.

Since the thirties we have seen further stress on the affirmative purposes of personnel management by the reports of the two Hoover Commissions (1949 and 1955)[39] and by the recommendations of the Sixth American

[39] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, *Personnel Management* (Washington: February, 1949); *Task Force Report on Federal Personnel* (Washington: January, 1949); *Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955); *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955).

Assembly in 1954.[40] Particularly the second Hoover report and the American Assembly report stressed such matters as career development, improvement of managerial competence, and clear separation of the career service from the political policy corps, as well as various devices to strengthen merit system processes. It is especially significant that the American Assembly should declare itself on these issues. Here is a program of national, non-partisan conferences on major problems of the day—foreign policy, economic security, etc.—sponsored by the Graduate School of Business of Columbia University. The Federal civil service, heretofore of interest primarily to political scientists, personnel experts, and government administrators, thereby became a subject of general public interest. This group of top representatives from business, labor, education, and industry, meeting in October, 1954, concerned itself with subjects that rarely make the front page in newspapers outside of Washington, D.C.

The changes in emphasis have been clear: a competent civil service could not come just from initial employment on a competitive basis and "equal pay for equal work." The big job of personnel management was emerging as that of securing the ablest people for the public service and of maintaining a well-trained, satisfied, productive working force.[41] Paralleling developments in private industry, this meant enlargement of the personnel function to embrace much more than recruiting, testing, and pay standardization. It has meant making the public service attractive as a career for the cream of the graduates from the nation's schools and colleges. It has meant inclusion of in-service training for orientation, for skill improvement, for increasing employee potential for advancement, for creating a sense of "belonging" and a sense of unity and common purpose in an organization—all factors that are vital to high morale. The Department of Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Social Security Administration were especially successful in building this common bond and *esprit de corps* through conscious training techniques.

The new role of personnel administration, further, has meant inclusion of internal placement policies and methods to insure promotion and transfer opportunities, so that the filling of positions is not wholly a matter of looking to formal examination registers. It has meant stimulation of recreational programs; provision for personal counseling, by which employees were "helped to help themselves" on home or office problems that might affect their performance; establishment of services and conveniences for employees that made life in the organization more satisfying—loan funds, employee libraries, car-sharing, improved eating and sanitary facilities,

[40] Sixth American Assembly, Columbia University, *The Federal Government Service: Its Character, Prestige, and Problems*, final ed. (New York: 1954).

[41] For an example of the scope of personnel work see Chap. A-4 of the *Federal Personnel Manual.*

and the like. It has meant inauguration of positive incentives—special salary increases for superior work, cash awards, honor awards. It has meant supervision of relations with employee organizations, with full recognition of employees' right to organize and bargain collectively on matters affecting their work status and conditions. In this area, TVA particularly, with its greater latitude than other executive departments in matters of recruitment, working hours, pay, and other conditions of employment, led the field. Even more important, the strong shift in national policy by the New Deal, giving labor its place in the sun, contributed to this belated acknowledgment that public workers were human too.

Most recently the positive approach in public personnel administration has focused the researches of modern social psychology on the management of organizations. Paralleling similar evolution in a number of large and progressive private business firms, the public personnel administrator is being gradually pushed into the constructive role of fostering whatever activities, policies, or practices will most contribute to the psychological security of employees, to their feeling of "belonging," and to their sense of success in a common enterprise. This is the slant of the latest training and employee relations programs, to develop the enthusiastic participation of each person in the organization.

To these developments great impetus has been given by the expansion of national government functions under the New Deal, during World War II, and in the Korean conflict. Increasing the size and problems of organization inevitably stimulates increased attention to personnel management.

Although all these developments will obviously be enlarged upon in succeeding chapters, it is important to call attention here to the limitations on what has been achieved. Let us remember that much of what we describe in this period since 1935 does not fit the situation in many state and local public services. Even in the Federal service only a firm beginning has been made. Road blocks and disappointments have been many. For the most part, a genuine understanding of the nature and goals of modern personnel administration is rarely possessed by the persons who hold the purse strings—the Budget Bureau, members of Congress, and, indeed, many top executives. Most private and public organizations still suffer from too many top administrators who know some subject-matter field or have a flair for public relations but have little notion of their personnel responsibilities (to say nothing of having little skill in the field) as heads of large aggregations of human personalities that are supposed to be working enthusiastically together in a common purpose. It is to the continual improvement of this understanding and attitude that this volume is dedicated.

SUMMARY

The course of those movements which have contributed to the evolution of American bureaucracy and the merit system has now been briefly traced. The crusade against the spoils system, the drive for economy and efficiency, the ever increasing tendency in the direction of centralization, and the development of positive management aims in personnel administration have largely determined the character of the American civil service today. But accompanying and conditioning these movements have been the attitudes and traditions springing from the conditions of an individualistic and pioneer society, which found their fullest expression in Jacksonian democracy.

The last several decades have witnessed the rise of the "new management," which has been applied to both business and government. Its principles could never have been extended to the sphere of public administration, however, had not the civil service reform movement created the nucleus of a stable body of public employees.

At the same time, the success of scientific management in business played no small part in stimulating the movement for efficiency and economy in the governmental realm. Finally, centralization of power and leadership, and dependence on administrative authority raise all the more insistently serious questions concerning the means of popular control over the bureaucracy.

The particular effect of the latest emphasis on the human aspects of management has been to recognize personnel administration as a positive force in developing leadership, in achieving the most productive efforts of workers, in fostering stable, democratic employer-employee relations, and in evolving the most effective human relations at all points in a work situation. Surely one of the answers to the problem of popular control of bureaucracy is public insistence on having executives who understand and follow such principles of administration. Only an organization that is democratically run internally, as well as competently run, can fully respond to its obligations as a public enterprise in a democracy.[42]

[42] See the comment by Paul Appleby on this point, quoted in Chapter 11, p. 254.

3

Scope and Status of Public Employment

I. SCOPE

Taken as a group, our public agencies are far and away the largest employers in the United States and are carrying on functions that overtop all others in their importance. Even in the United States it is literally true today that the State is omnipresent. It reaches into every aspect of our lives. Never before has the very existence of society depended so completely upon government.

The essential work of government is being conducted in the United States today by some 175,000 separate political jurisdictions, which in 1954 were employing nearly *one-ninth* of all the gainfully employed persons in the country. This great army of public servants totaled over 7,000,000 persons, excluding military personnel. Their distribution among the major jurisdictions is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Number of Employees, 1954

	Full-Time Employees	All Employees
Federal	2,203,000	2,373,000
State (non-school)	776,000	839,000
City (non-school)	1,026,000	1,220,000
County, township and minor units (non-school)	589,000	751,000
Public education (state and local)	1,755,000	2,050,000
Total	6,349,000	7,233,000

SOURCE: Bureau of the Census, *Government Employment: 1954* (Washington: May, 1955), p. 9.

The range and variety of public employments are almost as comprehensive as a dictionary of human occupations. In the Federal service there are about 10,000 different classes of positions. Their description in the form of

specifications, with many still incomplete, occupies thousands of printed pages.[1]

In the total Federal service, the occupations include the whole gamut of clerical and administrative positions, the domestic and community service occupations, and the standard skilled trades, as well as such special occupations as the following: taxidermist, fish culturist, barber-shop inspector, glassblower, criminal investigator, morgue attendant, optical worker, wheelwright, bridge-tender, and many others. On the technical side appear over forty different types of engineers. In addition to the usual types, there are aeronautical, hydrographic, lighthouse, traffic, electronic, geodetic, and cadastral engineers. Among the several general categories of science, covering thirty broad occupations, are to be found not only the biologists, chemists, and physicists, but also such specialists as silviculturist, agronomist, pharmacognosist, park naturalist, geomorphologist, meteorologist, archaeologist, and cryptographer. In the medical and hospital fields are the doctors and nurses, the various therapy and laboratory specialists, and related occupations. Law, economics, political science, public and business administration, and other broad areas are each represented by still other specialized activities. These titles give some idea of the range of occupations represented in the modern public service.

In the states, too, which employ some 839,000 persons, a description of the classes of positions is hardly less imposing. California, typical of the larger states, listed over 2200 classes of positions in 1955. Minnesota, nearer average size, had over 800 classes. Although the range is less broad than in the case of the Federal service, the positions run the gamut from the unskilled to the most highly specialized and technical. Even in municipalities the number of occupations ranges from the three or four hundred in moderate-size cities to somewhere between five hundred and a thousand in major centers.

One would go far before he discovered a business enterprise employing a greater variety of skilled and technical workers than is found in a modern city government. In any large industrial center there are few private firms spending as much on their annual pay rolls as the city itself. Philadelphia, for example, spent over $100,000,000 in 1954, and the annual pay roll for New York City has topped a billion dollars for a number of years.[2]

Taken as a group, the county governments also enter the lists as important employers. Although the occupations of a typical county are less varied, over half a million workers (not counting public-school personnel) are employed by these units.

The scope of public employment may also be measured in terms of pay

[1] U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Position Classification Standards* (Washington: 1948–1955, published in loose-leaf form).

[2] Computed from Bureau of the Census, "City Employment in 1954," *Government Employment*, April, 1955, pp. 14 and 17.

rolls. Various studies show that, outside the Federal Government, well over half of the operating public expenditures goes for wages and salaries. The amount going for wages and salaries was close to $10 billion in 1954 in the national civil service alone. The aggregate for all governmental employment in 1954 was approximately $23,900,000,000.[3]

The above review indicates what a vast enterprise the public business in this country has become. That it is bound to expand even farther no one who is alive to current world affairs will doubt. The long-cherished fiction that government is merely incidental to American life and is engaged in supplying more or less routine services must be recognized as contrary to the facts, even by the most obtuse observer. If this great machine is to run smoothly, if the public whose welfare is dependent on it is to be well served, it behooves the public in its own interest to elevate the status of governmental employment to the end that the more or most capable, the better or best trained, and the ambitious members of the citizenry will be attracted into it. As A. Lawrence Lowell wrote some years ago: "Democracy cannot afford to do less than employ the best instrument for the accomplishment of its ends; and the best instrument yet devised is the trained brain of man."

II. STATUS

A. LIMITED PRESTIGE

Until recent years the prestige attaching to public employment was singularly low in the United States. In fact, it was and probably still is lower in this country than in any other progressive state in the world. As we have traditionally looked upon government as incidental to the main business of life, so the better class of young people have too often failed to consider the desirability of entering upon a governmental career. Many capable men and women now found in public employment happened into it or sought a public position in the absence of a better opening or as a makeshift. In the high schools, colleges, and universities, neither official nor unofficial vocational advisers have done as much as they should to stimulate their students to anticipate and prepare for employment with public agencies.

The most sweeping evidence on the lack of prestige was brought together by Leonard D. White of the University of Chicago, who checked the attitudes of some 5000 people in Chicago in the twenties. He found that "Employment by the city apparently tends to command the respect of the immature, the uneducated, the foreign born, and the laboring people."[4] No

[3] For the twelve-month period ending with October, 1954. Bureau of the Census, *Government Employment: 1954* (Washington: May, 1955), p. 1.

[4] Leonard D. White, *Prestige Value of Public Employment* (Chicago: 1929), p. 144.

more flattering were the reactions of some 7000 additional persons interviewed in cities located in ten states.[5]

Since the thirties, however, a considerable change has taken place. This applies particularly to the Federal Government and a few states and local areas. The merit system has been more widely adopted; the upper ranges of positions are being filled by promotion from within; modern personnel policies are being put into effect; and, not least of all, young people of first-class ability have turned increasingly to the public service, especially in the absence of openings in other fields. Illustrative of the early stages of this change were the responses to a questionnaire administered to 6000 persons at the New York World's Fair in 1939. To the question whether the public service offers an attractive career to young people, the average was at 80 on a scale from 0 (total disapproval of the statement) to 100 (total approval). This sample was probably overloaded with metropolitan residents, who might well reflect the special prestige of the world's largest city.[6] During World War II, when men and women of outstanding attainment vied with each other to do their patriotic bit, there was no question of the high prestige of the Federal service or Federal employment. No doubt there has been considerable decline from this peak but probably not to the point that obtained back in the twenties.

Some specific evidence of continuing prestige is to be found in the sustained interest in the examinations given by the United States Civil Service Commission for college-caliber youth in economics, statistics, chemistry, public administration, and the like. Each year thousands of students enter the competition, among them many of the best products of the campuses. Thousands have been appointed to junior positions and are finding satisfaction in their work and the prospects for future advancement. Each year since 1934 such examinations have attracted an increasing number of young men and women. To Leonard D. White, a former member of the United States Civil Service Commission, goes the major credit for the early stages of this development. The idea of a "career service" has apparently been well planted among Washington executives. This contrasts strikingly with the situation that prevailed in the twenties, when government employment was a last resort for college-trained young people.

That a prestige problem still remains, however, is not to be gainsaid. The first Hoover Commission conducted a questionnaire poll in 1948 among that

[5] See White, *Further Contributions to the Prestige Value of Public Employment* (Chicago: 1932).

[6] For a general discussion see the symposium "Public Attitudes Toward Public Personnel" in *Personnel Administration*, January, 1947, particularly the article "Why Bureaucracy Is Belittled," by G. Lyle Belsley. For reports on the World's Fair study and on one in Cincinnati see *Public Relations of Public Personnel Agencies*, A Report Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly by the Committee on Public Relations of Public Personnel Agencies, William E. Mosher, Chairman (Chicago: 1941), pp. 57–61, 209–239, 250–259.

year's college and university seniors, resulting in a sample of 3448 replies from ninety-four institutions throughout the United States. Analysis showed that Federal employment still was disfavored more than it was favored. Government was considered superior to private employment principally in terms of three motivation factors: security, opportunity for public service, and employee benefits (leave, retirement, and health). But for those incentives which the students rated most important—salaries, opportunity for promotion and for personal development, employee prestige and recognition, and incentives to improve efficiency—a substantial majority favored private employment.[7]

In a study of attitudes of 660 college seniors toward industrial and Federal Government employment in 1953, a strong preference was still found for the private business career. Those with majors in the social sciences were more favorably inclined toward government than those in engineering and science. Government's strongest appeal to this group lay in the assumption that it required less work "under pressure," provided good experience for entrance into industry, and had more favorable policies on leave, retirement, and tenure—all of which were subject to question as a matter of fact, with the possible exception of the matter of leave. Students consider general work preference and promotion opportunity, in that order, and, to a considerably lesser extent, pay as the most important considerations in choosing a career. On all three counts, a clear majority favored industry over government.[8]

When study is made of those who are already in public employment, however, a different picture is obtained. A questionnaire study in 1947 revealed that, among 730 Federal employees in the higher professional and administrative brackets (65 percent had education beyond a bachelor's degree), almost three-quarters of the group intended to remain in government service. As contrasted with their reasons given for entering the Federal service in the first place, this group had become less interested in salary *per se* but more interested in retirement advantages. Most significant is the fact that 50 percent of the reasons given for remaining concerned professional interest, as contrasted with only 33 percent of the reasons given at the time of entering the service. If service in a public agency increases one's professional interest in his field, we might assume that it is a satisfactory mode of employment. However, this is more likely to be true among higher-level professional people than among the rank and file.[9]

In 1950 a study of the attitudes of 335 current and former government

[7] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Federal Personnel*, Task Force Report (Washington: January, 1949), p. 7.

[8] The American University (Charles M. Hersh, Principal Investigator), *College Seniors and Federal Employment*, report of a research study for the Division of Psychological Sciences, Office of Naval Research (Washington: January, 1953).

[9] Frances T. Cahn, *Federal Employees in War and Peace* (Washington: 1949), pp. 178–183.

scientists and engineers revealed that the opportunity to do interesting, challenging, or important work was clearly the strongest attraction of public employment, while the prospect of better pay had the strongest pulling power to lure these employees away from their Federal jobs. It is particularly noteworthy that work-centered considerations—working conditions, quality of co-workers and supervisors, nature of the projects, and freedom of research—were definitely the principal aspects of government work which these specialists "especially liked." Economic advantages were listed less than half as frequently.[10] This also had been the conclusion of a 1949 survey of former interns under the National Institute of Public Affairs. The foremost satisfactions expressed by this group of 423 respondents as to a career in the Federal service were, in this order: helping promote the general welfare through governmental action; playing a part in urgent, dramatic national and international affairs; carrying important responsibilities even at junior levels; and having high-type, stimulating, and congenial employee associates.[11]

The conclusion is inescapable that the nature of the work is the most appealing aspect of a career; that the attractions and satisfactions in government employment are genuine in this respect; but that people outside of public employment, and particularly students, are not fully aware of these advantages.

There is no doubt that depression and later war conditions contributed to the growth of interest in openings in Federal employment. Other jurisdictions, both state and local, likewise profited from the state of the labor market. The more progressive ones have at the same time greatly improved their employment policies from stem to stern. They are creating real competition with private employers. No one acquainted with the public service will deny that the prestige of public employment is generally on the upgrade, even though there has been some decline since the war. Unfortunately, too, a number of states and local jurisdictions continue to rumble along in the traditional ruts made by party politics and benighted personnel management.

A significant factor has been the increasing willingness of outstanding businessmen and other leaders to give the public service its due. Not only have testimonials been frequent, but they have shown more insight into the special demands of public employment, particularly upon executives. There is much meaning in the following excerpt from the *Harvard Business Review:* "Just as every young man might very well benefit from a year's

[10] Clark D. Ahlberg and John C. Honey, *Attitudes of Scientists and Engineers About Their Government Employment,* A Study Conducted by the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, for the Office of Naval Research (Syracuse: July, 1950).

[11] Karl E. Stromsem and Mitchell Dreese, "Attitudes of NIPA Interns Toward a Career in the Federal Service," *Public Administration Review,* Autumn, 1950, pp. 254–261.

compulsory military service, so it would be well if citizens could somehow have a year of compulsory civil service. They would be better business and professional men and far better citizens, if they lived through it. They would learn why government officials do not behave like human beings, an important reason being the impossible demands of the people themselves. One year upon a bureaucratic stage, the target of catcalls and cat carcasses, would make most people into moderate and constructive critics of government."[12] Similar proposals have been made by well-known business leaders who have served in public posts in recent years.[13]

The two most recent chairmen of the U.S. Civil Service Commission have taken a special interest in this problem of prestige. Decrying the blanket assaults on bureaucrats as undermining our democratic institutions, they have gone to considerable effort to correct the myths about public employees and public employment.[14]

The second Hoover Commission asserted in 1955: "Prestige attached to Government service is the most important intangible which can attract to the public service the type of men who are so much needed."[15] The commission's Task Force made a ringing plea for fairness in exercise of the right of democratically governed citizens to criticize the servants of the State. Recognizing the need for high standards of conduct and propriety in the government service, it urged that criticism be both specific and accurate: "Sweeping accusations and unsupported charges can damage the public service in a way that more than offsets the benefits of criticism." This being the case, the Task Force singled out political executives as bearing a special obligation to defend their employees, as well as themselves, from untruths. "Defense is the corollary of discipline. Both are essential."[16]

No more cogent plea for upholding public recognition of the competence and devotion found among government workers has been made than that by the Sixth American Assembly, which asserted in the conclusion to its report in 1954: "As a people we can no longer afford the luxury of unin-

[12] J. Harold DeNike, "Notes of a Neophyte Bureaucrat," *Harvard Business Review*, Summer, 1944.

[13] For example, Clarence Randall, Chairman of the Board of the Inland Steel Corporation, in his eloquent article, "A Good Word for Washington," *Life*, April 4, 1955.

[14] Chairman Robert Ramspeck in 1951 and 1952 made a series of important speeches on the subject throughout the country. Chairman Philip Young, when asked if he agreed with businessmen who rated government workers at least as good as those in industry, replied in 1953: "I'll go even further than that. In my years of working with them, I came to the conclusion that the people who work for Government have even greater loyalty, more idealism, a stronger desire to get a job done and get it done well than employees of private industry. Among them, you'll find a wonderful bond of common understanding and idealism."—National Civil Service League, *Good Government*, March–April, 1953, p. 10.

[15] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), p. 77.

[16] *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), p. 119.

formed and unreasoning deprecation of public employees. Deep-seated and long-standing biases and misconceptions must be rooted out of the American folklore relative to Government and public employment."[17]

B. NEGLECT OF PERSONNEL BY EXECUTIVE

That the preëminent task of management through all of the various channels of production is the direction of the activities of human beings is a truth that cannot be deduced from observation of the practices of the great number of public executives in this country. Under present-day conditions the chief executive gives his attention to certain staff functions, such as budgetary and accounting procedures, and in some cases he may see to it that the purchasing of supplies is well organized in the hands of a qualified staff. But when it comes to the personnel under his control, he as often as not accepts the established practices as something more or less inevitable. A most casual inspection would reveal how indefensible are many conditions arising under this situation. Inequalities in salary rates, inefficiency, indifference, lack of discipline and courtesy, lack of systematic training of newcomers, limited promotional opportunities, and favoritism of all sorts characterize many public jurisdictions—as well as much of private enterprise—in the United States. There are notable exceptions to this indictment, and their number is increasing. But the shortcomings listed are still too prevalent.

Motives, incentives, and interests of the workers become a part of the everyday thinking of the up-to-date employer. These are no longer symbols of vague and shadowy things. They stand for something intangible, it is true, but are not because of that less real. Only recently, morale, a thing of the spirit, was foreign to the executive's vocabulary and thought; today many count it among their most precious business assets.

Why has there been slow progress along these lines among public agencies? It is, in the first place, doubtless due to the fact that under our system of government the chief executive and his corps of immediate assistants are customarily "birds of passage." The responsible heads of the hierarchy of public servants in a given jurisdiction are usually inexperienced in public management and, what is more, are not likely to be in office for more than

[17] Sixth American Assembly, Columbia University, *The Federal Government Service: Its Character, Prestige, and Problems*, final ed. (New York: 1954), p. 186.

As a general article on this whole subject, see the excellent discussion by W. Richard Lomax, "Prestige Values in Public Employment in the United States and Canada," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1950, pp. 12–18. For a sample of other significant expressions on the prestige of the public service, see Paul Appleby, *Big Democracy* (New York: 1945), *passim*, and the following articles in *Personnel Administration:* Chester Bowles, "New Goals for the Public Service," June, 1946; O. Glenn Stahl, "Gentlemen Affected with a Public Interest," November, 1946; Frederick M. Davenport, "The Federal Service and Public Esteem," March, 1948; Gordon R. Clapp, "What Price Ability in the Public Service," May, 1948; W. S. Andress, "What Price Prestige," January, 1949.

a fairly brief space of time.[18] Therefore, even though they might wish to introduce innovations looking toward the development of a real *esprit de corps*, they would hesitate to do so because of lack of background in the circumstances surrounding and peculiar to the government service. Furthermore, there may well be passive resistance on the part of the permanent staff assistants and supervisors of the second line who do not take readily to innovations that might disturb their authority and the ways of doing things to which they have long been accustomed.

A second important reason is that the executive is bound to be responsive to the political leaders who secure his election. Such leaders are quick to make themselves heard when important appointments are to be made and when changes are proposed adversely affecting the interests of their protégés on the public pay rolls. That measures looking toward the equalization of salaries, the penalizing of inefficiency, the enforcement of discipline, and the like have such an effect goes without saying. The typical public executive is, therefore, prone not to change the routine relating to salaries, appointments, promotions, and other personnel matters, even though changes are dictated by principles of sound administration.

Third, the management of personnel was not until recent years recognized as a specialized function calling for expertness and appropriate authority. In many an agency personnel duties were handled by a chief clerk responsible for the routines of securing eligible lists, keeping records, and the like. All this added up to the neglect of important activities in the personnel sphere, to conflicting policies, and to the inertia and jealousy characteristic of those enjoying vested rights.[19]

These are the most important reasons for the comparative inaction of the chief executive and the consequent backwardness of the personnel movement in so many areas of government. It cannot be too emphatically stated that no worth-while progress can be made without the initiative and

[18] This is in the democratic tradition and in line with the historical fear of a permanent and efficient bureaucracy. As one observer put it, "Responsible government appears caught between the two alternatives: an experienced civil service or an untrained ministry; efficient bureaucracy on the one hand, inefficient democracy on the other."—Robert M. Dawson, *The Civil Service of Canada* (London: 1929), p. 111. However, as this author goes on to show, these may not be the only alternatives. Under proper organization, the political official and the bureaucrat may supplement each other.

[19] Paul Appleby, a former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, points out: "Cabinet members new to government or even new to the Cabinet level of government sometimes do greater damage to the administrative process than they offset by new contributions in the field of policy. To deprive them of the power to do great harm to administration and yet to open the way for them to make necessary policy injections is a continuing problem for which as yet no one has found a sound solution. Administration should therefore endeavor to provide itself with dynamism within its own organization. By so doing it could avoid altogether the threat of drastic revolution, could minimize the fluctuations of the political pendulum, and could make the march of government more continually progressive." Reprinted from *Big Democracy* by Paul H. Appleby by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Copyright 1945 by Paul H. Appleby, p. 106.

leadership of this official. If the personnel practices that are still stereotyped in many jurisdictions are to be vitalized, the vigorous leadership and the continuous attention of the chief himself will be needed. That constructive efforts will find ample reward is indicated by the progress made in the Federal Government in the past twenty years described in the preceding chapter. The establishment of personnel offices in the departments, the operation of interdepartmental consultative groups, the increasing decentralization of many personnel functions, the new organization of the Civil Service Commission are all indicative of a comprehensive and integrated personnel program for the whole service.

C. A SHIFTING BODY OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

One of the peculiarities of American government as compared with those of foreign countries lies in a disturbing readiness to commit far-reaching and intricate problems of management to men of no previous practical experience in the field concerned. In both city and state it is customary to replace important officials in charge of operations when the political tide turns. This reference is not so much to officials responsible for determining policy, who properly come and go with changes in administration, as to those charged with execution of policy.

The losses resulting from this practice are many. From the viewpoint of personnel control it is particularly disastrous for the development of leadership, which is a prime requirement of modern management. It is evident that if the administrative heads are "birds of passage" they cannot gain such a grasp of the work of their organization as sound leadership demands. It may be taken for granted that the superior official cannot command the respect and confidence of his staff unless he has a real appreciation of the staff's job.

Further, there is probably no single factor contributing so much toward the perpetuation of established routine and the consequent suppression of interest and initiative among the permanent workers of the staff as the lack of qualities of leadership and initiative on the part of the changing department heads. The proverbial prevalence of governmental red tape is to be charged, in part at least, to this account.[20]

The tenacity with which we hold to the Jacksonian belief that any upright citizen is qualified to meet the requirements of practically any public office, particularly those of a managerial character, is almost incomprehensible in a country which has made a fetish of the science of management. Although we have an increasing number of schools of public ad-

[20] The greater prevalence of red tape in public enterprises than in many private ones is also due in part to the fact that the public official is held more closely accountable for his acts. He is circumscribed by rules and regulations and statutory law. Red tape may be a guarantee of equal treatment for all comers.

ministration, we still do not generally recruit enough young men who have some promise of administrative capacities. Nor do we ordinarily provide sufficient training after employment designed to develop such capacities. Finally, we are more likely than not to cut off promotional opportunities by appointing outsiders inexperienced in the ways of public business to the positions which involve administrative responsibilities. As a consequence, large numbers of public servants are condemned to work always under a low promotional ceiling. The first-rank men are thus likely to be temporary appointees, while those in the lower ranks, although perhaps permanent, have usually come up through clerical channels and, however well acquainted with departmental routine, are men of clerical stature.

The wartime expansion of the Federal service called attention as never before to the need for trained executives. While substantial strides have been made in that service toward development of an administrative corps, we still have not bred in this country a race of high-grade permanent officials who correspond to the permanent undersecretaries in the departments of the British civil service. Nevertheless, the progress of the merit system, as discussed in the preceding chapter, indicates the degree to which all except the top policy-determining officials are becoming career officials.[21] In addition to the Federal Government, this is evidenced in such jurisdictions as New York City, Milwaukee, Los Angeles, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and California.

The prospects for further advances with respect to the inclusion of all except top-ranking officials within the range of the merit system are more promising today than ever before.[22] This is obviously necessary if manage-

[21] The 1955 Hoover Commission urged that the line of demarcation between the career and noncareer services be drawn above the bureau chief level, with policy-determining posts confined to the offices of each Cabinet secretary. Although it recommended increasing the number of noncareer, political assistants in each department, it clearly expected the "carrying-out" functions to embrace many high-level career jobs. Incumbents of the latter would be freed of involvement in public advocacy of politically charged points of view. See *Personnel and Civil Service*, pp. 25–36; *Task Force Report*, pp. 1–48.

An excellent discussion appears in David M. Levitan, "Administrative Responsibility," *Political Science Quarterly*, December, 1946, pp. 562–598.

The following statement offers another approach to the concept of "policy-determining officials": "The only posts which should properly be exempted as policy-determining, therefore, should be those of staff nature in the narrow sense of the term, called advisory in these chapters. Their occupants should share the determinative prerogatives of the Secretary; they should act only for him and through him. Free from routine responsibilities, they should never be part of the administrative chain."—Arthur W. Macmahon and John D. Millett, *Federal Administrators* (New York: 1939), pp. 136–137.

[22] Macmahon and Millett made a careful and revealing prewar study of the character of bureau heads, assistants, and undersecretaries in the several Federal organizations, *op. cit.* The second Hoover Task Force found in April, 1954, that out of 266 bureau chief positions in 45 major agencies, 76 were in the competitive civil service and 41 were filled by military officers. The others were excepted as follows: 80 by statute, with 50 filled by presidential appointment; and 69 by action of the Civil Service Commission. See *Task Force Report*, p. 22.

ment is to be professionalized and if the idea of a career service is to be promoted.

A final characteristic of the usual organization and management of public agencies is the relative autonomy permitted each department, particularly with respect to the handling of personnel. This is still true, despite recent advances in the direction of integration. It leads to a great diversity of personnel practices as to salaries, hours, leaves, discipline, and so forth. Uniformity of salary scales, working conditions, and the like is mandatory for the upbuilding and maintenance of morale, the ultimate test of good personnel management. But this can be achieved only through integration and coördination under common policy leadership.[23]

D. THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION'S ROLE

A fourth factor that has contributed to the existing "civil service tradition" is the influence of the civil service commission as the employment agency of government. The contributions to better government that have been made by this agency have already been touched upon and are further considered in the chapters on personnel organization.[24] They have been significant and eminently worth while.

But in the attempt to analyze and evaluate the factors that have brought about the "civil service tradition" one is bound to point out that the problem of management has been greatly complicated by the existence of this semiexternal and so-called nonpartisan employment agency. The assignment of extensive power to the typical civil service commission has caused a division of control in the personnel field that has sometimes proved to be harmful. Where there is lack of contact and of coöperation with operating heads, an effective job cannot be done. A friend and advocate of the civil service commission form and one widely acquainted with its operations once said: "Department heads co-operate with them [successful civil service administrators] because they have to, not because they want to, and the instant their firm hand is removed most department heads will largely or entirely cease to co-operate." The same critic raises the question whether even the most successful commissions have done much more than get the department heads to "swallow a sugar-coated pill with none too good grace."

Such a statement might well be qualified now, because a substantial number of cases may be cited where there has been fairly close coöperation be-

[23] A less than up-to-date but still sound treatment of this subject, with definite reference to the Federal Government, will be found in F. W. Reeves and P. T. David, *Personnel Administration in the Federal Government*, President's Committee on Administrative Management, No. 1 (Washington: 1937), pp. 37–43.

[24] See particularly Chapter 23.

tween a commission and administrative officers, a wholesome situation that is a *sine qua non* of successful personnel administration. What is significant for our thesis is that in most of these cases the commission has had the sustained backing of the chief executive. This has been true, for example, in Cincinnati, Los Angeles, and Milwaukee, and coincides with the opinion of a prominent chief examiner of one of our large cities, who wrote that "one of the most prominent facts in civil service administration so far is that its efficiency has depended so largely upon the attitude of the executive in power or perhaps his party."

Finally, reference should be made to the inherited and traditional attitude of a goodly number of commissions that they are primarily guardians at the gate and must constantly be on the alert against the nefarious machinations of appointing officials who would "put something over" on them. Such commissions stubbornly insist on their rights, rigorously enforce their rules and regulations, and stand on the letter of the law. They forget that they are primarily *facilitating* agencies and as such an integral part of the administration process.

The conclusion seems justified that the assignment of certain functions of personnel management to a semiexternal, nonprofessional, and presumably nonpartisan employment agency greatly complicates the personnel situation and constitutes an essential part of the problem involved in the "civil service tradition."

E. POLITICAL INFLUENCE

Lord Bryce once wrote, "There is no great democracy in the world in which politics so influences administration as in the United States." Although this observation was made a good many years ago and considerable improvement has since taken place, the comparison is still unassailable. If we appeal to our customary arbiter in matters of this sort—i.e., the man in the street—we will find that he is of the opinion that politics affects all aspects of public administration, and he is likely to accept this condition as inevitable. He might advise no one to enter public service unless he had political "pull."

There is no need to pile up evidence to prove that the spoils system is far from dead. Even under the presumably protective machinery of the civil service commission, changes in the complexion of the party in control have led more than once to a pretty thorough house cleaning of nonconforming employees in the city halls and the state capitols, and, to a lesser extent, in the office buildings of the Federal Government. So far as the writer knows, no one has attempted to estimate what these periodic house cleanings cost the citizens concerned in the given governmental unit. If a railroad or a large business concern should pursue any such policy with a change in the personnel of its board of directors, it might be irretrievably

in the red. But our fellow citizens in many areas accept this state of affairs either in silent acquiescence or with a sense of helplessness. A few openly defend it.

Not alone are the appointment policies of government strongly influenced by political and personal considerations, but they play havoc with every other phase of employment from initial selection to removal. Because of them, the doctrine of civil service neutrality is not so well developed in this country as in England. More than any other single factor, partisan and personal politics determine the quality and backwardness of public administration, as well as the still somewhat unfavorable repute of government as an employer. The palmier days of money graft have passed with the introduction of modern accounting systems and higher moral standards, but we are still paying the political parties a high bonus for the services they perform by permitting position graft on a grand scale.

Nevertheless, as we have already found in the previous chapter, progress against political influence has been substantial since the thirties. The public impact of reports by various commissions, the continuing efforts of the National Civil Service League, and the official actions of many chief executives have brought us into a new era of public personnel administration. Public employee associations, which have become increasingly influential, have thrown their weight behind the merit system. Perhaps, too, the general public has become somewhat less lethargic on public affairs because of the war and the rising costs of government. Such forces and conditions have joined to make the period 1935–1955 notable for advances in the realm of public personnel management. As previously noted, a number of states, cities, and counties have enacted merit system laws for the first time; the scope of the functions of already established commissions has been expanded; more adequate financial support has been forthcoming in many jurisdictions; state health and welfare agencies are profiting from merit programs; interdepartmental personnel councils are being established in a few jurisdictions; and, finally, the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada and the Society for Personnel Administration are contributing in a substantial way to the professional development of those responsible for the operation of personnel agencies.

The most serious effect of political influence at present, even where the merit system is well entrenched, is the tendency of some legislators to meddle in the internal management of executive departments. Too often, in an effort to please a constituent or his own ego, a legislator tries to influence an appointment or a promotion or interfere with a proposed separation. It is to the credit of many, however, particularly in the United States Congress, that they stay above such petty activities. Some assist a constituent only to the extent of getting the facts on an individual personnel transaction, recognizing that the executive branch, if it is to be held

responsible for administration, must alone exercise authority in such matters as discipline, removal, and advancement.

Discussion of political influence should not be concluded without some acknowledgment that there is room for argument on the degree to which "controlled patronage" should exist in our form of government. Appleby, for example, believes that the latitude of Federal department heads to make appointments excepted from competition should be extended "up to a total of perhaps thirty in an entire department," but he cautions that "responsible administrators should determine what jobs are of the type that require only simple qualifications and where, consequently, controlled patronage will not result in deterioration of personnel."[25] He subsequently makes a profound observation relating to our nonparliamentary type of government:

> Except for this popular demand on them, members of Congress as a whole would gladly see patronage discarded. The larger question is not one of direct political benefit to them but rather one of maintaining and developing a greater unity between the legislative and executive branches. The major party, which ordinarily controls both of them, offers practically the sole means of establishing such unity, for the Constitution itself formally divides these two great political branches. And patronage serves to bring the two branches to at least some little area of common ground. To rule patronage out of even new, non-Civil Service agencies will raise more insistently the question of certain fundamental, structural reforms within the government.[26]

F. THE CHARITY CONCEPT

No analysis of the "civil service tradition" is complete without some recognition of the persistent tendency to view government employment as a sort of gigantic eleemosynary institution. In the minds of many job seekers and politicians—and to a large extent the general public—the public service is still a place that has jobs to be dispensed on some "fair" basis—i.e., either to the party faithful, to various localities on the basis of population, to those "in need" of employment, or to groups to which the public owes an obligation. Too rarely, outside academic or official circles, do we encounter the view that the government is an employer seeking talent—a very special, important employer entitled to get and expected to use the most modern methods to secure the ablest personnel it can possibly attract and hold.

The charity concept is most clearly evidenced in such legal provisions as prohibition against holding two jobs at once (even where the hours of work and the duties are clearly compatible), restrictions on the number

[25] *Op. cit.*, pp. 148, 152. Reprinted from *Big Democracy* by Paul H. Appleby by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 154–155.

of members of one family who may work for the government, traditional low salary ceilings in top public jobs, residence requirements in states and localities and the apportionment rule in the Federal service, prohibitions against educational requirements for entrance, veteran preference laws, and excessive limitations imposed on the removal process. Most or all of these, in varied form, are found in nearly every jurisdiction in the United States. To be sure, some of these statutes—that on apportionment in the Federal service, for example—are flexible enough so that they offer no serious hindrance to the government as an employer. But only on the logic of the charity concept are many such laws and rules easy to defend.

Curiously, the concept has penetrated the operation of the merit system itself. Civil service commissions, in their zeal to protect "open competition," often fall into the error of scuttling the initial objective of securing the best-qualified people for positions. Open competition, pressed to an absurd extreme, could mean complete blocking of recruitment, for there would be no limit in time or space to which competition should be confined if it were to be truly and perfectly "open" to all comers at all times. It would also imply complete perfection of the measurement of human capabilities—an ideal still beyond our grasp. Compromise of the principle is clearly necessary to make it reasonable. Yet public executives frequently must contest with civil service commission zealots, who are much more sensitive to possible complaints of applicants if the commission fails to keep the candidacy field open or broad enough than they are to the needs of the operating departments for exceptional talent. We are not referring here to issues where there is danger of inroads by political patronage. Rather, the problems are usually in such innocent areas as plans for internships, arranging with educational institutions for the employment of coöperative students, use of consultants, and temporary appointments. In these and similar areas common sense dictates that open competition is unworkable and vitiates the larger objective for which the arrangement is intended. One writer has complained that the Federal Civil Service Act "improved the method by which the 'spoils' were to be distributed, but it did not get far away from the idea of government jobs as lucrative 'plums' to be awarded to the capable instead of merely to the political faithful."[27]

This is not to say that in a democracy the public employer can ignore the elements of fairness and justice in recruitment and selection. Neither should this be taken to condone prejudicial action for arbitrary or irrelevant reasons such as race, religion, or sex. The point is simply that the orientation should not be largely toward the job seeker; it should be first toward the employer and his needs. Secondarily comes the matter of

[27] W. S. Andress, "What Price Prestige," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1949, p. 8. This article discusses the charity concept at greater length.

equity in this process of ferreting out and retaining the best minds and hands in the service. Where "fairness" to all applicants and the ideal of merit (i.e., getting the best-qualified persons) appear to conflict, the scale should be tipped in favor of merit. This is the only procedure consistent with an efficient public service in a technological age.

SUMMARY

Such are the chief elements in the "civil service tradition." Such are the challenge and the problem that confront public management. To solve the problem requires statesmanship of a high order. The hand of tradition, a positive and persistent force, must be removed. Intangibles, such as the prestige problem and the "charity concept," must continue to be attacked. The insistence on official prerogatives and traditional authority must be reduced. Personnel administration must be coördinated across departmental lines in spite of resentment and the charges of "interference" that may ensue. Finally—and this is the meat of the nut—meeting the challenge demands that the chief executive make personnel his personal and daily problem.

The "finally" is the prime objective of the chapter. Any progress in the standards of the work force will be conditioned by and in direct proportion to the interest and the efforts of the chief executive. This task cannot be entrusted to separate department heads or to subordinate agencies, least of all to a more or less isolated commission, such as the civil service commission usually is. Personnel control is too vital a function to delegate to those who are not a "part of the works."

The future success of public administration is bound up in the continual rejuvenation of the bureaucracy. The present extent and further inevitable extension of governmental functions, which already touch upon our lives at all vital points, will sooner or later make it mandatory upon all public authorities to make public service an attractive career. This calls for positive, authoritative, and sustained action on the part of the chief executive, necessarily with the aid and stimulation of capable personnel assistants. His is the task of regenerating the public service and of infusing into his workers the faith that they are members of a great enterprise which is dependent for success on their spirit and devotion. No more pressing task awaits him. No more far-reaching problem in the field of public management remains to be solved.

PART II

Staffing

There is nothing I am so anxious about as good nominations, conscious that the merit as well as the reputation of an administration depends as much on that as on its measures.

—Thomas Jefferson, *Writings*, Memorial ed., Vol. IX, p. 248 (April 8, 1801)

4

Recruitment

No element of the career service system is more important than the recruitment policy.[1]

The selection process has always been the central point of interest in a public personnel program, and for a variety of reasons. It is, first of all, the cornerstone of the whole personnel structure. Unless recruitment policy is soundly conceived, there can be little hope of building a first-rate staff. It is, secondly, that aspect of the employment program in respect to which public personnel practices differ most strikingly from private. The merit system implies, above all else, a particular system of recruitment and selection.

The civil service commission was originally conceived as a recruiting agency, and little more. It was designed to eliminate favoritism in the selection process and to place a premium on competence and ability, as demonstrated in competitive tests. The interest of civil service reformers, therefore, always centered here.

But under the historic emphasis, there was a tendency to conceive of recruitment in negative terms. The task was to keep out the unfit, rather than to encourage the best to enter. It was naïvely assumed that, if political favoritism could be excluded from the selection process, men of ability would somehow find their way into the public service. The assumption long ago proved erroneous, yet only slowly did the negative emphasis give way to positive recruitment policies. How true this is must be evident to everyone who has had occasion to examine the literature and publicity issued by the average civil service commission in carrying out recruitment activities. Much of it seems consciously designed to discourage applicants rather than to stimulate them, although there has been notable improvement during and since World War II.

[1] Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel, *Better Government Personnel*, p. 37. The most important single work on the subject of this chapter is *Recruiting Applicants for the Public Service*, A Report Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly by the Committee on Recruiting Applicants for the Public Service, J. Donald Kingsley, Chairman (Chicago: 1942).

This is not to suggest that all jurisdictions have failed in this respect or that able recruits have not, in fact, entered the various services. Particularly since the depression and the war, capable candidates have been streaming toward public employment. Yet positive recruitment and selection policies are essential, whatever the state of the labor market.

Among the basic elements in a positive program of selection are the following: discovery and cultivation of the best employment market for the positions involved; use of attractive recruiting literature and of adequate publicity; employment of up-to-date tests of high selectivity and reliability; adequate search for candidates from within the service; a placement program that puts the right man in the right job; and a follow-up probationary program as an integral part of the selection process.

It is with such aspects of the employment program that this and the following chapters deal. The specific aim of the present chapter is to analyze the various factors involved in the process of recruitment and to suggest those points at which general practice is not in line with progressive personnel procedures.

I. JURISDICTION OF MERIT SYSTEM

Under the typical civil service law, the central personnel agency is given jurisdiction over specified groups of positions; in common civil service parlance, these positions are brought into the "classified service." The following are usually not subject to civil service commission control: elective officials, those appointed to special boards and commissions, heads of departments, and occasionally experts who may be permanent or temporary employees working under special contract. These are said to be in the "unclassified service." In the Federal service the term "classified" has been dropped. Positions subject to the merit system are in the "competitive service."

The term "classified service" has nothing to do with the grouping of positions into classes upon the basis of duties. It refers, rather, to that portion of the public service which has been brought under the merit system and over which the civil service commission has some jurisdiction. But the merit system and competition are not synonymous terms. The typical law also vests in the commission authority to determine which classified positions shall be filled by open competition, which filled by noncompetitive examination,[2] and which exempted from any test whatsoever.[3] In deter-

[2] The noncompetitive examination is synonymous with the familiar "pass" examination employed under the Federal law of 1871. The incumbents of noncompetitive positions are selected by the appointing officer, subject only to their passing a test imposed by the commission. There is no ranking of eligibles on the basis of test results.

[3] The Pendleton Act differs from the usual state and city laws in this particular. Under the Federal system, the law leaves the determination of these matters in the hands of the President.

mining classification the commission is merely deciding upon the method of selection most desirable in connection with each of the positions over which it has control.

It may be stated categorically at this point that the spirit, if not the letter, of the merit system demands open competition, wherever feasible. If the best are to serve the State, they can ordinarily be discovered from a number of applicants only through such competition. A noncompetitive examination procedure may result in qualified appointees, but there is usually no reason to believe that it results in the *best*-qualified. This is a distinction that needs to be kept constantly in mind. It is not necessarily implied that competition can be only by means of the traditional ranking of candidates by numerical ratings. They may also be grouped into broad categories of quality, recognizing that for many jobs examination methods do not lend themselves to fine distinctions.

Furthermore, there are positions which it is not feasible to fill through competitive methods, and where "the conditions of good administration" warrant the use of other means. In general, they fall into three groups: (1) certain positions of a highly technical nature, the qualifications for which are such that only a few persons can meet them; (2) high-grade administrative positions in which personality or experience may be the most important factor; (3) certain positions which are so undesirable for one or another reason that very few applicants can be discovered by any recruiting methods. It is obviously futile to attempt to fill a position by open competition if fewer than four candidates compete.[4] The freedom of choice given the appointing officer enables him, in such instances, to select whom he will from the applicants, and he might as well have followed such a procedure in the first place.

Unfortunately, however, many positions which do not fall in any of these three groups have been placed in the noncompetitive class in the various jurisdictions.[5] All too frequently, under pressure from appointing officers or others or because of an inadequate examining staff, positions are included in this class which could be filled without difficulty by competitive methods. When this is the case, the jurisdictional classification is being employed to weaken rather than to strengthen the merit system.

In the exempt class are found those positions which may be filled without examination of any kind. Usually, these fall into four groups: (1) laborers; (2) positions of a "confidential" or "policy-determining" character; (3) part-time or temporary positions; (4) positions which have not been filled satisfactorily by examination methods. Varying reasons are behind the

[4] The usual law provides for certification of the top three eligibles.

[5] In general, the proportion of noncompetitive positions should be small, although in case of emergency this method of selection offers the advantage of speed and may be legitimately employed.

exemption of each of these groups. That of laborers is widely defended because of the nature of the employment and on the specious ground that labor jobs are too unimportant for the attention of the personnel agency.[6] Employees, such as private secretaries or personal assistants, whose work is of a confidential nature are commonly exempted to give the appointing officer a free hand in the choice of those upon whom he depends most directly. Part-time or temporary positions are often exempted for two reasons. In the first place, the length of employment and its character may not warrant the effort and expense of selection by examination. In the second place, it has often been difficult to secure qualified workers who would accept temporary employment. Finally, there may be a few positions with duties or requirements of so peculiar a character that selection by examination does not yield the best results.

The exemption of specific positions from the ordinary processes of civil service selection offers one of the most serious and widely exploited possibilities of abuse to be found anywhere in the system. At this spot, more than at any other, the commission becomes the focal point for political pressures. Careful consideration of the list of exempted positions, which is included in many annual reports, will convince any unbiased observer that there is a reason, commensurate with sound personnel procedure, for the exemption of many of them. A large number, however, will be found not to differ from other positions which are included in the competitive class. In such cases, the assumption would seem warranted that the commission has yielded to political or personal pressure, or both.

II. THE FIELD OF RECRUITMENT

The area open to public recruiting agencies is limited in a number of directions. These limits are always in a state of flux and reflect, at any particular time, business conditions within the area of selection, educational emphases, general social attitudes, and indeed almost all the elements which contribute to the character of a civilization. Several of these are sufficiently well defined to permit of some degree of analysis and criticism.

In theory, under the merit system, all those persons possessing certain basic qualifications are prospective recruits for the public service. But actually this is never the case, and there are always large numbers of qualified persons who are outside the possible area of selection. Their numbers vary from time to time according to the state of the labor market, the character of the public attitudes toward governmental functioning and employment, and many other factors. Thus the potential reservoir of recruits has been seriously lowered in the United States by a society largely motivated by the acquisitive spirit, in which a powerful government has

[6] Laborers are sometimes classified separately in a "labor class."

been regarded with a jaundiced eye. To an appreciable extent government has been looked upon as a necessary evil, not a positive instrument of social control.

So long as such attitudes prevailed—and they have fluctuated from time to time—public service recruiting was under a shadow. Business was a good, government an evil. It was to business that social prestige attached. It was there that young people of ability naturally looked for a career. Until the effects of the business depression began to make themselves generally felt in 1930–1931, the numbers of prospective public recruits were seriously reduced by this low prestige. Similarly, following World War II, the ascendancy of material prosperity seriously lessened the attractions of government employment. Today the personnel agencies in many jurisdictions must labor unceasingly to dispel impressions that have crystallized over a period of approximately a hundred years, during which the country staggered along under the burden of the spoils system.

Along with its concomitants, low salaries and lack of career opportunities, this matter of prestige has been the most serious general limitation on the field of recruitment for public jurisdictions. The high caliber of personnel in many public agencies is all the more amazing in face of this insidious obstacle. With the gradual improvement of the prestige factor we can look forward to an influx of higher-quality staff even into regions of the service that are yet burdened with mediocre people.

Among the more specific considerations which further determine the area from which candidates can be recruited into the public service, the following are important: the character of the educational system, restrictions in regard to citizenship and residence, age and experience factors, sex barriers, and veteran preference provisions. We can do little more than touch upon these, although all of them bear directly upon the problem of recruitment, and each in its own way operates to determine the character and extent of the group from which personnel agencies may hope to recruit public workers.

A. THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

The demands of the service must always be related to the possible supply of recruits. The primary source of this supply is the schools and colleges. The State as employer must always be influenced by the State as educator, and the character of the educational system will determine to a certain extent that of the civil service.

In a penetrating passage, Walter Sharp once listed those general characteristics of the French educational system which bear upon recruitment: (1) the widespread reverence for learning which serves as the "mainspring of education in Europe"; (2) interest in broad intellectual, as opposed to

"practical," activities; and (3) its highly selective character.[7] In similar fashion, the broad characteristics of the American educational system which influence the character of the area of selection might be said to be (1) the marked tendency toward specilization and (2) the emphasis upon techniques and practical activities, rather than upon broad learning and conceptual understanding.

The emphasis upon the acquisition of specialized techniques to the neglect of conceptual understanding is a natural concomitant of the minute division of labor which characterizes the American economic system and has been reflected, in turn, in the conduct of the public schools. In a complex system, such as ours, it requires all of a man's time to master the techniques and tools which will enable him to find a place in the industrial hierarchy. To this fact the schools are continually in the process of adjusting themselves, and the character of the public recruiting process has been influenced accordingly.

As reflected in the public service, the principal effects have been of two general sorts. The emphasis has resulted, first, in a tendency to minimize educational achievement as an index to capacity for advancement. The second major result has been the development of a selection process which is largely a matter of fitting individuals already trained into more or less rigidly specified pigeonholes. Except for those entering positions at the bottom of the ladder, this frequently results in securing candidates who have not been particularly successful in their chosen careers.

As in so many other respects, the situation in this one is changing. There is today a noticeable tendency in the direction of recognizing educational achievement as one index to a capacity for advancement. Yet the extent of this movement is still restricted in part, at least, by the technical and "practical" character of much of our education. A training which emphasizes techniques is likely to be one which prepares a person for a specific job, not for promotion to a different one. It is a training more clearly adapted to the preparation of specialists than to the recruitment of those capable of developing skills and abilities of diverse sorts.

This is not to suggest that the specialist may not possess general capacities, particularly of an administrative character. Failure to recognize this fact is one of the most striking weaknesses of the British personnel system. There is no positive evidence to support the contention that the essential administrative quality of adaptability is "more likely to be found in men who have had a good general education . . . than in men who have been specialists in one particular branch of knowledge."[8] This may be true in

[7] Walter R. Sharp, *The French Civil Service: Bureaucracy in Transition* (New York: 1931), pp. 101 ff.

[8] Sir Francis L. C. Floud, "The Sphere of the Specialist in Public Administration," *Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 1, Second Issue, 1923, pp. 117–126.

some instances. A man may become so immersed in a particular subject matter as to lose all sense of perspective. But it is no more likely to be true of the scientist, let us say, than of the Latin scholar. Either may be a man of narrow outlook. In any event, there is no convincing evidence to suggest that adaptability is a quality associated with interest or proficiency in any particular type of learning. Broad sympathy and understanding are, of course, necessary. But it does not follow that they are necessarily to be achieved only at a sacrifice of specific knowledge and understanding. It is even possible that, as technical considerations increase in importance, technical competence will become an indispensable adjunct of administrative adaptability. These observations apply particularly to young people. Narrow specialization over a number of years may easily result in a lack of ability to see the field of special interest in a balanced perspective with respect to other fields.

The difficulty is, then, a somewhat different one. It is that personnel administrators should not think of the public service exclusively as a collection of specialties and regard the young people in the service as occupants of particular niches requiring particular techniques. They should also look upon young recruits as promotional material. To do otherwise is a danger which has been aggravated by the technical emphasis in American education. Adaptability is, unquestionably, a quality to be cultivated through opportunities made available in the early stages of one's career. It is a fragile quality, likely to be destroyed by long contact with routine work or by the lengthy practice of a specialty.

Since the early thirties more attention has been given to problems of articulating the educational system and the civil service. There has been widespread interest in questions of preëntry training and in methods for bringing about a closer correlation between formal education and the demands of public administration. This has led to the establishment in a number of universities of schools of public administration and to a whole series of conferences on the subject of training for the public service.[9] It has resulted, too, in a movement to open the civil service to persons with broad academic training in economics, political science, and public administration. This has borne fruit, in the case of the Federal service, in such examinations over the years as those for junior civil service examiner, junior social science analyst, and junior management assistant, and in the more recent college-level examinations. It is no longer true, as it was some years ago, that the universities contribute to the public service only in such technical fields as biology, chemistry, and physics.

It would be creating a false impression not to point out that educational achievement, as measured in years of schooling completed or in degrees

[9] See the discussion of preëntry training in Chapter 14.

secured, does play a part, and an increasingly important one, in the selection of recruits. It is customary today to restrict applicants for almost the entire range of positions to those who have completed a specified minimum of education. But this is a far cry from the closely correlated system in England, for example, where the public service, in the words of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service (1912), gathers "the natural fruits of the educational system of the country in its various stages as they mature." Unquestionably, however, the trend in the United States is in the direction of a more satisfactory relationship between formal education and the requirements of the public service. Upon the necessity for such a correlation the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel took a vigorous stand over twenty years ago. Striking out at the narrow classification which governs recruitment to the public services in many American jurisdictions, the commission said: "We do not believe that the public service should first be minutely classified into pigeonholes, for which the Civil Service Commission tries to find men who exactly fit each compartment, but rather that the service should be divided into ladders, for which young men are normally selected to start on the bottom rung."[10] The idea still has merit today. The commission then proceeded to recommend the establishment of a number of "career services," each "articulated with the American educational system and with the average age levels of young men and women who have reached the stage of education and development fitting them for the lower grades of the various services."[11]

The increasing relationships and coöperation between the public service and the schools and colleges are evidenced on all sides. The Federal service particularly has taken several forward steps, including more use of visits to college campuses and the establishment of close liaison in the various civil service regions.[12] A number of local and state jurisdictions, especially those in California, Wisconsin, and New York, have also worked out significant programs for gearing university and high-school graduation with public service career opportunities.

B. CITIZENSHIP

Practically all jurisdictions have some requirement in regard to citizenship as a limitation upon the area of selection for the public service. Employment in the civil service of the modern State is ordinarily the province of the citizen. To this some qualifications should be added. For example, in a number of American jurisdictions the civil service commission has the legal authority to waive this requirement under certain circumstances, usually if a qualified citizen cannot be found to fill the position. Needless

[10] Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel, *Better Government Personnel*, p. 5.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 37.
[12] Further details are given in Chapter 14.

to say, however, almost no use is made of this power, and noncitizens are in fact disqualified as candidates. On the other hand, due to continuing commitments abroad, the Federal Government hires many foreign nationals at its military bases and other establishments located in friendly countries.

C. RESIDENCE

Another usual and much more serious limitation arises out of the restriction of candidates to residence in local jurisdictional areas. In the vast majority of cases either the civil service law or the rules of the commission restrict the possible field of selection to residents of the county, the city, or the state, as the case may be. The states of California and Maryland have no specific requirements, in either the law or the rules, regarding the residence of applicants, but in practically every other case the area of selection is ordinarily restricted by the borders of the jurisdiction involved, although in differing degrees.[13] Furthermore, the apportionment provisions of the Federal civil service law, requiring distribution of appointments in proportion to state population, operate as residence restrictions for the so-called "departmental" service at headquarters in Washington.[14]

This is often an extremely serious restriction and one not in harmony with the merit principle. In large part, it harks back to the notion of the public servant as a parasite living on the community, and is bound up with the idea that each community should "take care" of its own. It is a cardinal feature of selection according to merit that the best-qualified candidate should be employed, whatever his residence.

In the case of certain routine positions, which can be filled as well locally as otherwise, a case may be made for such restrictions. Definite benefits may also follow upon the encouragement of the citizens of a city to participate in their government as public servants. Although the weight of some of these arguments may be recognized, the fact remains that the demands of a staff engaged in administering technical and complex activities cannot uniformly be met within a restricted area of selection. Such restriction is still one of the banes of the public service.

In many of the more progressive jurisdictions, however, it has become common to disregard residence qualifications in filling high-grade or key positions. This action is particularly called for in the absence of an extensive training program and when top positions cannot best be filled by promotion. A broad labor market is a prerequisite for the development of a profession of public service, and any requirements which limit the possible area

[13] It is obvious, of course, that when the requirement provides merely that applicants shall be bona-fide residents it is much less limiting in its effect upon the field of recruitment than when, as in some places, the requirement is residence for two years past. It should also be recognized that the requirement of state citizenship is one involving residence.

[14] The saving grace in this case is that the apportionment requirement may be waived when it seriously interferes with adequate recruitment, and it frequently is waived.

of selection and promotion on any but merit grounds are handicaps to the development of a first-rate public service.

D. AGE LIMITS

Age limits for public employment in the United States are, in general, becoming unrealistic. The usual practice is to specify age requirements in connection with each separate examination, although a general maximum and minimum are also prescribed in some jurisdictions.

The requirement of a minimum age of twenty-one, or even eighteen, frequently makes it difficult or impossible to recruit directly from school and is one more factor leading to recruitment only after several years of experience. This means that the opportunity to interest many of the more able young people in a public service career is lost. It is axiomatic that, if an effective career system is to be maintained, able young people must be recruited and developed for progress up through the higher levels of the organization.

At the other end of the scale, fairly high age limits in public employment have been in sharp contrast to those in private business. Industry is just now breaking away from the prewar habit of limiting initial employment to those under fifty or even under forty-five and thirty-five. As a matter of fact, as long as our population was comparatively young, it was not difficult to confine recruiting to younger people. A combination of wars and an aging population have taught us, however, that we can no longer limit our selection to the younger person. In the Federal civil service, for example, there is no longer a fixed maximum entrance age. A good case can be made, however, for using age limits for trainee jobs and for a few occupations requiring considerable physical stamina, such as electrician-lineman, mining engineer, and truck driver. Also people seventy years of age and older might well be given only temporary appointments.[15]

Our aging population is a problem of growing importance. It is a well-known fact that the percentage of people over sixty-five is increasing much more rapidly than is the percentage of the population between ages fifteen and sixty-five. Many of these older citizens are both able and eager to continue in productive work. It was dramatically proved during World War II, and again during the Korean emergency, that untold numbers of formerly retired people could contribute invaluable services for meeting their nation's needs. If the United States is to maintain its strength and progress, the potential services of the able older worker cannot be ignored. The

[15] For a discussion of this and other aspects of U.S. government treatment of the older worker, see Wilton H. Dickerson, "Older Workers in Federal Employment," *Employment Security Review*, November, 1954, pp. 4–7. A rider in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1956 eliminated all maximum age limits for entrance. P.L. 112, Sec. 108, June 30, 1955.

need to develop and retain employees for optimum lengths of service should, of course, be the primary consideration for utilizing older people. But we must also recognize, as a matter of social policy, the need to liberalize initial appointment restrictions now ruling out many able people.

Probably the greatest single barrier to the utilization of older workers has been the failure to recognize the differences in individual competence. One man at age seventy may be more competent than another at age fifty. The need is, therefore, to develop (1) more adequate means for testing competence of older people—certainly the combination of tests and standards used for younger people are not always suitable for this purpose; and (2) better methods for retraining older people. When these needs are met, arbitrary age limits for selection, other than a minimum necessary for the welfare of children, may be abandoned except for occupations making extraordinary physical demands and for trainee-type positions.

E. VETERAN PREFERENCE

On the question of veteran preference only brief comment seems called for at this point, since an entire section in a later chapter is devoted to this subject. Veteran preference affects the area of selection in two primary ways. In the first place, so far as the veteran group itself is concerned, preference provisions may widen the area and increase the numbers of possible recruits by eliminating or liberalizing other restrictions, such as those imposed by educational, physical, or age requirements. On the other hand, since nonveterans compete with veterans under a handicap and are thus discouraged from making application, various preference provisions may have a limiting effect on recruitment, although the tendency toward universality of military service of some kind among males is reducing this likelihood—and, by the same token, erasing the reason for preference.[16]

F. SEX

The elimination of sex barriers to recruitment has been the product of a lengthy struggle, and one not yet concluded. In general, however, there are now no legal provisions restricting the public services in America to males, unless we view the ultimate effect of veteran preference as constituting such a limitation. In the Federal service in Washington women accounted for 42 percent of the total in 1955, with the proportion for the entire service being 24 percent. Women comprise a large body in the modern public service, quite apart from employment in the public schools. Data by sex are not available for state and local government services, but women probably are almost as well represented there as in the national service.

Nevertheless, sex barriers still exist in practice, if not in law, and definitely affect the field of recruitment. Under provisions in the Federal

[16] The question of preference is considered in detail in Chapter 6.

service, which have been followed in most of the state and municipal jurisdictions, the appointing officer may specify, at the time of his request for eligibles, the sex of the persons to be certified. Such a procedure may result in disqualification, without the necessity of any legal barriers, which may serve to reduce the number of available applicants. But it may also be completely justified on the grounds that the nature of the work does not make it practicable to use women.

In summary, then, the task of the recruiting agency is twofold: (1) to work to eliminate or modify those conditions which restrict the possible numbers of recruits, wherever such limitations are not in the interest of an improved service; and (2) to enlist into competition as many as possible of those persons possessing the requisite qualifications to the end that, in the words of a motto of the state of Wisconsin, "the best shall serve the State."

The first task involves positive efforts to increase the prestige value of the public service, both by extensive publicity and by a reformation of personnel procedures, so that public employment may be at least as attractive as private. It involves further efforts in the direction of a reëxamination of the whole question of the relation of the educational system to the civil service and the formulation of lines of action to bring the two into closer harmony. The second task imposes upon the personnel agency the duty of bringing openings to the attention of as many prospective qualified recruits as possible and of eliciting general interest in public service.

III. THE METHODS OF RECRUITMENT

Recruiting media employed by some public personnel agencies in the United States are still unattractive, unimaginative, and ineffective. They are the products of poorly conceived, narrow legal requirements and of inherited administrative practice.

Recruiting efforts have been too much confined to the announcement of specific openings. In this connection, three methods are in common use: (1) an announcement of the position in a newspaper; (2) announcement sheets or bulletins, posted in public buildings and other centers of congregation; (3) circularization of lists of individuals, organizations, and institutions that might be expected to be in touch with suitable applicants.

The practical effect of these policies is frequently worthless from the standpoint of getting adequate competition. An obscure examination announcement buried among other legal notices in the official newspaper is scarcely calculated to reach the best sources of recruits. Although a few newspapers look upon announcements of civil service openings as news, this cannot be said to be universal. News releases should be issued in a live

and interesting form. Where effort has been expended in this direction, the results have been worth while.

Examples of enterprising recruiting methods abound in recent years. The labor shortages during World War II were a potent impetus to improvement of unimaginative publicity devices. California, for example, has successfully experimented with news stories written by a member of the personnel staff.

Oklahoma's State Personnel Board a few years ago conducted a successful campaign to recruit case workers for the welfare department and sanitarians for the health department by sending to each senior college student a personal letter describing job opportunities and giving the date and time of visits to his campus. This resulted in enrolling large number of students for examinations, a good many of whom were appointed. The agencies expressed satisfaction at the higher-than-average caliber of the employees thus obtained. A type of news story believed more effective than routine examination announcements was the publicizing of appointments. Accordingly special attention was given to obtaining news stories in local papers of appointments to local office staffs. Similar methods were used in recruiting clerical and stenographic workers through the commercial departments of high schools.

In New Mexico the Merit System Council, faced with negative factors which militate against merit system recruitment, has developed a model outline of procedure to offset them. In order to reach beyond those who usually respond to routine examination announcements, personal contacts are used to locate the trained and experienced individuals needed. Managers of the constituent agencies and their staffs are asked to engage in positive and direct recruiting, impelling many people otherwise out of reach to file applications. To out-of-state applicants the State Tourist Bureau is asked to send its colorful, descriptive booklets and maps. This council also urges its constituent agencies to speed the hiring process, thus shortening the time a successful applicant must wait before appointment. As a further aspect of the program, attractive announcements of vacancies are inserted in appropriate columns in college papers and professional journals.

In the state of Pennsylvania as many as 525 newspapers and radio and television outlets are reached in a typical news release program, which includes news on establishment of eligible lists and on periodic reports of activities as well as on examination announcements. Another method used by some states, such as Maine, is to construct exhibits or otherwise advertise the state or local public services at state fairs.

The North Carolina Good Health Association and the State Nurses' Association, in coöperation with several other agencies, staged an unusual recruiting program for student nurses, with excellent results. Based on an annual contest for "Miss North Carolina Student Nurse," the winner re-

ceived a free trip to Bermuda and a wardrobe donated by local merchants. With the interest evoked by the contest and the personal appearances of "Miss North Carolina Student Nurse," counselors obtained the 1000 applicants needed in 1947, with 100 to spare.[17]

The practice of posting announcements of pending examinations is general. It was common in the past for such announcements to take the form of single sheets tacked up on the bulletin board in the office of the civil service commission and in various public buildings. They were almost always unattractive in appearance and violated practically all the rules of good advertising. They were usually mimeographed, poorly laid out, and difficult to read. Framed in technical language and dotted with such legalistic barbarisms as "the above-mentioned date," "candidates will be advised," and so on, they were calculated to stifle the interest of prospective candidates rather than to stimulate it.

An outstanding record in avoiding this kind of announcement has been achieved by the U.S. Civil Service Commission and its agency boards of examiners in recent years. It is commonplace now for major announcements to be printed in two or three color contrasts, with liberal use of photographs and drawings. This has been particularly true of announcements for junior professional classes. Even the more routine announcements are often printed on attractive shades of paper, with easily followed paragraph headings and full information on the nature, requirements, and attractiveness of the work. The commission has also continued its series of beautifully illustrated general pamphlets on each of the major professions. The one on librarians, for example, describes the need for librarians, the nature of government libraries, duties of government librarians, pay scales, how to learn about examinations, and general civil service information. It also gives brief descriptions of twelve major government libraries.[18] A number of city and state agencies have issued announcements that compare favorably with these modern issuances of the Federal commission.

Of particular significance are the renewed efforts of the national government to attract college graduates to junior professional and managerial assignments. In addition to a new open-continuous type of general examination started in 1955, a "job directory" has been published by the Civil Service Commission and a recruiter's guide prepared for those who are to maintain continual relationships with universities and students.

Most commissions mail announcements to a number of organizations or institutions, relying on them to post the bulletins. If this procedure is to be

[17] The foregoing examples are drawn from *Merit System Methods*, published monthly by the Division of State Merit Systems, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

[18] *The Librarian in the Federal Service*, Pamphlet No. 37 (Washington: December, 1948). Similar publications exist for physicists, metallurgists, engineers, and others. See U.S. Civil Service Commission pamphlet series.

effective, however, there should be a periodic checkup of the organizations to see that they are actually posting the bulletins and not merely throwing them in the wastebasket. Many a commission has developed an unwarranted sense of satisfaction in regard to its recruitment program because it was sending out large quantities of bulletins. A checkup might have revealed that most of them never got beyond the desk of the recipient and that the commission was wasting time and money.

This brings us directly to the general question of mailing list procedure. The mailing list is one of the most frequently employed recruitment devices. It is of two sorts: request and general. The request mailing list is composed of the names of all persons who have expressed interest in a particular examination or class of positions, either by mail or through a call at the office of the commission. Its distinguishing characteristic is the fact that those whose names are on the list are there through some act of their own. They took the initiative; it was not taken by the personnel agency.

The general mailing list, on the other hand, is one prepared by the personnel agency itself and designed to cover the principal sources of recruits: schools, professional societies, vocational counseling offices, labor unions, and so on. This is an important part of the equipment of a progressive recruiting agency, yet not all civil service commissions have taken the trouble to develop a comprehensive general list. Probably the most extensive one in use is that of the Federal commission. It includes the complete membership roll of practically every professional or technical organization in the country and contains hundreds of thousands of names. These are classified into some several hundred different lists, the appropriate one being circularized when an opening occurs. Among the state commissions, those of California, New Jersey, and New York have also made extensive use of this method of publicity.

The Personnel Board of the state of California some years ago made important improvements in the usual procedure for dealing with the request mailing list. The essentials of good mailing list procedure, the California system authors maintained, were six in number: (1) the notices must be timely, neither too far in advance of the examination nor too near it; (2) candidates should be notified only of examinations for which they are reasonably well qualified; (3) the notice must include all pertinent information necessary to the candidate in deciding whether or not to compete; (4) the methods of notifying candidates must be dependable; (5) the system must be relatively inexpensive; and (6) it must be sufficiently flexible to meet the needs for new classifications.[19] These criteria are, for the most part, met by the California system.

[19] William Brownrigg and Louis Kroeger, *Toward Effective Recruiting: A Method for Notifying Qualified Candidates of Scheduled Examinations*, Pamphlet No. 7, Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada (Chicago: 1937), p. 3.

The basis of the procedure is a special form known as a "request for examination announcements," which elicits data much like those of the usual application blank. In particular, it emphasizes training and experience data. The reverse side of the form contains a list of all the types of occupations found in the state service. All persons making inquiries are asked to fill out the blank, giving training and experience in detail, and checking on the reverse side the types of work in which they are especially interested or for which they believe themselves qualified. These forms are reviewed by a member of the central technical staff, who checks the training and experience data against the occupational possibilities, seeing that the candidate has not indicated any types of work for which he is obviously unqualified or overlooked any for which he seems to be well qualified. The pertinent data are then transferred to punch cards. When an examination is scheduled, a member of the technical staff determines which of the types of work listed on the reverse of the form require qualifications similar to those for the examination under consideration. The cards are then mechanically sorted, and those which have been coded for that particular group of occupations are drawn out. Postcard notices are then sent out.

The many advantages of such a procedure are obvious. It makes certain that all potentially qualified persons who have made inquiries will be notified. It is flexible. It is relatively simple to operate. On the other hand, it has proved somewhat expensive in practice and may be impracticable for small jurisdictions.

Among the other devices which have been used to bring openings to the attention of prospective candidates, radio and television announcements merit mention. A number of public personnel agencies have experimented with this medium. If it is to be fully effective, broadcasting material must be specially prepared. It is not enough to read a standard announcement over the air. Television and radio have great possibilities so far as stimulating interest in the public service is concerned, and it is to be hoped that more and more commissions will see fit to experiment along these lines.[20]

It is probable that the most resourceful member of any commission's staff should be assigned to the important task of keeping in touch with the exployment market and the methods of recruitment in private industry. Certainly someone of ability should be charged with the duty of discovering and developing new sources of supply. This involves personal relations with teachers, editors, influential professional and technical men, as well as with labor. Contacts with people who are in strategic positions will prove to be an invaluable means of developing sources of labor supply. In the small or medium-sized jurisdictions such contacts may prove more fruitful than any other form of advertising. Labor scouting of this sort is not included in the program of many public personnel agencies. It is, however, a necessary

[20] Further discussion of television, radio, motion pictures, and other media will be found in Chapter 23 under "Public Relations."

adjunct of successful recruiting and will remain so until public employment is more sought after by qualified persons than it is today.

Although there is considerable need for extensive and intensive investigation of the relative value of various methods of recruitment, little has been done along these lines. Obviously, analysis of the relative effectiveness of various publicity devices and techniques is an important step in the recruitment process but one which has usually been ignored. Recent years, however, have seen some progress in this respect.

The importance of recruitment methods was recently underlined by the second Hoover Commission, which urged for the Federal Government "continued efforts to improve the character and distribution of announcements," "adequate public information programs," and "expansion of college recruiting."[21] These are emphases that could apply with equal force to all public jurisdictions.

The significance of a systematically developed recruitment policy cannot easily be overemphasized. The very character of any organization will in the long run depend on the quality and character of the recruits who are brought in from time to time. Many methods have been devised and tried out in experience which should be adapted to local conditions. Resourcefulness and ingenuity should constantly be brought into play. The employment market is ever changing, as are the demands of the public agency. Contacts with educational institutions should be assiduously cultivated, not alone because their officers can serve as employment aids in securing leads, but also because they may be stimulated to organize or modify courses which will provide better preëntry training for prospective public servants.

Furthermore, it is incumbent upon the personnel agency to test the success of its various recruitment policies by keeping a check on the results. Just as advertisers and advertising agencies check on the effectiveness of their publicity efforts, so should the personnel agency test its publicity policies.

Finally, the status and prestige of public service can be immeasurably improved through advances in public employment policies. These advances must be maintained. There can be no resting on the oars. The employment market in a healthy economy is a highly competitive one. With its new and expanding functions the government as an employer can ill afford to content itself with anything less than the better, if not the best, ability available.

IV. APPLICATION PROCEDURE

The goal of recruiting activities is the production of an adequate number of qualified applicants for employment. Recruitment ends with an application. The examining process begins with one. Application proce-

[21] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), p. 60.

dures constitute, therefore, the connecting links between recruitment and other aspects of the selection process. In addition, they make important contributions to individual placement, discussed at another point in this book. Their proper handling is, therefore, of strategic importance.

Application procedures involve a number of steps, each of which will be considered briefly. These may be listed as (1) construction of a form designed to secure information upon which to base admission to competition; (2) administration of the application form; (3) audit of applications to determine the presence or absence of desired qualifications; and (4) admission or rejection of candidates for competition. These steps should be governed by one pervasive principle, namely, that the procedures employed be such as to exclude obviously unqualified persons from competition at the same time that all interested persons possessing the requisite qualifications are admitted to competition. This implies, on the one hand, that the application should be so constructed and administered and the preëxamination audit so conducted that the presence or absence of basic qualifications can be easily determined. It implies, on the other hand, that all unnecessary barriers to admission to competition should be eliminated.

The purposes to be served by the application will, of course, determine the nature of the form to be used. Considered merely as a tool in the selective process, the application meets five primary needs: (1) to identify and locate the applicant; (2) to determine eligibility for competition; (3) to evaluate qualifications for employment; (4) to determine preference status; and (5) to serve as a basis for estimating character and habits.[22] Each one of these leads to the inclusion of certain items in the blank, and the determination of the content of the application form is largely a matter of the selection of items related to these purposes.

The application blank may, of course, serve many purposes beyond these almost universally accepted ones. Among those recognized in one or another jurisdiction the following are important: (1) to provide a basis for the interview; (2) to furnish data for selective certification; (3) to provide information regarding special qualifications which might be useful in placement; and (4) to furnish information for in-service personnel records. These may be termed secondary purposes, in contrast to those in the first list, and to the extent that they are to be served the content and form of the application blank will be varied. The form which is to become the core of the in-service record system, for example, will naturally embrace items not found on that designed only for selection purposes. The first step, therefore, in sound application procedure is the determination of the place of the application in the whole employment process and the careful definition

[22] See *Recruiting Applicants for the Public Service*, Chap. 5. This presents a detailed treatment of application procedures.

of the purposes it is to fulfill. This is a good illustration of the general rule that in administration planning must always precede execution.[23]

At this point we should acknowledge that the traditional concept of a separate application for each examination is probably due to be outmoded. For many years the highly successful recruiting system of the Tennessee Valley Authority has relied on the idea of a single application from each applicant. This forms the basis of consideration or testing for any occupation for which he appears qualified. The necessity for an applicant to apply separately for each examination or occupation in which he is interested has been one of the shortcomings of the merit system in the United States.

The Task Force which made the basic study for the 1949 Hoover Commission's report on *Personnel Management* in the Federal service recognized this problem. In connection with its proposals for greater recruitment authority in the individual agencies and for positive recruiting methods, it said:

a. Appointing agencies should be required to accept an application at any time from any applicant if there are existing openings for which the applicant is properly qualified under the standards established or approved by the Civil Service Commission. The agency should also be allowed to accept applications for anticipated openings.

b. The applicant should not have to pre-determine the positions for which he may qualify, but be allowed to submit a full statement of his qualifications, permitting the appointing agency to consider him for any position for which he is found qualified.[24]

Under this procedure the old methods of setting closing dates for receipt of applications and separate applications for every examination would be discarded. More and more jurisdictions make use of open, continuous registers of eligible candidates, on the basis of one-time applications, particularly for those occupations which do not require written or performance tests.[25]

A. DESIGN AND CONTENT OF THE APPLICATION BLANK

Modern application blanks employ items permitting short-form answers. Such a procedure has many advantages in terms of standardization and

[23] Although the five primary purposes provide a good starting point in planning the application form, the trend is clearly in the direction of extending the secondary uses. This is particularly true of the use of the blank as a tool in certification and placement, dealt with in a later chapter.

[24] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Task Force Report on Federal Personnel* (Washington: January, 1949), p. 23. The second Hoover Commission reinforced this in part by calling for "more open continuous examinations which can be taken by candidates at any time."—*Personnel and Civil Service*, p. 60.

[25] A survey in 1953 showed that of seventy-nine large state and local personnel agencies reporting, sixty-four had established continuous testing programs, usually for those job classes for which there is constant demand. See Civil Service Assembly, *Personnel News*, October, 1953, p. 37.

increased accuracy of reply and can be extended with a little effort to almost every item.

Items on previous experience and training occupy a large proportion of all application forms and are of the utmost importance. They serve not only as a means of determining eligibility for particular examinations but often as a partial basis for the rating of candidates as well. Moreover, they have additional uses in the certification and placement processes. It is usually desirable to require a complete educational history, including the name and location of the last grammar school and the last high school attended and space for university, business, correspondence, or special courses. Provision should be made to show the highest grade or year completed, and questions should cover graduation, degrees, certificates, and so forth.

The employment history also should be elicted in considerable detail. In the case of four-page applications a history of all employment since leaving school may be required, while most two-page blanks will restrict the dates to the previous decade. In any event, items should include the dates of employment, the position or occupation, types of duties performed, salary, employer's name, business, and address.

Whether a photograph should be required is a moot point, although most jurisdictions today have abandoned the practice. Objection to the requirement rests principally upon two grounds: (1) that it adds to the trouble and expense of application and may thus discourage qualified candidates; (2) that it creates public suspicion that examiners will be influenced by appearances. For these reasons, most opinion today is opposed to the requirement at the time of application.

The application form ordinarily includes spaces for references, the requirements varying anywhere from two up to a half-dozen or more. As a general rule, these are employed for two purposes: (1) as a means of getting at intangibles such as character or personality and (2) as a method of verifying and corroborating information presented by the applicant. In neither respect are references very satisfactory devices, although their reliability can be somewhat increased by personal investigation, discussed later. It is fairly obvious, however, that no candidate is likely to list as a reference a person whose testimony might prove unfavorable. Because of this, past employers, teachers, and so on are likely to prove more valuable than the persons cited directly for reference purposes.

In addition, provision must be made on the form for adequate information for mailing; instructions for completion of the form; identifying data such as name, address, and telephone; citizenship; veteran preference status; and personal data on age, marital status, and health.

In private employment the application blank is a primary instrument of selection. In the public field, with much more elaborate testing devices

and programs, it is perhaps less important to have an application blank containing all the items which have predictive value for success on the job. Under such circumstances the application blank may be regarded as a source of information rather than as an important selective tool. But even then it is necessary to choose between types of information, some of which would possess relevance and some not. This means that reserach is necessary if a reasonably good blank is to be produced. The minimum requirement in this respect is careful analysis of the old applications of outstandingly good and outstandingly poor employees with a view to the discovery of significant or apparently irrelevant items. Even though there is less need for a highly selective application blank than in private employment, it is possible that certain factors bearing upon success on the job can be rated more directly and less expensively here than in later tests.

B. ISSUANCE AND RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS

Although a number of specific questions are involved in both the issuance and the receipt of applications, most of them are too minor for extended treatment in a work of this kind. The general principle should be emphasized, however, that the rules governing these matters ought to be so liberal that all qualified potential applicants have a fair opportunity to file. A niggardly policy in respect to the issuance of applications never yields real dividends, however saving it may be of application forms.

The important questions regarding the issuance of applications have to do with the time of issuing and the methods to be employed. In respect to the time factor there are two possibilities: (1) a continuously "open" procedure, under which applications will be issued at any time; (2) a "closed" procedure, through which issuance is restricted to the direct recruitment stage following the announcement of an examination. Although the latter has been the more usual usage, the 1949 Hoover Task Force proposals suggest that this time-honored procedure is due for an overhauling.

The chief advantages of closed filing are those of uniformity and economy. Open filing, on the other hand, produces information on a much larger group of potential employees than is the case where the filing time is limited. Such information provides an excellent basis for selective recruiting and for the handling of emergency situations. These are important advantages. They may also be secured, however, by combining closed filing with the request for examination announcement procedure developed by the California State Personnel Board.

C. VERIFICATION OF STATEMENTS

With the filing of the applications, the problem of verification arises. This is an essential step in application procedure, although it may be delayed until after the examination. It is obvious that unless some check is made the

information secured through the application may be largely worthless, particularly if it is common knowledge that no effort is made in this respect.

Some of the information secured can be verified without great difficulty. Educational and employment experience can be checked ordinarily through a simple form letter or reference blank sent to the schools listed by the applicant and to previous employers. Pertinent information may also be secured in a similar manner from those listed as references, although in respect to character references field investigation is probably essential. It has already been suggested that certain information can be verified or ascertained only by a neighborhood investigation. Indeed, personal investigation of potential employees is an indispensable tool in the selection and placement processes. As such, it is described in greater detail in the next chapter.

There is some variation in practice respecting the point in the employment process at which references should be checked and statements verified. In some jurisdictions this step is taken only after the establishment of the eligible list. Such a procedure eliminates the necessity of checking up on the large numbers of candidates who fail the examination. On the other hand, admission of candidates to many examinations depends upon their having had certain combinations of training and experience, while in others their final standing on the eligible register is determined in part by the ratings accorded to these factors. In such instances it is obviously necessary to verify claims in respect to these matters at some earlier stage in the proceedings.

D. PREËXAMINATION AUDIT OF APPLICATIONS

The purposes of the preëxamination audit of applications are three in number: (1) to check for completeness of data on application forms; (2) to determine the possession by the applicant of the legal requirements for eligibility; (3) to determine the possession by the applicant of minimum entrance qualifications.

The most difficult step in the review, and the one requiring the greatest amount of technical knowledge, is unquestionably that in which the presence or absence of minimum training and experience qualifications is ascertained. It is difficult to define objectively the factors involved and to assess properly the many possible combinations of "equivalent" training and experience. Although the complex question of rating these factors will be discussed at a later point, the task of ascertaining the fact of eligibility in terms of qualifications may be touched upon here. It is by no means simple. Even when the fields of acceptable education and experience have been defined in specific terms, unforeseen combinations will emerge. Decisions must be made as to the circumstances under which the applicant's education will affect the acceptability of certain experience, and vice versa. Types of experience unfamiliar to the reviewer may emerge and require a

careful study of their relevance to the position applied for. Only well-trained examiners are competent to perform this phase of the review, assisted by various devices to help standardize the process as much as possible.[26]

Of course, applications may be rejected not only because an individual proves ineligible in terms of either legal or qualification requirements but also for fraud or misrepresentation.

E. RIGHT OF APPEAL FROM REJECTION

The right of appeal from an administrative decision adversely affecting an individual is an important adjunct of democratic government. If for no other reason, therefore, applicants should be given full opportunity to appeal the rejection of an application. But there are additional reasons for allowing such an appeal, several of which have been stated by a committee of the Civil Service Assembly:

> . . . No public personnel agency, realizing the incompleteness of present-day examining techniques and measuring devices, would care to assume the responsibility of deciding whether to accept or reject an application for admission to examination without having before it all available relevant information. The effectiveness of the original reviewing process and staff may often be measured by the number of appeals on rejection and the percentage of cases in which appeal results in a reversal of decision. The right of appeal, therefore, serves to challenge the agency and its staff to use every available technique in reaching the original decision regarding the acceptability of an applicant, and to establish formal methods for open investigation of its procedures.[27]

A review board might be established to hear appeals from the rejection of applications. Probably it should include the person in charge of the audit of applications, but it should not be wholly composed of persons directly involved in the original process.

SUMMARY

Since brief summaries have already been made at the conclusion of several sections of this chapter, only the most general points require reiteration here. First of all, the field of recruitment should be kept as unfettered as possible with limitations that have little or nothing to do with the competence of applicants. Next, use of the most modern devices and techniques must be encouraged if the methods of recruiting are to keep up with the times. Finally, the handling and development of application blanks must be based on factual research to make certain that they are

[26] Procedures found useful are described in detail in Chap. 6 of *Recruiting Applicants for the Public Service.*

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

meeting the purpose intended. It goes without saying that, in any public jurisdiction, if the recruitment program does not reach out and attract the best minds and skills to apply for employment, then the rest of the staffing process consists merely of a sorting out among the mediocre and the ill qualified.

5

Methods of Examination

> . . . When you make an appointment be careful to allot it to the man adapted to it and not one lacking for needful capacity. . . . Not every duty can be assigned to every man. . . . Give the work, therefore, to one who is expert in it and thus avoid annoyance.
>
> —*Kai-Ka'us-ibn-Iskandar*[1]

The cornerstone of the public personnel program is the process of selection by means of competitive examinations, a process that had its origin at the very beginning of the merit system. By this means favoritism was to be excluded and the goal of securing the best man for every job achieved. Competitive examinations were the answer to the twin problems represented by democracy and the requirements of good administration. They were the means by which equality of opportunity was to be united with efficiency. From the beginning, therefore, the merit system has placed a special emphasis upon formal selection procedures, and progressive civil service commissions everywhere have been to the fore in the development and use of employment tests. This is still true today, even though some short-sighted commissions have been content to mark time while selection methods were being improved.

The science of testing—and it is continuing to become more scientific—involves many problems calling for painstaking research and experimentation. For example, the analysis and testing of personality factors are still in the experimental stage. The importance of such factors in selecting men and women potentially capable of filling administrative positions is obvious. It will increase as the government service becomes still more professionalized and as the functions of government continue in social and economic spheres. We shall then require, as we are coming to today, a selection program that will permit discrimination as to capacity for leader-

[1] *Qabus Nama* (Letters of a Persian Chieftain in 1082 A.D.), translated by Reuben Levy, *A Mirror for Princes* (New York: 1951), pp. 225–226.

ship, maturity, and other traits. This implies that the examining staff of the personnel agency must include technicians who are interested and qualified to keep in touch with the most progressive experiments in psychology, to adapt the results of successful experiments to the requirements of the service for which they are responsible, and to contribute to the development and perfection of testing techniques. Many such men are found today in the more progressive jurisdictions, and recent years have seen steady progress in this respect. There is, however, still room for improvement.

I. THE PLACE OF TESTS IN THE PERSONNEL PROGRAM

The use of tests in personnel administration is neither new nor unusual. As early as the third century B.C. Plato was suggesting the aptitudes and skills essential to warriors and considering tests by which to select this group for the State.[2] Tests of some sort have always been used in selecting men for particular tasks. Frequently these have been no more than evaluations of performance on a similar job, as manifested through recommendations. Or, again, the foreman may have questioned the applicant about the particular work involved or asked him to demonstrate his ability with a lathe or other tools. In a broad sense, therefore, there is nothing novel about the principle of testing. Only the technique has been refined.

Ever since World War I an increased emphasis on the use of tests in personnel work has rapidly developed. This is due in part to the impetus given to psychological testing by the widespread employment of the Army Alpha and Beta forms during that war. At the same time, it was part of a general movement which affected industry and government alike—the pressure for economy and efficiency. World War II gave added impetus to test research and experimentation.[3]

Any well-conceived test is an instrument for measuring or evaluating a sample of behavior as a basis for the prediction of probable future behavior. Its essence is a typical life situation in which the behavior of the applicants may be observed and evaluated. This is true of the whole range of tests, from those purporting to measure abstract intelligence to the highly specialized tests which have been developed for tabulating-machine operators. A secondary purpose of employment tests is to secure "some simple measure which will place the men in the same order relative to each other as they will stand in efficiency at the job after a long trial." This is a highly idealistic statement. Few, if any, tests are sufficiently selective to predict the absolute rank ordering of those tested. But, in any case, the examiner collects samples of the individual's behavior which are believed to be representative of his

[2] *Republic* (Bakewell translation), Book II, pp. 71 ff.

[3] Note, for example, the unprecedented researches of the U.S. Office of Strategic Services, Assessment Staff, in *Assessment of Men: Selection of Personnel for OSS* (New York: 1948).

future behavior on the job. In general, these tests are designed to evaluate either aptitudes or special skills, or both.

The objectives of the well-designed testing program are synonymous with those of the entire selection process. They are two in number. In the first place, the program is designed to select persons who will be efficient in the particular position to which they are assigned at entry. This is the immediate end of any system of recruitment and selection. But there is a second objective which must be kept in view, and one which is often forgotten in the rush to adopt "practical" tests. *The process should result also in the selection of employees who possess a capacity for growth and development.* This is essential if the personnel agency is to capitalize on the many advantages accompanying the practice of filling higher positions by promotion. It is absolutely indispensable to the development and operation of a career system.

In the United States, emphasis has been placed primarily upon the first of these objectives—that is, upon securing persons who will be immediately efficient in a particular job. This has had important repercussions upon the selection process. It has led, in the first place, to overemphasis upon experience as a criterion for entrance. It has long delayed that "close and consistent co-ordination between the standards of public service recruitment and the standards of education and training in the school program of the Nation" which a former Federal official called the "basic essential" of a career system.[4]

The second result has been the development of the so-called practical, or duties, test, one of the most important contributions of America to the technique of personnel administration. Through its use we have been remarkably successful in the selection of typists, postal clerks, filing clerks, and many other types of employees. But the duties test also has distinct limitations as an instrument of selection. It is exceptionally ill adapted to the discovery of what might be termed promotional capacity. It is a standing invitation to cram. For these reasons practical tests have often failed to result in the selection of employees capable of growth and development. We have obtained junior clerks, not potential administrators. This has been the most serious failure of the American system. The well-conceived selection program fulfills both objectives. In the United States we only began recognizing this fact in recent decades. The college-level entrance examinations developed by the Federal commission are examples of moves in the direction of a balanced program.

If we accept the two primary objectives of the testing process, it follows

[4] Bess Goodykoontz, then Assistant Commissioner of Education, in the Foreword to *Education and the Civil Service in New York City*, by Wallace S. Sayre and Milton Mandell, Project in Research in Universities (1937), Bulletin No. 20 (Washington: 1938), p. vi.

that we must test both capacities and achievements.[5] The more outstanding civil service commissions have recognized this fact, and there is today a notable tendency toward aptitude testing in the public services, despite the traditional handicap imposed by most civil service laws: the requirement that tests shall be "practical in character and deal in so far as possible with the actual duties of the position."

The employment of carefully validated and standardized tests goes far to reduce the element of chance and caprice often present in the selection process. Where such tests are not employed, selection is an uncertain matter indeed, for the man who can judge character and ability intuitively has been shown by psychological experiments to be nonexistent.[6] Yet there are many limitations in the use of tests, and these must be considered. There is no royal road to sound selection, and judgment will always be an essential ingredient in the process.[7]

II. INITIAL STEPS IN THE EXAMINING PROCESS

Considered broadly, the principal steps involved in the examination process are six in number: (1) job analysis to determine the abilities and capacities required for success in the position to be filled and in the promotional hierarchy of which it is a part; (2) determination of the types of evidence which can be adduced in respect to the presence or absence of these desired characteristics and of the appropriate examining instruments for each; (3) the outline and preliminary preparation of the examining instruments; (4) the standardization and validation of the examinations to be employed; (5) administration of the examinations; and (6) evaluation of the test results.

Each of these involves a number of other elements or considerations which may be discussed briefly at this point. The dependence of the test upon adequate job analysis is immediately apparent. The content of any valid test must have some definite relationship to the duties of the job. This is equally true whether it is an aptitude or an achievement test that is being constructed. If a mechanical aptitude test is employed in the battery for a particular position, it is because machanical aptitude is thought to have some relationship to immediate success on the job or possible future development and success. From this standpoint the entire testing program depends upon the job and promotional ladder analysis.

[5] Some writers prefer the terms "competency" and "proficiency." See Morris S. Viteles, *Industrial Psychology* (New York: 1932), p. 120. The line between the two is not sharp, and experimental evidence suggests that they are more closely related than we once thought. See Anne Anastasi and John P. Foley, Jr., *Differential Psychology* (New York: 1949), Chap. 7.

[6] H. L. Hollingsworth, *Judging Human Character* (New York: 1923).

[7] The most complete and authoritative book on test procedures in civil service is Dorothy C. Adkins and collaborators, *Construction and Analysis of Achievement Tests*, U.S. Civil Service Commission (Washington: 1947).

But the occupational analysis which provides the basis for the development of the test battery should go beyond the ordinary duties classification. One specialist has differentiated three parts in such a study:

I. The first part is an ordinary job analysis. This analysis is logical rather than psychological. It gives a detailed and rather minute list of the various part-activities of which the occupation is made up.

II. The second part of the analysis is a carefully controlled concrete study of a considerable number of individual workers, to discover in which part-activities of the occupation the more efficient individuals are chiefly superior to the less efficient.

III. The third part of the analysis is the extensive study of these critical part-activities found to be significant by part II. The purpose of this third part is to discover what traits of intelligence, capacity, temperament, will, etc., combine to produce efficiency in these particular segments of the behavior under investigation.[8]

One of the greatest weaknesses in the testing programs of many jurisdictions today arises out of an inadequate understanding of the positions for which examinations are being prepared. Class specifications are helpful here, but they are wholly inadequate guides. To write a good examination, the examiner must know the job backwards and forwards. To this end it is essential that he maintain close relationships with departmental officials, with outside experts in the fields involved, and with educational institutions offering training in the specialties required. Nor can his study end with the particular job. He must also be familiar with its relation to other positions and with promotional opportunities. Only upon the basis of such information can he determine the types of skills, traits, and aptitudes desired of a person in the given position.

Having completed such an intensive investigation, the examiner is in a position to consider the types of evidence which might indicate the presence or absence of such skills, traits, or aptitudes and to determine the best means of adducing that evidence. At this point in examination planning he will decide upon such questions as the character of preliminary qualifications, types of training required, which qualities can best be discovered in an oral examination and which in written or performance tests, and so on. Upon the basis of these decisions he will begin to develop an outline of the examination and to work up its specific content. Such an outline will show the different parts of the projected examination, their relative weights, the types and numbers of items to be employed for each subject covered, the nature of oral or practical tests to be employed, and similar essential information.

The other steps in the examining process—standardization, validation, and administration—are dealt with later. Before turning to these more

[8] Clark L. Hull, *Aptitude Testing* (Yonkers-on-Hudson: 1928), p. 286.

technical matters, however, it is desirable to have clearly in mind the kinds of examinations now in use.

III. RATING EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING FACTORS

The credit given to the experience and training of candidates is an important factor at any time in the selection of competent personnel. In certain types of unassembled examinations, however, particularly for high-grade technical positions, such factors may constitute the examination. They will at least occupy a considerable place in the rating of candidates for any but the lowest-grade positions.

As a selection tool, the evaluation of experience and training serves two primary uses: (1) that of eliminating candidates who do not possess the minimum qualifications, and (2) that of constituting in itself one of several weighted factors in the selection process. Despite the importance of these functions, the evaluation of training and experience has always proved more difficult than that of performance on more formal tests, owing essentially to the difficulty of establishing comparable standards in respect to various kinds of experience, to variability even in the same type of experience, and to the knotty problems involved in determining the degree of relevance a particular type of experience or training will have for success in the given position. None of these problems can, of course, be resolved in a vacuum. Each must be approached in terms of long experience in similar situations and of constant experimentation. The trained and experienced examiner comes in time to have a rough notion of the comparability of various types of training or experience and to recognize degrees of the same type. The determination of the extent of relevance of particular varieties of training and experience to particular positions is a matter of careful job analysis, in the first instance, and of continuous follow-up studies of the backgrounds of test groups of employees, in the second.

If this important rating task is to be well performed, however, it cannot be left to rule-of-thumb procedures, but must be made as objective as possible. The steps involved in the process are the same as for written tests: first of all, job analysis leading to a comprehensive statement of duties and responsibilities and to a determination of minimum qualifications for the given position; secondly, careful definition of what is to be rated; and thirdly, the actual evaluation itself.[9] In respect to the final step, ratings must be based upon both quantitative and qualitative considerations, and it is this fact which has made the development of objective devices difficult.

[9] For a discussion of these steps as applied to the Federal service see David T. Stanley, "The Objective Evaluation of Experience," *Personnel Administration*, April, 1939, pp. 6–9. See also Charles I. Mosier, "Rating of Training and Experience in Public Personnel Selection," *Compass*, January, 1946.

The Federal Civil Service Commission, in developing handbooks for its decentralized boards of examiners, has outlined some important criteria and methods for the evaluation of experience and training.[10] Comparable systems have been worked out by state and local jurisdictions.

IV. CLASSIFICATION OF TESTS AS TO FORM

The classification of tests is no simple matter because of the multiplicity of types now in use, because of the numerous categories in which these types may be classified, and, finally, because many tests fall into more than a single class. For our purposes, however, all tests may be classified upon two bases: (1) upon the basis of form and (2) upon the basis of what they are designed to measure. It is to the first of these that attention is now directed. The second will be considered in the following section.

Viewed broadly, all tests are either of the work-limit, the time-limit, or the unlimited type. In the last case, applicants are free to take as much time as they desire to complete the test, and this factor is not involved in scoring. In the two other varieties time is an element in rating. The work-limit type is scored in terms of the time required to complete a given task; the time-limit test is scored in terms of the degree of achievement within a given time span. These two forms are basically similar in terms of results, but the time-limit test is better adapted to group testing, since the examiner does not have to keep track of individual times in administering the test, and work differences can be scored after the test has been given.

A second broad division may be made into written, performance, and oral tests.

A. WRITTEN EXAMINATIONS

Paper-and-pencil tests are used by most public personnel agencies in the United States, and their development constitutes one of the major contributions of government to personnel administration.[11] For the great body of intermediary positions—those at neither the top nor the bottom of the scale—the written examination provides a primary basis of selection.

Any form of written test possesses certain administrative advantages over the oral and performance types. The written form is much easier and cheaper to administer. It can be given to a large number of individuals at the same time, thus conserving the time of the examiners. As a general rule, it is easier to evaluate objectively, and the technical proficiency demanded in rating is usually, although not always, less. Such advantages account, however, for the general acceptance of this form.

[10] Civil Service Handbook, X-105 (revised periodically), *Instructions for Rating Unassembled Examinations*. The "X" series of handbooks, from 101 to 110, constitutes a veritable encyclopedia of examination and employment procedures.

[11] The best available text is Adkins, *op. cit.*

Written examinations may be divided into two broad classes, variously called either subjective and objective or free-answer and short-answer. Of the two, the subjective, or free-answer, is the older form. Practically everyone is familiar with it. It consists in the setting of questions which the applicant is free to answer as he thinks best.

This type of examination is much easier to set up than the objective type but is accompanied by serious disadvantages. Possibly the most weighty is the difficulty of evaluating the answers in any uniform or reliable manner. From the standpoint of the applicant serious objections may also be raised. The essay, or free-answer, examination places a premium on literary ability, an attribute often unrelated to the duties of the position for which the test is given. Under such circumstances, test validity is impaired, and public relations will almost certainly suffer. The subjective test is, of course, of the highest value in the selection of employees for positions in which literary skill plays a part. Moreover, if properly employed in a modified form, it may be useful in rating candidates for positions in which the ability to select and organize facts or to analyze complex problems is relevant. In a few jurisdictions significant experiments have been undertaken in the production of modified free-answer tests for higher positions. By the careful phrasing of specific questions, employment of a large number of items, and development of rating keys, some of the usual disadvantages of this type of examination may be minimized and a partially objective type produced.

The impetus toward the adoption of the short-answer, or objective, type of examination was originally supplied by the extensive use of this form in psychological tests. As the designation "short-answer" suggests, this type of examination is distinguished more largely by the form of the answer than by that of the question. The task of the competitor, from the mechanical standpoint, is reduced to a minimum, and his answers are in a single mark or a word or underline. The short-answer form is widely used by public personnel agencies.

Objective tests fall generally into three classes: (1) completion, (2) multiple-choice, and (3) true-false. All of these are based upon a similar principle, that of achieving objectivity through constraining the responses of the candidate.

Of the three forms of objective examination listed, the least constraint is placed upon the responses of the candidate under the completion form of question. This is similar to the free-answer test in that the candidate is free to make any response which he believes appropriate, but differs from it in that the response is limited to one word or a few words.

One of the most popular forms of the short-answer test is the multiple-choice type, with its several variations, including the analogy and degree-of-truth tests. The multiple-choice form places greater constraint upon the candidate, since he is limited in his answer to a few possibilities. Conse-

quently, it is more objective than the completion type. It is also easier to construct and to score. Under this form of examination the subject is asked to indicate by a mark, underline, or some other method which of several answers is the correct one to the question. Numerous variations of the multiple-choice test have been devised.

The true-false examination places the most complete restraint upon the responses of the candidate. In effect, this is a multiple-choice type in which the number of choices has been reduced to two. The ease with which such an examination is administered and scored, together with its high objectivity, contributed to make it at first one of the most widely used forms. The questions on a true-false examination can be answered with great rapidity, and the objection to particular items on the ground of unreliability is partially met by the inclusion of a large number of items. With this form, the candidate is confronted with a series of complete statements which he checks as being either true or false. In recent years psychometricians (test experts) have steered away from true-false tests because of their relative unreliability. By pure chance a candidate has a fifty-fifty probability of choosing the right answer to an item.

The most popular varieties of short-answer tests are particularly well adapted to the testing of specific knowledge, although the short-answer form may be extended in many ingenious directions for examination of general material. Their advantages lie in their objectivity, in the fact that both the tests and the results can be standardized, in the ease with which they may be administered, and in the fact that the duties of the positions can be more completely covered by an examination of this type than by the free-answer variety. Finally, the short-answer examination is often preferred by candidates.

B. PERFORMANCE TESTS

The tests now employed in industry and the public service include a large number that are neither oral nor written. These are commonly referred to as "performance" tests, although any examination is actually a matter of performance. Among the tests that may be classed in this group are actual demonstrations on the job (involving use of tools or equipment), the various form-board and block tests (other than the paper form boards), the mechanical assembly tests, peg-board and stylus tests of steadiness, and job-miniature tests involving the use of apparatus similar to that to be used on the job.[12] All of these have one thing in common, namely, that they employ some kind of performance other than writing or speaking. For the most part they involve motor reactions. The most common examples of performance tests are stenographic and typing tests. Various other examples are discussed under the classification of tests as to purpose.

[12] See *ibid.*, Chap. 5.

C. ORAL TESTS

The oral test has long served as a basic selection tool in private employment but has been more slowly accepted in the public field. This conservatism arises out of three considerations: (1) the difficulty of developing valid and reliable oral tests; (2) the difficulty of securing a reviewable record on an oral test; and (3) public suspicion of the oral as a channel for the exertion of political influence through the destruction of anonymity. Despite these acknowledged disadvantages, however, orals have been used increasingly in public personnel testing and have become important instruments wherever tests of personal attributes are considered essential. As we have noted, no satisfactory written tests have yet been devised for measuring such personal characteristics as initiative, ingenuity, and ability to elicit coöperation, many of which are of prime importance. When properly employed, the oral test today deserves a place in the battery used by the technical examiner.

1. Individual Oral Tests. There are, of course, a number of points in the employment process at which oral tests of one sort or another are ordinarily employed. Thus, an interview plays a part in almost any selection where it can supplement other procedures. With such interviews we are not here primarily concerned, although the techniques involved may not radically differ. What we are concerned with in this section is the competitive interview usually termed "oral examination." Under what conditions should it be employed in the selection process? What are its inescapable limitations, and what its proper uses? What problems are encountered in its administration?[13]

The general principle is that resort should never be had to an oral if the relevant factors to be tested can be measured at some other point in the examining process. The reason is that the reliability of the oral, even under the best of conditions, tends to be lower than that of the well-designed written test. The oral test should be confined, then, to the evaluation of relevant traits which cannot be measured in any other way. Thus, it should not normally be employed as a means of rating education or experience, or as a test of intelligence or knowledge. Each of these can, ordinarily, be better evaluated by some other device.

The first task in preparing the oral test, as in all kinds of tests, is the determination of factors to be considered and rated. Theoretically, of course, innumerable elements enter into the matter of personal fitness, but some are much more important, relative to a particular position, than others. It is these significant qualifications which the examiner must isolate, utilizing

[13] We are especially indebted to the Civil Service Assembly Committee on Oral Tests in Public Personnel Selection and its report, *Oral Tests in Public Personnel Selection* (Chicago: 1943).

statistical studies of persons already occupying the position, careful job analyses, and any other devices or techniques likely to assist him in this difficult task. He then proceeds to break down the various capacities, skills, and traits desired and to determine the best method of securing evidence on each. As already indicated, only those significant factors which cannot be tested otherwise are reserved for the oral—a practice that is due not only to the relatively low reliability of the device but also to considerations of administrative cost.

Having in a general way determined those qualities to be probed through the oral, the examiner proceeds to break these down into their least component parts, always keeping two questions in mind: (1) which of the selected items are really predictive of success in the given position and what is the degree of relationship; (2) which of these significantly related factors can be reliably discovered and assessed in an oral examination? Both questions are of basic importance, and most oral examinations fail upon the basis of faulty or superficial analysis at this point. To include the factor of appearance, for example, in a test for telephone operator would not be likely to improve its validity. Such a factor would be excluded on the basis of the first of the above criteria, that of relevance. But there may be many relevant factors which would also have to be excluded, not because they are unimportant, but rather because there is obviously no reliable way of testing for them.

After determination of the factors to be examined through the oral, the next step is the selection of test material—topics to be discussed, questions asked, and so forth. These derive naturally from the factors to be rated. They should be carefully considered in advance for at least two reasons: (1) in no other way can the examiners be sure that evidence will be adduced upon all important points; (2) the competitive principle demands substantial uniformity of procedure between different candidates. This is not to say that the oral should be completely stereotyped. It is one of the advantages of this form of test that it can be adapted to the individual. If competitive conditions are to be be maintained, basic topics and types of questions should be the same for all candidates.

Much has been written about the qualifications of a good oral examiner, and a list of these qualities would be sufficient to discourage any ordinary mortal. Among those more frequently mentioned, the following may be cited: ability to inspire confidence in all kinds of people; faculty of being a good listener; adaptability; freedom from prejudice; ability to talk the language of those interviewed; ability to put people at ease; kindliness; sympathy; firmness; efficiency; sense of humor; ability to keep job specifications in mind. Most jurisdictions will have to get along with persons who are deficient in one or another of these respects, but the ideal may be kept in mind.

Even with ideal native qualifications, however, oral examiners require special training. Skill in the conduct of the competitive interview is not an inherited but an acquired characteristic. It is, in the last analysis, a matter of training.

In the conduct of such training, two devices have proved of particular value. The first is an interviewer's manual, including general information and hints on interviewing in general. Publications developed in various jurisdictions are reported as extremely valuable in training the members of examining boards. The second is the preliminary practice interview. This provides opportunity for actual experience in an examining situation and enables the person giving instruction to point out the strength and weakness of each examiner's approach, to call attention to leading questions and other inappropriate methods of procedure, and to bring home the warning against "halo" effects and other sources of unreliability. Such preliminary interviews will also provide an opportunity for the clarification and establishment of standards of comparison and will reveal the tendency of any rater to make use of only a small part of the available scale of values. Wherever it has been employed, the practice interview has proved itself an excellent training device.[14]

The conduct of the examination will vary somewhat, depending upon the factors being rated and the personalities of the examiners and examinee. However, a few general points may be noted.[15] The atmosphere in which the proceedings are conducted should be neither coldly formal nor highly informal. Interviewers should not, for example, barricade themselves behind a desk, with the poor candidate sitting alone out in front. If a large table is available, all may sit around it, including the candidate. The attitude of the questioner should be one of friendly interest, and care should be taken not to give an impression like that of a trial lawyer cross-examining an opposing witness. The purpose of the examination is to develop evidence of the possession or absence of certain qualities or traits, and the atmosphere in which it is conducted should be one which will encourage candidates to supply such evidence.

The questioning should open on some topic of mutual interest or concern, such as the nature of the job for which the candidate is competing and his general qualifications for it. After the candidate has been put at ease, questioning can proceed to adduce evidence upon each of the factors selected for rating. Questions should be simply and clearly phrased, and, although a basic uniformity must be maintained, their phraseology should be varied to suit the personality and background of each candidate. Leading

[14] Cf. Walter V. Bingham, *Oral Examinations in Civil Service Recruitment*, Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, Pamphlet No. 13 (Chicago: 1939).

[15] For a more adequate discussion of some of the problems involved see Walter V. Bingham and Bruce V. Moore, *How to Interview* (New York: 1941).

questions should, of course, be avoided, as should any sort of catch question.

2. Group Oral Tests. Group oral examinations refer to those in which examinees are judged on the basis of their participation in discussion of selected topics with other examinees. They are becoming widely used in both government and industry. Although the method was first used by German psychologists for military selection purposes during the 1920's, it was not until World War II that it was used by the British and United States armies and subsequently for civilian purposes in the latter countries.[16] A basic assumption underlying the use of the group oral performance test is that these techniques create a real-life situation in which the individual can react spontaneously and, in doing so, reveal temperamental, personality, and character attributes of which he himself is perhaps unaware but which the observer can note and interpret in order to formulate conclusions regarding personality pattern.

There is considerable variance in administration of the group oral test. It was found in an analysis of practices in forty-four public agencies which use this test that twenty-one make no provision for chairmen; eleven designate a member of their own panel as chairman; five agencies allow the group to decide whether or not they want a chairman, and if a chairman is desired the group selects him; seven agencies select an outside person to be chairman. Likewise, there is considerable variance in the number of candidates included in groups for examination, ranging from three candidates in one agency to fifteen in another. The most common numbers were eight and ten. The amount of time allowed for the group interviews varied from a half-hour in five agencies to four hours in one agency. Fifteen agencies allowed one hour. Applicants considered hour-and-a-half interviews ideal and two-hour interviews to be the maximum satisfactory length. Two or three examiners seem to be considered the optimum number for judging the group examination.[17]

There is no universal agreement as to selection criteria for raters of a group oral performance test. In fact, this matter is rarely discussed by its advocates. Among those who do mention raters, there are three general points of view. One is that the interviewers should be experts in the field for which the candidates are being considered. Another is that the raters should be expert in judging people. The third point of view is a compromise

[16] See Milton Mandell, "The Group Oral Performance Test," *Personnel Administration*, November, 1952, p. 3; P. E. Vernon and J. B. Parry, *Personnel Selection in the British Forces* (London: 1949); U.S. Office of Strategic Services, *op. cit.;* John Munro Fraser, "New-type Selection Boards in Industry," *Occupational Psychology*, October, 1947, pp. 170–178; and A. G. Arbous and Joy Maree, "Contributions of Two Group Discussion Techniques to a Validated Test Battery," *Occupational Psychology*, April, 1951, pp. 73–89.

[17] Harold Fields, "An Analysis of the Use of the Group Oral Interview," *Personnel*, May, 1951, pp. 480–486.

which utilizes both experts in the subject-matter field and trained psychologists or psychiatrists. Although British government and industry are more inclined to include psychologists as members of the rating teams or advisers to them than do their counterparts in the United States, there is no statistical evidence that use of psychologists adds to the validity of evaluations of participants in group oral examinations. It is generally agreed that raters should be trained, but little has been said regarding method or content for such training.[18]

Although serving some appealing purposes, the value of the group oral performance test is still questionable. It is believed that some of the qualities which the group oral measures most reliably—such as intelligence—are better measured by other, more objective instruments. Intercorrelations of ratings on the different factors listed on rating schedules indicate that they all are highly correlated.[19] To date, most validity studies of the group oral test which have been reported have lacked either sufficient controls or adequate criteria.

The high "face validity" of the group oral performance examination and the common desire of employers and supervisors to see prospective employees before they select them combine to create a lasting demand for the group oral test. Thus there is considerable difficulty in limiting its use to a role commensurate with its proven worth. This problem, along with others, reflects the dearth of knowledge of the general area of personality and the lack of practical means of identifying known personality traits.

3. Rating Procedures. The act of rating on both individual and group oral tests involves three steps: (1) reviewing the evidence; (2) evaluating the evidence by comparing it with a defined standard; and (3) recording the evaluation.[20] For each factor to be rated standards of acceptability and excellence will have been determined in advance, and these are ordinarily translated into some sort of quantitative measurement—intervals on a

[18] Milton M. Mandell discusses this in his 1952 article, *loc. cit.*

[19] For example, Arbous and Maree found that on the rating schedules for 219 examinees the correlations between total ratings on personality items and total ratings on ability items for five judges ranged from .73 to .93. This suggests that raters are not able to differentiate between various specific personal characteristics but tend to rate the person who shows considerable ability as having fine personality traits and vice versa. See Arbous and Maree, *loc. cit.* This is one of the most comprehensive studies on the validity of the group orol performance test for the selection of administrative trainees.

For further discussion of the controversy over the utility of group oral tests see William Brody, "Judging Candidates by Observing Them in Unsupervised Group Discussion," *Personnel Journal*, November, 1947, pp. 170–173; Charles A. Meyer, "The Group Interview Test: Its Weakness," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1950, pp. 147–154; Harold Fields, "The Group Interview Test: Its Strength," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1950, pp. 139–146; Harold Fields, "An Analysis of the Group Oral Interview," *Personnel*, May, 1951, pp. 480–486; and Milton M. Mandell, *loc. cit.* (Part II of the Mandell article appears in *Personnel Administration*, January, 1953, pp. 11–17.)

[20] *Oral Tests in Public Personnel Selection*, p. 121.

graphic scale, percentages, units along a numerical scale, and so forth. Each of these various scales or devices is designed to assist the examiner in recording his judgment, and there is not a great deal to choose among them for this purpose.

The question whether or not examiners should arrive at independent judgments or should be required to come to a collective agreement, like a jury, troubles many jurisdictions. The best practice is to require independent ratings—at least in the first instance. At a later time, ratings may be compared and opportunity allowed for discussion of any wide discrepancies and for a review of the evidence involved. The weight to be given to each factor should, of course, have been determined in advance and should not be considered by the participating examiners.

Good procedure demands that there be established in respect to each oral examination a comprehensive record of the procedure followed, the evidence secured, the standards employed in rating, and the actual ratings. Such a record is required if the conduct of the proceedings is to be beyond suspicion. It also serves three other important purposes: (1) as a basis for clearing up differences of opinion between examiners as to what a candidate responded to a given question; (2) as a basis for deciding appeals on ratings, thus eliminating the necessity of a reëxamination in most cases; (3) as a basis for review by the courts, when such review is provided by law.

The oral examination has failed in the past in direct proportion to the extent of its misuse. It is a delicate instrument and, in inexpert hands, a dangerous one. The first condition of its successful use is the full recognition of its limitations. One of the most prolific sources of error in the oral has been the failure on the part of examiners to understand the nature of evidence and to discriminate between that which was relevant, material, and reliable and that which was not.[21] It also must be remembered that the best oral interview provides opportunity for analysis of only a very small part of a person's total behavior. Generalizations from a single interview regarding an individual's total personality pattern have been proved repeatedly to be wrong.

V. CLASSIFICATION OF TESTS AS TO PURPOSE

Broadly speaking, mental tests fall into two groups upon the basis of the sort of thing tested: (1) tests of capacity or aptitude and (2) tests of achievement. The distinction is not absolute, since each enters to some extent into measures of the other, but it is one of major emphasis. The manner in which these two groups may be combined to realize the ends of the selection process has already been suggested. The first is designed to measure traits or innate capacities of various sorts and differs from the second group in that

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 114–121.

only incidentally does it involve learned behaviors or particular subject matter.

A. TESTS OF GENERAL ABILITIES

In discussion of tests of aptitude a further practical division may be made upon the basis of the generality or specificity of the capacities tested. Strictly speaking, the so-called general aptitudes are really composites of a number of specific aptitudes which represent certain general characteristics such as the ability to achieve in school or the ability to do mechanical work. From an operational standpoint, however, the concept of general aptitudes can be quite useful. Thus, tests have been devised for general intelligence, clerical ability, and mechanical ability, for example, on the one hand, and for more specific factors like spatial aptitude, verbal fluency, and numerical facility, on the other.

Psychometricians have never fully agreed on the exact nature of intelligence. Some have stressed that it has just a few aspects, whereas others have concluded that it consists of a great diversity of specific abilities.[22] Fortunately, it is not necessary to know the exact nature of a thing in order to measure it. To be sure, we might perfect more sensitive measuring instruments if we knew definitely whether what we call intelligence was one thing or many, but the absence of that knowledge does not render measurement impossible. The same can be said of spatial ability or of mechanical aptitude. It is possible to test these, whether or not they are composites.

Although several of these more general or composite aptitudes might be discussed, probably two of the better examples from the standpoint of testing in the public service are (1) abstract or general intelligence and (2) mechanical aptitude.

1. General Intelligence. The most widely known and extensively employed psychological test of capacity is the general intelligence test. There is considerable disagreement among psychologists as to the exact character of what the various standardized tests of abstract intelligence measure. In general, however, those who have designed the tests mean by intelligence just what is popularly meant by it: smartness, alertness, the ability to

[22] Some of the general works on this subject are C. E. Spearman, *The Abilities of Man* (New York: 1927); E. L. Thorndike, *The Measurement of Intelligence* (New York: 1927); L. L. Thurstone, *Primary Mental Abilities* (Chicago: 1938); William Brown and Godfrey H. Thomson, *The Essentials of Mental Measurement* (London: 1940); Edward B. Greene, *Measurements of Human Behavior* (New York: 1952); Philip E. Vernon, *The Measurement of Abilities* (London: 1940); George D. Stoddard, *The Meaning of Intelligence* (New York: 1943); Joseph Tiffin, *Industrial Psychology* (New York: 1952); Anne Anastasi, *Psychological Testing* (New York: 1949); Florence I. Goodenough, *Mental Testing* (New York: 1949); Donald E. Super, *Appraising Vocational Fitness* (New York: 1949); and Oscar Krisen Buros (ed.), *The Fourth Mental Measurements Yearbook* (Highland Park, N.J.: 1953). The last-named work (1163 pp.) is a comprehensive bibliography and encyclopedic reference to all kinds of tests, containing critical reviews of tests, articles, and books on the subject.

adjust readily to new situations, and so forth. It is not necessary to formulate a careful definition of intelligence in order to use intelligence tests. The pertinent question is, are they of any value in the selection process? If they are selective and the selections made upon the basis of these tests have some constant relationship to later adjustment to the job situation, they may serve an important utilitarian purpose.

There is a considerable accumulation of evidence to show that a constant relationship exists between one's performance on intelligence tests and his educational achievement, and that a minimum level of "general intelligence" is a prerequisite to success in a number of occupations. Numerous investigations have indicated a relationship between intelligence, as measured by general intelligence tests, and vocational success. The evidence suggests not only that certain determinate minima of intelligence are essential in many occupations but also that an individual can be too intelligent for a particular job, causing unnecessary turnover. Thus, it seems probable that there are upper and lower limits within which the most likely candidates for many positions may be bracketed. Whether this would be true of all occupations, however, is questionable. The relationship of general intelligence to vocational success seems closer in the cases of professional, technical, and clerical positions than in those of a more mechanical nature.[23]

Tests of general intelligence are frequently found to give better results in predicting success in many higher-level specialized positions than do specialized tests which are not properly validated for the specific jobs or groups for which they are being used. In other words, if an agency does not

[23] For examples of the literature on the correlation between intelligence and job performance see "Measuring Abstract Intelligence in Personnel Work," *Public Personnel Studies*, May–June, 1929, pp. 69 ff.; Douglas Fryer, "Occupational-Intelligence Standards," *School and Society*, September, 1922, pp. 273–277; Kenyon J. Scudder, "The Predictive Value of General Intelligence Tests in the Selection of Junior Accountants and Bookkeepers," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 13, 1929, pp. 1–8; Millicent Pond, "Occupations, Intelligence, Age and Schooling," *Personnel Journal*, April, 1933, pp. 373–382; E. W. Unger and E. T. Burr, *Minimum Mental Age Level of Achievement* (Albany: 1931); Douglas H. Fryer and E. J. Sparling, "Intelligence and Occupational Adjustment," *Occupations*, June, 1934, pp. 55–63; Raymond B. Cattell, "Occupational Norms of Intelligence," *British Journal of Psychology*, July, 1934, pp. 1–28; Y. Awaji, "Intelligenzpruefung in Japanischen Heere," (Intelligence Testing in the Japanese Army), *Zeitschrift fur Angewandte Psychologie*, April, 1928, pp. 81–118; Herbert Moore, *Psychology for Business and Industry* (New York: 1942); Edward N. Hay, "Predicting Success in Machine Bookkeeping," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, December, 1943, pp. 483–493; Milton L. Blum and Beatrice Candee, "The Selection of Department Store Packers and Wrappers with the Aid of Certain Psychological Tests," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, February, 1940, pp. 76–85; Naomi Stewart, "AGCT Scores of Army Personnel Grouped by Occupation," *Occupations*, October, 1947, pp. 5–41; Walter Dill Scott, Robert C. Clothier, and William R. Spriegel, *Personnel Management* (New York: 1954); and Tiffin, *op. cit.*, pp. 88–101.

An excellent modern summary appears in J. P. Guilford, "Is Personnel Testing Worth the Money?" *Controls and Techniques for Better Management*, American Management Association, General Management Series, No. 176 (New York: 1955), pp. 52–64.

have the resources to develop and maintain continuously valid tests for specialized jobs requiring a high level of general intelligence, it may obtain better results from using a general intelligence test. Where resources permit adequate research, however, special aptitude tests can ordinarily be developed which will give a better prediction of success in any specific job than could be obtained from a test of general intelligence alone.

Public personnel agencies have devoted considerable attention to the measurement of general intelligence. In many jurisdictions intelligence tests are given as a matter of course to all applicants for certain classes of positions. There are considerably more than a dozen well-standardized tests of general intelligence from which the personnel administrator may choose. Among them are the Army General Classification Test, the Terman Group Test of Mental Ability, the Otis General Intelligence Examination, the Ohio State University Psychological Test, and the Thurstone Test of Mental Alertness.

In some jurisdictions general intelligence tests have come in for severe criticism on the ground that they were not "practical in character." It is sometimes necessary for the chief examiner to take cognizance of this objection. Tests can then be developed which are phrased in terms of the duties of the position but which correlate highly with reliable intelligence tests. In fact, most duties tests are measures of general intelligence, at least in part, and there are some positions for which no other index is satisfactory. For example, most of the applicants for the position of policeman have never had any training or experience in police work. The examiner, faced with the necessity of selecting policemen, must necessarily depend upon measures of aptitude and capacity, rather than achievement.

It should be pointed out also that factors other than general intelligence contribute to success and failure. Some of the disillusionment of past years has been due to failure to recognize this fact. Some personnel administrators have staked their whole program upon the intelligence measurements and then, when their predictions of success were not always fulfilled, have placed the blame on the intelligence tests. This is unreasonable. The fact that a particular position requires a certain minimum of intelligence does not preclude the possibility that many other traits also are required for success. The intelligence test should be used not to supplant but to supplement other methods. "The best way to use [it] is to eliminate definitely all applicants who make scores below a certain minimum and to select applicants from among those who make acceptable scores . . . and who show other evidence favorable to their appointment."[24] Intelligence tests and tests of other capacities and abilities should be used together in any scientific system of selection or promotion.

[24] Thurstone, *op. cit.*, pp. 440 ff. This system is frequently followed today by personnel administrators.

2. Mechanical Aptitude. Another capacity for which a number of tests are available has been called mechanical aptitude. This is the ability to do all kinds of mechanical work. In this respect, tests of mechanical aptitude differ sharply from trade tests for a lathe operator, for example. They are measures of general capacity rather than of specific achievement.[25] The test for this capacity which once had the widest use was the Stenquist Assembly Test, developed in 1914 by John L. Stenquist.[26] It consisted primarily of ten simple mechanical devices, among them a paper clip, a clothespin, a bicycle bell, and a simple lock, which were presented to the subject with their parts disassembled; he was required to assemble as many of them correctly as he could in a specified time.

This test was revised and improved under the title Minnesota Mechanical Ability Test, which was followed by the Minnesota Paper Form Board Test and the Block Location Test, both of which are paper-and-pencil tests and therefore better suited to the public personnel situation requiring examinations for large numbers of people. In 1940 the Psychological Corporation published the Bennett Test of Mechanical Comprehension. This test requires comprehension of the nature, operation, and effects of various physical principles rather than knowledge of specific tools or mechanical equipment. It represents an attempt to eliminate the effects of differences in experience and environment. The Purdue Mechanical Adaptability Test, published in 1946, is a brief test for measuring aptitude for mechanical, electrical, and related activities. It measures the examinee's knowledge of these skills. Various adaptations of these types of mechanical aptitude tests are used in the public service.

B. TESTS OF SPECIAL APTITUDES OR CAPACITIES

Since the landmark researches of Dr. E. L. Thorndike on general categories of intelligence there has been considerable research directed toward determining specific aptitudes—discrete unitary characteristics which are important in varying degrees in a variety of occupations and activities.[27] Probably the greatest contribution to the success of this research is the work of L. L. Thurstone[28] in developing and applying the method of factor

[25] However, "analysis of the organization of mechanical ability indicates that it probably does not involve any single general factor. Low intercorrelations between different measures of mechanical ability suggest that factors of high specificity play a major role."—D. G. Paterson, R. M. Elliott, L. D. Anderson, H. A. Toops, and E. Heidbreder, *Minnesota Mechanical Ability Tests* (Minneapolis: 1930), p. 299. See also Harry D. Kitson, "Does General Mechanical Aptitude Exist?" *Industrial Arts*, June, 1930, p. 215; J. W. Cox, *Mechanical Aptitude* (London: 1928).

[26] See John L. Stenquist, *Measurements of Mechanical Ability*, Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 130, Columbia University (New York: 1923).

[27] See Super, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

[28] Thurstone, *op. cit.*

analysis.[29] In his pioneer study in 1938 Thurstone isolated eight special mental aptitudes: spatial, number, visualization, memory, word fluency, verbal relations, perceptual speed, and induction. This study served as a basis for the *Chicago Tests of Primary Mental Abilities.* Another study of aptitudes was conducted by the United States Employment Service (USES) under the direction of Carroll Shartle.[30] In addition to mental abilities, the USES also studied speed and coördination. This study yielded eleven factors: spatial, symbol perception, spatial perception, numerical, verbal, intelligence, logic, speed, aiming, finger dexterity, and manual dexterity. In 1947, the then Army Air Forces (AAF) under the direction of J. P. Guilford, factor-analyzed the results of a considerable number of tests which yielded twenty-eight primary factors.[31] J. P. Guilford and Wayne S. Zimmerman state that they plan ultimately to develop tests of twenty "primary abilities."

Thus, it can be seen readily that a growing number of specific aptitudes are being isolated and that tests for identifying and measuring these aptitudes are being devised. Yet the amount of work remaining to be done in this field is suggested, for example, by the fact that the twenty-eight primary factors isolated by the AAF accounted for only 28 percent of the variance in pilot success.

For some time combinations of tests of special abilities have been used for predicting success in specific occupations.[32] These test batteries usually included only tests of those skills or knowledges considered to be essential for the job. For example, a stenography battery might include a typing test, a shorthand test, a spelling test, and a word meaning test. Since many specific aptitudes have now been isolated through the process of factor analysis,[33] and various combinations of these aptitudes are found to be related to success in different positions, *differential test batteries* have been constructed to provide, with a minimum amount of testing, an index of

[29] "Factor analysis is the tool used in sorting out the abilities of man. It helps separate special aptitudes from general intelligence and permits grouping of tests which overlap. . . . Factor analysis has clarified theoretical and practical problems. It helps to reduce duplication in testing programs where tests with different names actually measure the same trait. It reduces a conglomerate of psychological tests to ordered families. . . . Perhaps the greatest contribution of factor analysis has been to bring system to the study of the nature of intelligence."—Lee J. Cronbach, *Essentials of Psychological Testing* (New York: 1949), pp. 192–194.

[30] Staff, Division of Occupational Analysis, War Manpower Commission, "Factor Analysis of Occupational Aptitude Tests," *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* Summer, 1945, pp. 147–155.

[31] J. P. Guilford (ed.), *Printed Classification Tests,* Army Air Forces Aviation Psychology Report, No. 5 (Washington: 1947), and J. P. Guilford, "Factor Analysis in a Test-Development Program," *Psychological Review,* January, 1948, pp. 79–94.

[32] For a technical discussion on combining tests into a battery, see Robert L. Thorndike, *Personnel Selection* (New York: 1949), Chap. 7.

[33] For a discussion of the use of factor analysis in test construction, see Anne Anastasi, *op. cit.,* pp. 352–358.

these different aptitudes.[34] In other words, a battery of tests is designed which will identify and measure each of a number of specific human aptitudes. Scores on each of these tests are correlated with success in many different jobs, and optimum weighting (the relative effect on the total score) for each test for each job is determined. For some jobs, a certain minimum score on a particular aptitude test will be essential, but ability above that amount will not be correlated with success. In such cases, a minimum score on that test should be required, but that score should not be combined with other test results in ranking candidates. Thus, with a single test battery, candidates' potential can be ascertained and ranked for many different jobs. This not only provides an economical means of testing but also permits better placement of candidates.

An example of a test battery used in the public service is the U.S. Civil Service Commission's Multiple Abilities Battery. The purposes of the Multiple Abilities Battery, as stated in its Manual of Directions, are quoted below:

> The Multiple Abilities Battery is a device designed to evaluate applicants for low-level, entrance positions. It is a written test intended to overcome the difficulty of selecting the best qualified workers for low-level and entrance jobs since at this level there are few experience requirements and applicants may not have specific jobs in mind when they apply. The subtests in this battery are designed to measure the various abilities required in such jobs, and therefore, are useful where little or no experience is required.
>
> The Multiple Abilities Battery is a flexible instrument that makes it possible to place these applicants in the most effective manner and at the same time preserves in the selection process, the competitive principles of the merit system. By using this battery, employment and placement officers can select applicants whose abilities match the requirements of the jobs to be filled. When this battery is used in a program of recruitment for a number of jobs at one time, the labor supply can be more fully utilized by examining applicants for the several jobs at once so that each applicant can be placed in any of the jobs for which he qualifies. The applicant is placed on all registers for which he proves eligible.[35]

C. EMOTIONAL AND PERSONALITY TESTS

The fact that many personal traits of a temperamental or emotional sort are closely related to vocational success has long been recognized. Their identification and measurement, however, have proved extremely difficult. Although a number of interesting experiments have been made in this field and several of the leading commissions have utilized personality tests in an experimental way, the reliability and standardization of such tests leave much to be desired. This does not imply that personnel agencies

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[35] U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Multiple Abilities Battery* (Washington: 1952), p. 3.

with a competent staff and facilities would not do well to experiment with them. No aspect of the personnel program is more fertile for research.

Well known, for example, is the Bernreuter Personality Inventory, which estimates at one time the four personality traits measured by Thurstone's Neurotic Inventory, Allport's A-S Reaction Study, Laird's C-2 Introversion-Extroversion Test, and Bernreuter's Self-Sufficiency Test. Correlations of the component scales in the Personality Inventory with the other four separate tests have yielded high coefficients.[36]

Also mention should be made of interests for which a number of inventories and scales have been developed. Of these, Strong's Vocational Interest blanks have been used widely and successfully in vocational counseling, and some agencies have used them experimentally in recruitment. Strong has differentiated a number of occupational groups in terms of patterns of interest, and the probabilities are that a person will not be successful in a given field unless his interests resemble those of persons successful in that area.[37] Although the use of interest tests for initial selection for the public service is limited by the possibility of examinees giving false answers in order to appear interested in jobs for which they are applying, such tests can be used very effectively within the service, along with proper orientation and counseling, in achieving optimum placement.

D. ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

Achievement tests, as distinguished from aptitude tests, are widely employed, and the traditional civil service examinations are of this type. They are useful in the selection of employees already possessed of particular job-skills but are only incidentally indicative of the possibilities of future development. Tests of this character may be classified as *educational, trade,* and *demonstration* or *performance tests.*

Whenever a test aims to discover the extent to which an individual has

[36] General works on personality testing include Raymond B. Cattell, *Description and Measurement of Personality* (New York: 1946); H. J. Eysenck, *Dimensions of Personality* (London: 1947); Super, *op. cit.*, Chap. 19; Anastasi, *op. cit.*, Chaps. 20–23; H. J. Eysenck, *The Structure of Personality* (London and New York: 1953); and Frederick Gehlmann, L. W. Ferguson, and John F. Scott, *Personality Tests—Uses and Limitations*, Personnel Report No. 561 (Civil Service Assembly, Chicago: 1956).

[37] E. K. Strong, Jr., "Vocational Interest Test," *Educational Record*, April, 1927, *Change of Interests with Age* (Stanford University: 1931), "Classification of Occupations by Interests," *Personnel Journal*, April, 1934, "The Vocational Interest Test," *Occupations*, April, 1934, pp. 49–56, and "Predictive Value of the Vocational Interest Test," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, May, 1935, pp. 331–349. See also Douglas Fryer, *The Measurement of Interests* (New York: 1931); I. R. Berman, J. G. Darley, and D. G. Paterson, *Vocational Interest Scales* (Minneapolis: 1934); G. F. Kuder, "The Stability of Preference Items," *Journal of Social Psychology*, February, 1939, pp. 47–50; E. K. Strong, Jr., *Vocational Interests of Men and Women* (Palo Alto: 1943); Super, *op. cit.;* Anastasi, *op. cit.;* and Buros, *op. cit.*, pp. 736–750, for a picture of work in this field.

mastered specific subject matter, usually of an academic type, that is an *educational test.* It may be a test of spelling ability as employed in most clerical examinations, of knowledge of sociology, economics, or government, as employed in a battery for junior social workers, of surveying methods in a civil draftsman or engineering examination.

There are many standardized educational scales available to the personnel administrator. In general, however, administrators have preferred to devise their own educational tests. This preference has been emphasized by the fact that many of the standard scales have been standardized upon the basis of results with children and require considerable adaptation before they can be used with adults.

The United States Civil Service Commission carries on considerable experimental work with educational tests. It includes tests of formal training in academic subjects, such as arithmetic, spelling, and physics, in many of its test batteries.

Trade tests are also educational tests, but for purposes of discussion they may be differentiated. The trade test is designed to measure the degree to which a person possesses a given occupational skill. Thus, we may have trade tests not only for the carpenter, the toolmaker, and others in the skilled trades groups but also for clerical workers, accountants, architects, city planners, and many other occupations. The essential characteristic of the trade test is that it is composed of items designed to test the applicant's knowledge of or skill in the performance of the duties of the particular job.

An idea of the general character of the trade tests employed in civil service may be gathered from an examination of two groups of tests: (1) those for mechanical positions and (2) those for clerical positions. The trade tests for mechanical positions used by the more progressive civil service commissions employ both short-answer items and picture tests. The use of picture tests has marked a distinct advance in testing for specific trade knowledge. An expert mechanic may be totally unable to compose an essay on the tools used in his trade, for example, but he can identify them with ease from a good photograph and reveal his knowledge of their uses through the short-answer questions.[38]

There is a wide variety of *clerical tests* adapted to different clerical positions. However, if the tests for stenographers, bookkeepers, and others requiring specialized knowledge are eliminated, a fairly accurate classification of the tests employed for other clerical positions can be made. Their content can be divided into five parts: (1) arithmetic and spelling; (2) classifying and tabulating; (3) tests of business information; (4) grammar, reading,

[38] Tests for skilled workers have also been highly developed in the private as well as in the public field. For excellent accounts of the specific developments along these lines see Viteles, *op. cit.*, Chaps. 13 and 14, and Tiffin, *op. cit.*, pp. 145–163.

letter-writing, oral English; and (5) proofreading, alphabetizing, filing.[39]

Another variety of achievement test is the so-called *practical* or *demonstration test.* This is the type of testing done when an applicant for a job as paver is asked to pave a section of street, or as architect to design a building, or as diesinker to cut a die. Practical tests of this kind are universally employed in industry and have had wide usage in civil service.

This extension of the performance type of test beyond the mechanical or routine areas in which it has traditionally been used was one of the major developments of public personnel testing. Demonstration tests possess a number of distinct advantages. In the first place, experience has shown the work sample to have greater validity from the standpoint of prediction than almost any other type of test. For example, it is perfectly possible for a man to pass a written information test on paving when he has never paved a foot of street. But if pavers are selected upon the basis of their ability to pave as revealed in the actual performance of the work, there is every reason to believe that they will be able to perform the work satisfactorily after they are hired. A second advantage lies in the fact that the demonstration test is given under conditions closely analogous to those of the job and excludes extraneous elements, such as language ability, which might interfere with the performance of a man on a test, but not on the job. Finally, they possess many advantages from a public relations standpoint, since both candidates and the general public understand them and appreciate their relevance to selection.

At the same time, certain distinct limitations should be kept in mind. Possibly the most serious of these is the difficulty of rating this type of test. For some positions an objective scheme of rating can be easily devised. It is simple, for example, to rate the performance of a typist in terms of the speed and accuracy of her work. It is another matter to rate performance in many of the skilled trades or professions. Here the procedure must be subjective, and this makes for unreliability. The door is readily opened to favoritism and political influence when the standing of a man depends upon subjective estimates of his work.

A second major difficulty is an administrative one. Demonstration tests are expensive and difficult to administer. If the number of applicants for a position is large, a practical demonstration may be entirely out of the question. If the tests are being conducted with expensive machines or tools, there is always the possibility that an inexperienced man may get into the examination and damage the equipment. In spite of these limitations, however, and in spite of the fact that the demonstration test may

[39] This classification, first published in 1923, still is sound; see L. L. Thurstone, "A Comparative Study of Clerical Tests," *Public Personnel Studies,* Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (November–December, 1923).

fail to differentiate men with capacities for improvement, it has been widely employed.

E. HEALTH AND PHYSICAL TESTS

A general "going over" by a medical staff to discover organic or other serious physical defects in all applicants for appointment is advisable, particularly if the appointees are to become members of a retirement system providing some form of income in case of partial or total disability. Many progressive private employers and public agencies have adopted this policy.[40] Periodic health examinations have also been prescribed in exceptional organizations and are widely advocated by the medical profession.

In case a preliminary health examination is not required for *all* new entrants, it should be not advisable but mandatory for prospective appointees to certain classes of positions which call for physical exertion and abilities of one sort or another. Reference is made to police and firemen, employees of the street cleaning and sanitation departments, and laborers of all sorts. The New York City and Los Angeles commissions, for example, have devised a variety of practical methods of testing the physical equipment of applicants. Strength, endurance, agility, coördination, and various physical skills may be tested out in a number of ways according to the requirements of the different classes of positions. It has also long been customary to establish minimum height and weight qualifications for policemen. However, there is some feeling in recent years that there has been too much emphasis on arbitrary physical standards. So many other variables enter into the physical fitness of a candidate that the efficacy of such arbitrary standards is questionable.

F. USE OF STANDARDIZED TESTS

The direct use of any standardized tests by public personnel agencies is always somewhat limited, for at least three reasons. In the first place, the general public tends still to be suspicious of tests which do not appear to have a direct connection with the position to be filled, and this suspicion is sometimes shared by the courts and by legislative bodies. From the standpoint of public relations, therefore, it may often be necessary to translate such tests into more acceptable terms. Secondly, the available tests have all been standardized upon the basis of school population, college students, or army recruits, and the available norms are not, therefore, directly applicable to the selected group of civil service candidates. This does not mean that such norms are not suggestive, but it is a limiting factor in their use. Finally, there is the problem of cramming and of cram schools. Commercial tests are available to anyone and have a limited number of forms, and

[40] See Chapter 15 for further discussion of health examination programs.

performance on them can be improved by coaching. For these reasons, among others, the widespread use of commercial tests probably cannot be expected.

It does not follow from this, however, that standardized, commercially available tests are not of importance to the civil service examiner. He must attempt to test the same sort of things measured by standardized examinations and in much the same ways. Every agency, therefore, should maintain a file of such tests, not only as a source of suggestions and ideas, but as essential data for examination research. Tests of known reliability and validity may in themselves become criteria against which to check examinations produced by the public personnel agency.[41]

VI. FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF TEST CONSTRUCTION

A. VALIDITY

Tests should have validity, that is, *they should actually measure what they purport to measure.* A perfectly valid test would rate prospective employees in exactly the same relationship to one another as they would stand after trial on the job. Perfect validity is practically impossible to achieve. Reasonable validity, however, is not only possible but indispensable. Selection upon the basis of tests which have no known validity may be little different from selection upon the basis of the turn of a card. Yet some public personnel agencies in the United States are still using tests which have not been subjected to this criterion.

The validity of a test is determined by the relationship between the test results and some criterion of efficiency on the job.[42] The coefficient of correlation has become the most widely employed index of validity. It is a statistical index expressing the degree of relationship between two variables. A coefficient of +1.00 signifies perfect correspondence, while one of 0.00 indicates no relationship at all.

The process of determining the validity of a test, then, involves correlations between the test results and some criterion of efficiency on the job. The character of this criterion is of considerable importance, and the difficulty of securing an adequate one has discouraged many examiners from attempting to establish validity at all. Where the worker is engaged in production activities to which it is easy to adapt unit measurements, the question of the criterion presents no problem. Thus, the efficiency of a typist can be gauged by the speed and accuracy of the work accomplished,

[41] Buros, *op. cit.*, is an especially useful tool because of its critical analyses of tests in all fields. Several professional organizations, like the American Public Health Association, provide tests and testing services to public agencies. See the association's *The Merit System Service* (New York: 1949).

[42] For an interesting discussion of test validation see L. J. O'Rourke, "Office Employment Tests," in W. J. Donald (ed.), *Handbook of Administration* (New York: 1931), pp. 792–806.

that of an assembler by the number of pieces assembled in a given time, and so forth. But the simplicity of the problem disappears when attention is directed toward an adequate criterion of efficiency for policemen, let us say, or civil engineers or psychiatrists. In these cases and many others the investigator must rely upon appraisals by those closely acquainted with the work of the employees.

There are two procedures by which the validity of a test is determined, each supplementary to the other. In the first instance, the test may be administered to employees of known ability already on the job. If those employees who are known to be most efficient score highest on the test, while the least efficient employees score lowest, the test has validity. The second procedure in checking on the validity of a test, and one that should be employed to supplement the foregoing, consists in follow-up studies of the performance of those employees who have been selected through it. No test can be said to be truly valid until both these procedures have been employed. Underfinancing in most instances has prevented enough endeavor along these lines in public personnel agencies. In addition, the absence of a generally satisfactory performance appraisal system has made the determination of the criteria difficult and has retarded what work has been done. Finally, the fact that follow-ups can be conducted on only a small fraction of the original test population—those actually appointed—has been a limiting factor.

B. RELIABILITY

By the reliability of a test is meant *the consistency with which it serves as a measuring instrument.* If a test is reliable, a person taking it at two different times should make substantially the same score each time. Under ideal conditions a test can never be any more than a sample of the ability being measured. Because of this fact the sample should be as representative as it is possible to make it. No test is of value in personnel work unless it has a high degree of reliability. This is usually determined by one of three methods: (1) by giving the test to the same group at two separate times and correlating the resultant series of test scores, (2) by giving two or more different (but equivalent) forms of the same test and correlating the resultant test scores, or (3) by the so-called split-half, or odd-even, method. When reliability is determined by the latter method, the test is given but once, but the items are divided and scores on one-half of the items are correlated with scores on the other half.

C. STANDARDIZATION

There are several senses in which the term "standardization" is employed in respect to test construction and validation. It refers sometimes to the establishment of norms, sometimes to the process of scaling items, and

sometimes to the whole procedure of construction and validation.[43] In so far as the tests used in public personnel administration are concerned, however, the process of standardization may be said to include (1) the establishment of norms and (2) the scaling of test items in terms of difficulty.

The establishment of norms is more difficult in respect to tests employed by personnel administrators than in the case of educational tests for at least two reasons: (1) the population examined is less homogeneous, and (2) control groups are less easily obtained than in the schools. It does not follow from this, however, that norms cannot be determined. The entire examining process assumes a degree of homogeneity among the groups tested, and an examination can, if necessary, be standardized in this sense while in use. That is, norms may be established upon the basis of performance on the test over a period of time. Such has been the process followed in the case of a number of tests employed by the United States Civil Service Commission, although it would be less feasible in those jurisdictions which publicly distribute copies of their tests. The points that should be stressed here are that a test score can be interpreted only in relation to other scores, that the testing process involves, therefore, the recognition of some sort of norm, and that the question of the adequacy of norms is a relative one. Perfectly adequate norms for a given examination would embrace the entire population eligible for that examination. For practical purposes, however, norms established upon the basis of a representative sample are sufficient. What constitutes adequacy, therefore, would vary for examinations for different positions in which varying qualifications were involved.

More important as an element in the standardization of public personnel tests is the scaling of test items in terms of difficulty. To be of functional value in a test, each item must be of such difficulty as to be missed by a part of the examinees but not by all. That is, no item is of discriminatory value which is answered either correctly or incorrectly by everyone. Secondly, since items of different degrees of difficulty will discriminate between persons of different degrees of ability or achievement, it is essential that the items be well distributed along the difficulty scale.

The difficulty of an item is, of course, determinable only in terms of the proportions of the total test population who miss it. This phase of standardization properly demands, then, a careful analysis of each item in a test to determine the degree to which it is correctly or incorrectly answered and the inclusion in the final test of a sufficient number of items of various degrees of difficulty.[44]

[43] Cf. Earle South, *A Dictionary of Terms Used in Measurement and Guidance* (New York: 1938).

[44] See the standard works: Adkins, *op. cit.*, pp. 137–148, and Herbert E. Hawkes, E. F. Lindquist, and C. R. Mann, *The Construction and Use of Achievement Examinations* (Cambridge: 1936), p. 82.

Most of the tests at present employed by progressive public personnel agencies are carefully standardized and of good reliability. With some experience it is possible to build a test which will at once result in a good distribution of scores. If a large number of items is collected and careful analysis made of the test results of each item, the items may be graded as to difficulty and filed away for future use. When a particular examination has to be held, it is then necessary only to go to the file and select the proper number of easy, intermediate, and difficult items, and a reasonably balanced test will result.

D. THE EVALUATION OF TEST RESULTS

The evaluation of test results, involving as it does all the problems of scoring and weighting of items and the assignment of relative weights to tests used in a battery, is surrounded with highly technical considerations. Most of these are beyond the scope of this chapter, and the questions involved can be considered only in the broadest terms.[45] In so far as scoring is concerned, suffice it to say that a raw score means little or nothing until it is interpreted in terms of other scores on the same test and in the light of established norms. It is unfortunate that so many legislatures and municipal councils have seen fit to set an arbitrary passing mark for all civil service examinations, or that the commission itself has fixed it in its rules where this is not the case. The usual passing mark is 70 on a scale of 100, although 75 or even 80 is sometimes employed. Obviously, these mean nothing at all. Seventy on one examination may have no relationship to 70 on another, and this may or may not be the critical score for either. This difficulty can be overcome by the examining staff if the critical raw score is determined on a particular test and that is called 70. All too frequently, however, no such procedure is employed.

The use of a critical score in interpreting test results means that the examiner is really employing a rough two-step scale. The critical score may be set at that point above which most of the candidates will be successful on the job, and all making less than the test's critical score may be dropped from consideration. This is an extremely rough method of interpretation, but even this procedure implies careful standardization of the tests employed and full knowledge of their validity. It also involves the pursuit of follow-up studies to determine the selective qualities of the test and the relative efficiency on the job of those with various test scores.

A somewhat more desirable method of interpreting raw test scores than the critical score is the method of percentiles. The chief difficulty with the employment of the critical score is that the correlations between test success and success on the job are never perfect. If they were, it would be

[45] The interested reader is referred to Donald J. Sublette, *Statistical Procedures in Connection with Personnel Testing* (Detroit Civil Service Commission: 1936), and Adkins, *op. cit.*, Chap. 4, particularly pp. 194–202.

possible to set a critical score above which all applicants would succeed in the position. Practically, however, this is a matter of the ratio between hits and misses. The best that can be achieved is to say that the chances are 5 to 1 or 10 to 1, or some other ratio, that those who achieve the critical score or above will succeed. It is always, therefore, a matter of arbitrary judgment, affected by the number of applicants or the state of the labor market, as to where the score should be placed.

On the other hand, interpretation in terms of percentiles gives the examiner a complete picture of his test results and yields much finer divisions than the rough two-step scale resulting from the use of the critical score. Moreover, it is equally adaptable to all test scores and is a convenient, if somewhat inaccurate, method of reducing the scores on a number of separate tests to a common basis. Because of these advantages and because the general idea of ranks is easily grasped, this method has been widely employed.[46]

Whenever possible, tests should be centrally scored. This procedure is desirable in the interest of uniformity and is usual wherever a central personnel agency exists. In ratings which require subjective judgments, best practice calls for independent ratings by two or more examiners and the reconciling of any marked differences between the two. Other things being equal, the objectivity of the final rating increases with the number of independent ratings.

The problem of assigning relative weights to the various tests in a battery is one with which personnel administrators are frequently confronted. Practically all the tests used in the public field are in the battery form and require some sort of weighting scheme. It should be remembered that, *if the tests in a battery are not weighted, they weight themselves according to the variabilities (standard deviation) of their distributions*, and the result may not be at all what the examiner wishes.

A number of methods of assigning relative weights to tests in a battery are sanctioned by common usage. The simplest and most widely employed procedure is to assign a weight to each separate test in accordance with the guess of the examiner as to the importance of each. This is the procedure almost universally followed by public personnel agencies in determining the weights to be attached to experience statements, interviews, and written tests. A more defensible practice is to assign the weights, still somewhat arbitrarily, upon the basis of coefficients of correlation between the separate tests in the battery and the criterion used to determine validity. Even this method requires a great deal of practical experience if it is to be employed successfully. The only really reliable method of assigning weights is through the use of multiple-regression equations. The labor

[46] Otis *Universal Percentile Graph*, published by the World Book Company (Yonkers-on-Hudson), may be used for the presentation of the resulting scores.

involved in such a procedure is much more than with arbitrary weightings, but the resultant increase in the validity and prognostic power of the test more than compensates for it.[47] (Whatever method is used will depend for its success largely upon the adequacy of the job analysis and criterion of validity employed.)

One of the major problems associated with the rating of examinations is presented by the volume of competitors. It is not at all unusual to have hundreds and often thousands of applicants for a single examination; the task of rating such large numbers of papers within a reasonable time is colossal. The problem has been met in most large jurisdictions by the application of machine methods.

VII. THE FORMAL TESTING PROGRAM AND ITS ADMINISTRATION

The volume of work done by the examining divisions of the various civil service commissions in the United States is tremendous. Some idea of the extensiveness of this work may be gained from Table 4, which shows the number of examinations and of persons examined for the Federal competitive service, for the two-year period 1953–1954.

TABLE 4. Number of Examinations and of Persons Examined, Federal Civil Service

Fiscal Year	Number of Examinations Announced	Applications Processed	Total Placements Made[a]
1953	24,480	1,718,850	429,312
1954	25,549	1,381,816	313,935

[a] These include all appointments requiring the commission's approval, such as interagency transfers and reinstatements. Therefore, figures in this column cannot be related to the number who were rated on examinations.

SOURCE: Figures are from U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Annual Reports* for fiscal years 1953 and 1954, pp. 13 and 51 respectively.

The bewildering variety of the positions for which examinations are held in any one year is exceeded by the greater variety of special aptitudes and skills required of employees in those positions. Obviously, no single individual can be familiar with such a range of data. This raises the question of where the examiner is to turn for help on his testing program. There are a number of possibilities, most of which have been utilized by one or another public personnel administrator. In the first place, standardized or partially standardized tests developed by others in the field may be employed. Many of the larger personnel agencies depend to some extent upon

[47] The interested reader is referred to any of the standard works on measurement techniques previously cited.

these. There has also been a growing tendency toward collaboration among various agencies in test construction and the exchange of test materials. The problem is now commonly approached through the device of joint examinations, which are perfectly feasible in many areas and have the effect of lightening the burden of test construction and of permitting specialization.[48]

Another method lies in the use of specialists already employed in the governmental service. This is widely followed, with technicians within the service coöperating freely in the development of tests for specialized and technical positions. In addition, many examinations employed by the United States Civil Service Commission are administered by boards representing the department or service concerned. The utilization of talent already in the service is a desirable procedure and may meet all requirements in the larger jurisdictions. In the smaller ones, however, it is necessary for the examining staff to fall back on the assistance of outside experts and special examiners. This may have the disadvantage that the examiners are unacquainted with the particular needs of the service, but this is not an insurmountable obstacle. A more serious limitation from the standpoint of many public personnel agencies lies in the fact that it is often expensive to bring in qualified experts.

From the standpoint of administration, civil service examinations may be divided into *assembled* and *unassembled* tests. The assembled test is more extensively employed. It is distinguished by the fact that all the candidates are brought together in some central place or, in the case of large jurisdictions, in several centers, and tested as a group. The unassembled examination, on the other hand, is administered without assembling the candidates and is usually taken individually. In many instances the competitor in an unassembled examination is tested wherever he may be, without having to report to any central place. Naturally, therefore, the content of the two types of examinations differs. Formal written tests have been seldom employed in the unassembled examination. Instead, it may consist in the submission of papers by the candidate, usually a detailed education and experience statement. Upon the basis of these tests the more promising candidates may be asked to appear for a personal interview.

The typical civil service examination is of the assembled type, but the unassembled examination is frequently used in competitions for high-grade positions. Likewise, special rights of veterans to reopen examinations

[48] Numerous instances can be found each year. For example, coöperative testing programs are often cited in the *Municipal Year Book*. The Division of State Merit Systems of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has also been a source for promotion of cooperative test activity among state and local jurisdictions concerned with Federally aided programs. For example, in 1955 a total of twenty-one jurisdictions in seventeen states participated in a HEW-sponsored workshop on construction of examination items for jobs common to their health and welfare agencies.

and the increasing use of open continuous registers has stimulated more unassembled tests, even when written.

Another distinction, which was touched upon earlier, may be made between competitive and noncompetitive tests. The essential feature of the competitive examination is, of course, competition. This is true whether it is an open or a closed competitive test. The open competitive examination is the more widely employed form and is characterized by the fact that it is thrown open to all properly qualified persons who care to compete. The field is usually somewhat restricted by the civil service laws, which often provide that competitors must be residents of the particular jurisdiction. Aside from this and the educational and experience qualifications set up by the examining staff, the open competitive examination is open to all, appointments being made from those who make the best relative showings. The closed competitive examination differs from the open only in being confined to a more restricted field of applicants. It is not unusual, for example, to restrict competition on certain examinations to persons already in the service or to those employed in a particular department or a particular grade or class. The competitive promotional examination is likely to be of this type.

The noncompetitive examination differs from the competitive in that it is a straight pass-or-fail proposition, not involving the element of competition. It may be administered to one or a number of persons at one time. Any candidate who passes the noncompetitive examination may be appointed immediately, whether his mark is 71 or 98. It is still extensively employed for purposes of promotion and the filling of high-grade and very low-grade positions. However, it is usually more desirable to make the initial selection process a competitive one. With positions such as those in the unskilled labor group, competitive examinations may not be worth their cost, although this seems to be belied by the experience of many organizations in recruiting laborers by examination.

An important step in the examination process is the consideration of appeals on examination and experience ratings. Unless candidates are given an opportunity to appeal these ratings, there is the possibility that favoritism will be charged. Moreover, any examiner is likely to make a mistake, and there should be some machinery set up by which mistakes can be rectified. This fact has been recognized by most of the larger public personnel agencies in the United States. However, the consideration of appeals is still largely an informal matter. A common procedure is for the appellant to be turned over to one of the examining staff, who "talks him out of it."

In a number of jurisdictions, however, the matter of appeals on examinations has been more completely standardized. In the Federal service, for example, appeals (following reconsideration by the initial examining unit in the case) are heard by the Board of Appeals and Review, an agency

created by the commission and responsible to it. This board is entirely independent of the examining offices and may therefore be considered to be more impartial than one composed of persons who have already graded the papers. It has full authority independently to rerate papers and experience. Many other jurisdictions likewise have formal appeal machinery.

VIII. PERSONAL INVESTIGATIONS

The personal investigation constitutes an indispensable step in the well-devised selection program, particularly in relation to positions involving responsibility. Candidates may meet all requirements in terms of education and experience qualifications, have an excellent test record, and still be unsuitable for employment by reason of character, temperament, or similar factors which cannot be weighed in the formal testing program. Reliable information on questions of this kind can be secured only through careful inquiry by trained investigators.[49]

The purposes served by the personal investigation vary from one jurisdiction to another, but the procedure is well adapted to any of the following: (1) verification of statements made on the application; (2) discovery of significant data bearing upon integrity, character, repute, and so forth; (3) discovery of significant data bearing upon temperament, emotional stability, sociability, and the like. Here we are not discussing the problem of loyalty, which is dealt with at length in Chapter 18.

One of the first questions which must be settled in connection with the administration of the personal investigation has to do with the agency to be charged with this important function. Practice varies. In some jurisdictions, investigations are conducted by the personnel agency, in others by the operating departments, and in still others by both. In the Federal service, the Civil Service Commission investigates some candidates before certification, but many of the departments investigate applicants independently, either before appointment or during the probationary period. The investigative function is an integral aspect of personnel management and should be performed by either the central personnel agency or the appointing authority.

There is some variation in practice respecting the stage of the employment process at which the investigation is made. The more usual times are: (1) after the determination of eligibility, but before certification; (2) after certification, but before appointment; (3) during the probationary period. Obviously, the investigational load decreases in relation to the degree to which the employment process has advanced before investigation. From the standpoint of economy, therefore, stages 2 or 3 above would possess advantages over stage 1. However, the best practice places the investiga-

[49] For a general discussion of investigative methods see President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement, *Investigative Services* (Washington: 1942), Vol. III, Part II, pp. 91–110.

tion conducted by the central personnel agency at the eligibility level, rather than later. It is as important to determine qualifications in terms of character, temperament, and so forth, prior to certification as it is to determine those respecting education, experience, and skill. But cost has led to widespread neglect of this procedure.

The actual conduct of the investigation will vary under different conditions, depending in large measure upon the factors to be checked. Many jurisdictions rely heavily upon mailed inquiry forms, in order to reduce to a minimum the amount of personal interviewing with persons who know the candidate. The extent to which the interview method is preferable will depend partly upon the factors to be evaluated. Where factors of temperament, character, or personality are important, the greater cost of an interview procedure will be more than warranted. The personal investigation tends to be a rather expensive aspect of the selection process, although the costs involved vary widely, depending upon the types of procedure followed. But its value, especially for technical and managerial posts, is incalculable. In addition, mention should be made at this point of the effectiveness of fingerprinting as a device for excluding persons with police records.

As in other instances of rating, opportunity should be provided for appeal in respect to the rating developed by the personal investigation. This means that the candidate should have the opportunity of knowing the character of any damaging evidence secured against him (provided the confidence of sources is not violated) and of filing an answer to it. Unless this important principle is observed, the potential dangers in an investigational procedure may outweigh all the advantages. These potential dangers are very great indeed. The investigator engaged in making a confidential inquiry is essentially irresponsible unless checked at some point, and the matters under investigation are often of so intangible a character as to lend themselves to the exercise of malice or prejudice. It is especially important, therefore, that a candidate disqualified upon this basis should first have an opportunity to be heard. Such opportunity is one of the distinguishing marks of responsible government.

SUMMARY

After the recruitment stage, the basic steps in the competitive selection process center on the function of examination. Examination may take the form of rating of training and experience, but a widely used form of examination in public jurisdictions is the written test. Close in importance are the performance test and the oral test. As to purpose, civil service tests range the gamut from many kinds of tests of aptitude, particularly those measuring general intelligence, to a wide range of achievement tests. The

latter represent the most commonly known type of examination for entrance to the public service.

The importance of test validity and reliability is so great that no more fitting appeal can conclude this chapter than that for increased attention to, and funds for, test research. There is still too little scientific analysis and control in various phases of testing and selection. The major civil service testing agencies should be equipped with strong research staffs which will bring together the output and findings of psychological research laboratories and make independent checks on the results of their own testing programs. Even the staff of the United States Civil Service Commission is woefully small. Unfortunately, such activities do not seem to be appreciated by the budgeteers and congressional appropriation committees. Yet there are few aspects of personnel administration where more is to be gained in the way of improvement of efficiency than in the measurement and prediction of the performance of candidates for jobs.

The smaller jurisdictions must depend on pooling their research with other governmental units or upon the services that may be rendered by a higher jurisdiction. Thus, several states, notably New York and California, provide such leadership to local communities. The most significant provision of this kind on the Federal level is that provided by the Division of State Merit Systems of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for all state agencies receiving various health and welfare funds through that department.

Until more legislators and executives are appreciative of the values of personnel research in this and other phases of the field, public personnel administration will fall short of all that is expected of it.

6

Selection: From Outside the Service

The problem of staffing a government agency is one of filling positions or occupational categories from any of several sources. When an appointing officer is considering the establishment of a new job or wishes to fill a vacancy, his attention should be turned to all practical sources of candidates whether inside or outside the service. Thus, initial recruitment and selection are inextricably bound up with movement of employees already in the service from job to job. This chapter and the one following attempt to discuss the many ramifications of this total subject. It is only for convenience and because the steps for securing candidates from outside the service are essentially different from selection from within that we have divided the subject into two chapters. This chapter deals with those aspects of selection from among outside candidates which follow the examination process.

I. EMPLOYMENT LISTS

The applications having been passed upon and the examinations rated, the next step in the employment process is to compile and promulgate the list or register of eligible candidates. This is usually composed of the names of all those who possess the requisite qualifications and who have received the passing grade on the examinations.[1] These are ranked in the order of their relative standing, from the highest to the lowest, except as such ranking is disturbed by the preferential rating given war veterans and their widows or, in case of disability, their wives.[2] Since large numbers of veterans present themselves for appointment to governmental positions, and preferential treatment is granted in almost every jurisdiction, special attention is given to this subject in connection with a discussion of employment lists.

[1] Such a procedure may bear little relation to the needs of the service. In times of a plentiful labor supply, unless standards are raised, it frequently results in a list containing many more names than can ever be certified.

[2] In cases of identical ratings, ranking is determined by priority of filing applications.

Separate eligible lists are usually maintained for each class of positions for which examinations are given. They can be properly established, however, only upon the basis of a comprehensive duties classification.[3] Otherwise they cannot be closely related to the positions to be filled, and, furthermore, unnecessary duplications may result. For example, in jurisdictions where no classification study has been made it is not unusual to find separate eligible lists for a junior file clerk in one department and a junior clerk in another, although for practical purposes the duties of the two positions are identical. Since the certification of eligibles from another register is frequently not possible, this means that dozens of qualified candidates may indefinitely await appointment on one list while a shortage exists on another.

Quite a few years ago the U.S. Civil Service Commission began experimenting in the direction of securing flexibility of registers, by setting up less specialized examinations and using selective certification as a means of reducing the total number of lists which have to be kept up to date.[4] The commission or board of examiners passes on requests from appointing offices for selective certification, desired because of more or less peculiar and specialized requirements of the position or positions to be filled. This is now a common procedure in the use of college-level entrance examinations. The vesting of such discretion in the commission is almost mandatory in view of the great variety of positions now appearing in the classification of any fair-sized jurisdiction. To keep eligible lists up to date for the hundreds of classes of positions which appear in most classification schemes is practically impossible. The remedies are broader examinations and selective certification under some such scheme as the Federal commission inaugurated.[5]

Although the procedures related to the employment list are largely routine, one or two points seem worth emphasizing. The first has to do with the length of time elapsing between the announcement of an examination and the promulgation of the eligible list. It is a reasonable assumption that practically all those who take an examination desire at the time to enter the public service. Six months later, however, the situation may have changed. If this period of time elapses, and it is not unusual, many desirable candidates may subsequently have found employment elsewhere. Moreover, it is probable that the most desirable candidates will have dropped out of the race. Confronted with a restricted area of selection in the first place, the public personnel agency can scarcely afford to cripple the selection

[3] See Chapter 9.

[4] U.S. Civil Service Commission, *47th Annual Report* (1930), pp. 29 ff., and *56th Annual Report* (1939), pp. 32–34.

[5] For statement of official rule on selective certification see U.S. Civil Service Commission, *55th Annual Report* (1938), p. 52. The New York City law and various others likewise permit the commission to use selective certification.

process further by losing desirable candidates through an unduly long interim between the examination and the announcement of results. The length of time elapsed in this connection is a significant criterion of commission management.

This brings up a further consideration, namely, the reduction of the time between the posting of the eligible list and the appointment. In this connection, the employment agency is again confronted with one of those dilemmas which are common in the public sphere. On the one hand, the pressure of the examining work, due in part to understaffing, leads naturally to a desire to establish long eligible lists upon the basis of a single examination, so that the process may not have to be frequently repeated. In addition, much can be said for such a practice from the standpoint of good administration. The whole process of placement is greatly facilitated by a plentiful supply of eligibles, while abuses attendant upon provisional and temporary appointments are thus minimized.

On the other hand, there is a considerable shrinkage of eligible lists after they have been in force for some time. The average person cannot be expected to wait hopefully for a year or two on the chance that he may receive an appointment to a government position, and the superior candidate is not likely to. Moreover, shrinkage at this point is particularly costly, since the personnel agency has already expended a substantial amount of time, energy, and money in recruiting the applicants, rating their tests, and establishing the eligible list. It is essential, then, that the length of the employment list be reasonably related to the needs of the service. It should contain the names of but few more persons than may reasonably expect appointment within a year.

This does not mean that recruiting methods should be relaxed, so that fewer candidates apply. It means, rather, the adjustment of the testing program both to the available labor supply and to the requirements of the service, by so varying the standards that only a reasonable number achieve eligibility. It is better from the standpoint of the candidate, as well, to notify him immediately of his inability to qualify than it is to place him upon an eligible list from which he has no chance of appointment.

Because of a realization of some of these considerations, time limits are usually placed upon the life of eligible lists, either in the civil service laws or in the rules adopted by the commissions. For the most part, however, such limitations are too broad and too arbitrary to meet the needs of good administration. The usual procedure provides for the expiration of an eligible list at the end of one year, with the proviso that its life may be extended for an additional year by formal action of the commission. In some cases, however, longer extensions may be made, while a number of jurisdictions provide a two-year duration for employment lists, with possible extensions.

Moreover, the rules usually provide that a list cannot be canceled prior to its fixed expiration, except for fraud, and then only after public hearing. This restriction may be desirable as a curb on political influence. The interim between the canceling of a list and the promulgation of a new one can of course be used advantageously by a political-minded commission for securing entrance into the service through the gateway marked "provisional appointment."

A final question that deserves attention is that of publicity. To what extent should the employment list be a matter of public record? In the Federal service each applicant is notified of his examination rating, and those who have passed may be notified of their position on the list, but the complete list is never published and is not even available for public inspection at the offices of the commission. Beyond that, the only method by which an eligible can determine his status at any particular time is by direct inquiry to the commission.

On the other hand, several jurisdictions require the publication of the entire eligible list. It is rather more usual than not for the commission at least to maintain a copy of the list open to the inspection of the candidates, and in some cases to the public generally. Under such circumstances, it is customary to keep an up-to-date record of all certifications, appointments, and the like, so that any interested person can perceive the situation at a glance.

Certain objections are frequently raised to this procedure. In the first place, it is often urged that a candidate should not know when he has been certified and passed over. Another common objection is that such publicity may result in political pressure upon appointing officers and upon candidates themselves, since the politicians can thus follow the progress of their protégés. There are grounds for these objections, but they are more than outweighed by the objections which may be advanced against a policy of secrecy. Lack of publicity raises suspicion concerning the whole personnel procedure and is likely to lead to discouragement of the most desirable applicants.

Before turning to a discussion of the next steps in the employment process, i.e., certification and placement, it is in order to consider the preferred treatment accorded to veterans and their dependents in the setting up of eligible lists.

II. VETERAN PREFERENCE

In all the nations of the world, the State has been frequently faced with the problem of what to do with its creditors, i.e., with those who risked life and limb in its service. The handling of this issue contributed to the downfall of the Roman Empire, and the problem has troubled every nation since. The solutions in both ancient and modern times are of two varieties:

(1) the granting of a gratuity or pension and (2) the granting of a job. In the latter case, the public service has been opened to the veteran on terms of favoritism. This alternative has been embraced almost universally and often supplemented with a pension.

Those responsible for governmental policy are thus once more confronted with a dilemma. On the one hand, good administration demands that the public service shall be restricted to the best-qualified, the most fit in the whole State. On the other, humanitarian as well as political considerations have persuaded legislative bodies that the State should provide suitable occupations for this class of its citizens and particularly for those who have been disabled. To this end, the tendency is to make the public service their citadel, and to a certain extent to ignore the demands of good administration. The present section will deal with the manner in which various jurisdictions have created a privileged and favored class, so far as public employment is concerned. This will be followed by a brief evaluation of veteran preference.

A. PREFERENCE TO VETERANS IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

Although the problem of the ex-soldier was acute following the Revolutionary War, the small size and relative obscurity of the Federal service militated against transforming it into a haven for the veterans. Moreover, a great majority of the Revolutionary army returned to their own farms, although even then various states had their difficulties. The official opening of the Federal service to war veterans on a preferred basis awaited the War Between the States, and it was not until 1865 that preference was first accorded this group by law. An act passed March 3, 1865,[6] included the following provision: "Persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service by reason of disability resulting from wounds or sickness incurred in the line of duty shall be preferred for appointment to civil offices, provided they are found to possess the business capacity necessary for the proper discharge of the duties of such office." This particular provision was continued in force by the Civil Service Act of 1883.[7] As interpreted by the Attorney General, it meant that qualified veterans were "entitled to a preference for appointment against other persons of equal qualifications for the place,"[8] and further that "it was the purpose of Congress to make it the duty of those making appointments for civil offices to give a preference, other things being equal, to the class of persons named."[9]

Thus interpreted, the preference held little danger to the service, except

[6] Reënacted as Sec. 1754 of the *Rev. Stat.* The brief historical treatment on these pages depends heavily on Lewis Mayers, *The Federal Service* (New York: 1922), pp. 406 ff.

[7] Sec. 7, 38th Cong., 2nd sess., Res. 27.

[8] *Opinion of the Attorney General*, 1881, 17, *Op.*, 194.

[9] *Opinion of the Attorney General*, 1889, 19 *Op.*, 318.

in so far as its existence might serve to make the task of recruitment more difficult. The insistence on qualifications was such as to give veterans only a slight advantage over other applicants for public employment. But the rules of the Civil Service Commission adopted in 1888 went far beyond this, providing that those veterans entitled to preference should be preferred above all others, regardless of relative qualifications, and that they should be considered qualified if they received an examination rating of 65, even though 70 was the usual passing grade. This more sweeping interpretation received support in 1910, when the Attorney General overruled his predecessors and held that the act of 1865 *required* that qualified veterans entitled to preference should be preferred to all others on the eligible list, "irrespective of their rating."[10] Even this opinion, however, did not suggest a lower standard of qualification for those entitled to preference than for others, as had become the commission's practice. There seems no doubt that the commission went farther than was required by law.

The act of 1865 was superseded by a law enacted July 11, 1919.[11] It was virtually a reënactment of the provisions included in the act providing for the selection of officers taking the 1920 census as passed by Congress in February, 1919,[12] excepting that the preference was extended to "the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold such positions."

Once more the commission went beyond the letter, if not the spirit, of the law in the rules subsequently adopted. The fact was now clearly established that public office was to be regarded as a gratuity, so far as the veterans were concerned, and that the State as administrator was to bow to the State as almoner.

It is unnecessary to go into the details of the preference provisions that existed between 1919 and 1944. They were modified from time to time by executive order. The most important of these was the order of March 2, 1929, which provided principally for the following, as modified by subsequent orders in 1931 and 1932:

(1) The addition of ten points to the earned rating of a disabled veteran with an existing service-connected disability; the names of disabled veteran eligibles to be certified ahead of veterans not disabled and nonveterans, regardless of their ratings.

(2) Ten points added to earned ratings of widows of veterans, and wives of veterans who themselves are physically disqualified for government employment, instead of the five points formerly allowed. Wives and widows of veterans who are

[10] *Opinion of the Attorney General*, 1910, 28 *Op.*, 298.

[11] 41 *Stat.* 37.

[12] 40 *Stat.* 1293. This act reads, in part: "Hereafter in making appointments to clerical and other positions in the executive departments and independent governmental establishments preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines and widows of such, if they are qualified to hold such positions."

allowed the ten points to be certified ahead of veterans not disabled and non-veterans.

(3) More liberal preference in retention in the service for a government employee entitled to preference under the law and rules, when reduction of force becomes necessary.[13]

These provisions, designed primarily for World War I veterans, were established by executive authority and were not pinned down in statutory form. The most important change that occurred with the passage of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944[14] was that substantially these same provisions were set forth in law. Evidently Congress did not wish to leave to the executive branch the decision on how preference should be handled for veterans of World War II, even though historically the executive branch had always gone farther than the statutes had required in guaranteeing preferential treatment to veterans.

Other important changes included:

(1) Placing all ten-point preference eligibles at the top of the list, regardless of earned ratings, except for professional and scientific positions at salaries over $3000.

(2) Restriction of competition to veterans in examinations for guards, elevator operators, messengers, and custodians, as long as preference eligibles are available and for a period of five years following official proclamation of the war's termination.

(3) Allowance of time credit for military service in rating experience.

(4) Preference in retention during reductions in staff.

(5) Special notice and appeal rights for veterans in the service in the event of discharge, suspension, or reduction in rank or compensation.

(6) Confining preference for the nondisabled to veterans who served during a war.[15]

This placed in law the most drastic preference requirements that had yet been devised. In passing it should also be noted that it was this act which legislated two highly questionable policies into Federal personnel administration. First, it made statutory the old civil service rule that appointing officers could fill vacancies by selection from no more than the highest three names certified from a register of eligibles.[16] Second, it specified that no minimum educational requirement be prescribed in any civil service examination "except for scientific, technical, or professional positions the duties of which the Civil Service Commission decides cannot be performed by a person who does not have such education."[17] Since these

[13] U.S. Civil Service Commission, *46th Annual Report* (1929), pp. 7 f.

[14] P.L. 359, 78th Cong., 2nd sess., June 27, 1944. 5 *U.S. Code*, Supplement 851 *et seq.*

[15] Persons who entered military service after July 1, 1955, are not entitled to preference. These are commonly referred to as "peacetime veterans." This date would undoubtedly have been earlier if it had not been for the Korean emergency, 1950–1953, and ensuing international tensions.

[16] P.L. 359, June 27, 1944, sec. 8.

[17] *Ibid.*, sec. 5.

two points are discussed more fully in other sections of this book, there is no necessity to go into them here.

It was not until 1953 that the Congress saw fit to require veterans to achieve a passing grade on examinations before premium points are added and to define disabled veterans who get super-preference as those having at least a 10 percent compensable disability.[18] These modifications of the then nine-year-old Veterans' Preference Act constituted a distinct improvement and removed two of the main weaknesses of the law. They were achieved with the support of the major veteran organizations, including the American Legion, after these groups were persuaded by government leaders that the original provisions were inhibiting the maintenance of reasonable personnel standards. Doubtless they could not have been passed without the acquiescence of these influential organizations.

It is extremely difficult to assess accurately the effects of the veteran preference provisions in the Federal service over the years. Analysis of appointments after World War I, covering a twenty-year period from July, 1919, through June, 1939, shows that nearly one-fourth of the appointees in the competitive service were veterans.[19] Although the number of veterans in the service at any one time during that period is unavailable, it is safe to estimate that this figure was about one-fifth of the employee population. By 1954, as the result of World War II and the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, the proportion of veterans in the Federal competitive service had increased to nearly one-half, and the proportion among men reached 60 percent. Of the roughly twenty million veterans in the United States, well over one million are on the Federal pay roll.[20]

At one time the argument could be made that the quality, morale, and attractiveness of the service were seriously jeopardized by the presence in the government of a privileged office-holding class, far out of proportion to its percentage of the total adult population of the country, with a substantial number having failed to get an earned rating of passing level on an examination. This charge is less serious now. The fact is that after World War II the great bulk of employables, particularly those starting out on a career, were necessarily veterans. The greatest dislocation arose from the fact that only a small proportion of young women were veterans, whereas the great majority of young men were. Hence, the high proportion of women in the Federal service that developed during the war was swiftly reduced as men returned to their jobs and veteran preference began to have its effect in new appointments.

Related to the preference issue, although of more transitory importance,

[18] P.L. 271, 83rd Cong., 1st sess., August 14, 1953; 67 *U.S. Stat.*, 581.

[19] U.S. Civil Service Commission, *56th Annual Report* (June 30, 1939), p. 152.

[20] U.S. Civil Service Commission, *1954 Annual Report* (71st) (June 30, 1954), p. 79, and Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), p. 22. For a complete historical summary see U.S. Civil Service Commission, *History of Veteran Preference in Federal Employment, 1865–1955* (Washington: 1955).

was the effect of the Selective Service Act in guaranteeing reëmployment rights to veterans who had been in the employ of the government when they entered military service. Extensive and complicated regulations were necessary in the Federal service to cope with the staff adjustments that were required under this reëmployment program. Similar reëmployment policies were also in effect in the states. It goes without saying that, so long as we have some degree of compulsory military service, those men already in the government's employ who are drafted should be accorded genuine assurance of return to such civilian pursuits without loss of advantages that accrued in the interim. This is not "preference" in the usual sense but simply restoration to circumstances previously applicable.

In view of the high proportion of the employed population which veterans comprised, the problem of preference during the early years after the war was to a considerable extent one of competition among the veterans themselves, which left a good deal of room for the government to select the best. The remaining problem is one as to the effect of continued preference over the years, as well as the philosophical one of the justice and social desirability of using public employment as a means for rewarding military service in behalf of one's country. But more about this later.

B. PREFERENCE TO VETERANS IN STATES

Although the Federal preference provisions are more sweeping than those found in most other jurisdictions, the majority of the states have accorded some form of legal preference in employment to veterans. In those states which do not have state-wide merit systems, such rules are usually confined to that portion of the service for which a merit system is required under Federal grants-in-aid. Obviously, preference cannot be on a very formal basis where there are no formal methods for entry into the service. The mechanics of examination, rating, and certification lend themselves to precise forms of preference at several steps in the employing process. However, the language of the law in some states without merit systems amounts to absolute preference in all appointments.

Every state which has a state-wide merit system has some provision, usually by statute, for veteran preference. The customary device is like that in the Federal service, five additional points on examination ratings for veterans (and usually their wives and widows) and ten for disabled veterans,[21] with the allowable disability ranging from zero in a number of

[21] The most recent tabulation of preference in state governments appears in State of Minnesota, *Report of the Interim Committee on the Civil Service Program* (submitted to the Minnesota legislature of 1955); see particularly pp. 63–69. Another tabulation and discussion of preference in the states is found in John P. McCarthy, "Veterans' Preference in Public Employment," unpublished thesis (University of Chicago, December, 1947). See also Robert W. Binkley, "Civil Service and the Veteran," in *Problems of the Veteran*, Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, 1945 Legislative Problems, No. 2 (Berkeley: December, 1944), and "Civil Service Preference for Veterans," *Good Government* (National Civil Service League), January–February, 1948.

states to 15 percent in Kansas and Oklahoma, with most states requiring 10 percent. Some states grant ten extra points on examinations for non-disabled veterans, and two (Ohio and Washington) augment the earned rating by percentage increases (20 percent and 10 percent respectively). Although the great majority of states require a passing score, nine permit the preference points to bring a failing grade over the passing mark. Three states (Maryland, Massachusetts, and New Jersey) place all veterans at the top of the list regardless of score; seven extend this privilege to disabled veterans. Some preference in promotion examinations exists in fifteen states, seven making it equal to that allowed for initial employment. Only eight states give play to preference in retention during staff reductions. Thus, a total of thirty-five states and the territory of Hawaii have some form of preference in state employment. In most instances state preference laws apply to local subdivisions, so that provisions in cities within a state are usually similar.

By 1947 at least 559 cities of over 10,000 population allowed veterans some kind of priority in obtaining city jobs.[22] In 120 cities veterans are given extra points after they have passed an examination, along the lines of most of the state plans, while 142 give them points merely upon taking the examination. Additional preference to disabled veterans is found in 161 cities. Among the highest point preferences granted are the twenty-point bonuses given by Columbus and Cincinnati. A few allow ten points. General preference, meaning simply an advantage in selection when all other qualifications are equal, is granted by 225 cities, while 144 decree preference without any definite plan.

During the years 1944 and 1945 there was a definite increase in and liberalization of veteran preference benefits in state and municipal services. Veterans' counseling and placement services were set up in the majority of state and local civil service agencies. As examples of stiffening of the provisions, New Jersey gave appointing authorities no choice among eligibles when veterans were certified, and Colorado fixed in its state constitution the requirement that civil service systems provide veteran preference in the state and local services.

On the other hand, some jurisdictions limited their preference procedure to five years after the war or after the discharge of the veteran, as did Chicago, Mobile County (Alabama), and all the cities in New York State. By 1949 movements were afoot in various places to reduce the more drastic provisions that had gone into effect earlier. Illinois in 1949 modified its law by providing a five-point bonus to veterans who receive passing marks on examinations, replacing the former policy of automatically placing all veterans who passed at the top of the list. New York amended its con-

[22] Out of the 703 cities reporting; see *Municipal Year Book, 1947*, p. 127. The total number of cities with over 10,000 population was 1072.

stitutional provision on preference by reducing the almost absolute preference that had existed to a point system. Official reports to 1955 state legislatures in both Illinois and Minnesota recommended reduction of preference rights. Elimination of absolute preference and requirement of a passing grade were urged in Minnesota, while in Illinois a State Personnel Administration Commission advocated limiting employment preference to a five-year period after the return of veterans to civilian life. The latter report conceived of this preference as part of the rehabilitation process. There is also a move in Michigan to reduce the number of preference points in examinations. The pendulum is generally beginning to swing away from the more drastic preference laws.[23]

C. VIEWS ON VETERAN PREFERENCE

By its very nature the subject of veteran preference is controversial. The largest veterans' organizations have proved to be most effective lobbies in its support. Civil service unions and professional personnel and merit system organizations tend to look upon it with suspicion, although during and following a war few are able to brave the tide of sentiment that brings renewed demands for preference. Between the two world wars the opposition to the American system of preference had gained considerable headway.[24] Most other countries had not employed such methods, confining their preference policies largely to certain occupations that could make use of the special experience derived from military service. But, as World War II drew to a conclusion, this movement to modify or eliminate veteran preference was completely swamped by the desire of legislators to outdo each other in suggesting rewards for the veteran. The culmination was the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and similar laws in the states, which made stronger and more firmly entrenched the use of public employment as a principal method of paying off the soldier and the sailor.

By comparison with our neighbor to the north, however, we have rather modest preference laws. Like only a few of our states and cities, Canada places all veterans who pass an examination at the top of the register of eligibles. To be so benefited a Canadian veteran must have served overseas. Since those with such background represent only about 60 percent of all veterans, this absolute preference is somewhat mitigated.

Acknowledgment should be made here that the linkage of veteran pref-

[23] The reader is referred to the *Municipal Year Books* for 1945–1955 as convenient sources of trends in preference. See also McCarthy, *op. cit.;* Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Merit System Methods,* No. 39 (October, 1949); and State of Minnesota, *op. cit.* The Illinois recommendation is contained in *Toward a Stronger Civil Service,* Report of the State Personnel Administration Commission to the 69th Illinois General Assembly, March 1, 1955, p. 29.

[24] See, for example, the excellent monograph by John F. Miller, "Veteran Preference in the Public Service," in *Problems of the American Public Service,* Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel (New York: 1935).

erence points with competitive examination systems has also served to make veteran organizations stanch supporters of the merit system. Hence, we frequently have the anomalous situation in which the advocates of special privilege for one group rise up to defend the merit system against the encroachments of political predators who seek absolute privilege for another group—their party.

In any event, the problem of employment of veterans immediately after a war is a real one. It cannot be dismissed lightly with a statement that the merit system must remain unsullied. However, although not all preference devices are of equal seriousness, many are grounded upon the idea of public office as a reward, even a sinecure, rather than as an opportunity for service and for a career. Certainly the first task of the State should be the maintenance of a high-grade administrative machine, of a well-integrated and effectively operating bureaucracy. No considerations of political expediency or of the welfare of a portion of the citizenry should ordinarily be allowed to interfere with the accomplishment of a task so important to the whole people. Just what, then, is the obligation of the State in the employment of veterans?

In essence there are two basic philosophies underlying veteran preference in public employment: (1) the idea of preference as a continuing reward for service to the country and (2) the concept of preference as a readjustment aid to help veterans adjust to civilian life. Both concepts are evident in current policy, although the reward theory is the more heavily relied on and the one usually articulated by the average citizen. Acceptance of one or the other of these fundamental approaches to a rationalization of the subject, however, leads to substantially different conclusions regarding the kind and degree of preference that is appropriate.

Under the reward philosophy government jobs become a form of gift, to be equated with pensions, bonuses, free medical care, and the like. Therefore, it is perfectly logical for a veteran to enjoy the benefits of the reward at any time he chooses to avail himself of it. Furthermore, it is only on this theory that various forms of preference after a veteran is in the service can be defended—for example, preference in promotions and transfers and in retention during staff reductions. In fact, if we accept the reward idea as the main reason for preference, there is really no substantive limit as to the forms and degree that preference might logically assume. We would make the reward as generous as possible. The only limitation would be the burden on the economy and the willingness and ingenuity of citizens and legislators to develop new forms of gratuity. A continuation of this philosophy could lead to a gradual increase in the number of persons entitled to preference and in the already high proportion of the public service made up of veterans. A major flaw in this line of reasoning is that it ignores the sacrifices and hazards endured by nonmilitary groups in the population who are equally patriotic and actually may be more exposed to the dangers of mod-

ern warfare than are military personnel. In an atomic age, how can we distinguish between the valor of the civilian aircraft spotter and that of the soldier who may or may not actually go to battle? Or between the civilian telephone operator who mans a post during an attack and the officer on a desk assignment in the Pentagon? This is not to disparage military service but only to point up the pitfalls of the reward approach in recognition of such service through public jobs.

The readjustment concept starts from a substantially different premise. Rewards for military service and achievement would be provided in ways other than use of public office. It is reasoned nevertheless that, because men are removed from their normal civilian pursuits during time of war, their employer (the government) is under special obligation to see to it that they are restored to a situation in civil life as nearly approximating where they otherwise would have been as practicable and to make this adjustment as swiftly and smoothly as possible. Hence, providing an advantage in *re*-employment of a veteran with this same employer—this time as a civilian—seems entirely logical. It is especially defensible when the advantage can be granted without compromise of the general proposition of merit in public service selection processes. By and large, the more common preference devices of added points on a passing grade have reasonably achieved this objective. The readjustment concept has further implications, however. It would not support absolute preference, such as placing names at the top of a list. It would not offer a basis for continuing initial employment preference to a veteran after the first few years following his release from military service. Finally, it would not rationalize provision of preferential treatment of veterans after they are already in the service, such as in promotions, in reductions in staff, and in appeal processes.

It is the readjustment concept which has led various bodies to urge a time limit on preference in entrance to the public service. During and immediately after World War II committees of both the Civil Service Assembly and the National Civil Service League urged that preference not apply in promotions and that appointment preference be limited to a period of five years after a war or five years after discharge of the veteran, whichever is later.[25] The American Assembly in 1954 recommended for the

[25] Further detailed recommendations are made by both organizations. See *The Employment of Veterans in the Public Service in the United States*, A Report Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada by the Committee on Veteran Employment Policies, August 1, 1944 (Chicago: 1944); and *Report of Committee on Veteran Preference of National Civil Service League* (New York: 1945). It should be noted that the Civil Service Assembly was so mindful of the veteran problem immediately after the close of hostilities that it published a helpful pamphlet, entitled *Facts About Jobs in Government for Veterans* (Chicago: 1946), which is designed to assist the veteran in learning about his opportunities and rights in the public service. The President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement was unable to agree in 1941 on any recommendations concerning veteran preference: *Report* of the committee, House Doc. No. 118, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: 1941), p. 6; also *Documents and Reports to Accompany Report on Civil Service Improvement*, Vol. III, Part II, pp. 57–88.

same purpose "a fixed period following completion of military service" in the case of non-disabled veterans, such preference to be usable only once. It also said that preference should not apply in the higher ranks of the civil service, that special appeals procedures for veterans should be eliminated, and that preference for the disabled should be due to an actual occupational handicap and "should be such as to facilitate their employment and retention in positions for which their disabilities do not unduly limit their effectiveness."[26] Furthermore, in 1955, the Personnel Task Force of the Hoover Commission proposed the five-year limitation cited above and, with other minor modifications, generally echoed the recommendations of the American Assembly.[27] Extensive comment is unnecessary to show that all these significant proposals flow from the concept of preference as a temporary aid to readjustment of veterans to civilian life and gainful employment.

Similar conclusions have been drawn by various individual writers, including Frederick C. Mosher, who analyzes the use of public employment as a reward and finds it wanting, whether viewed from the standpoint of offsetting sacrifices, compensation for valor, or reward for service. Speaking as a veteran and calling the veteran issue "basically a readjustment problem," he states the proper aim to be restoration of the veteran, as nearly as possible, "to the status which he could reasonably expect to have attained had he not been in the military service" and accordingly urges special placement aids, assistance in acquiring training, and full credit for military experience in evaluation of personal histories in examinations—in place of the more typical arbitrary preference points.[28]

There is some evidence that the veterans themselves do not want extreme forms of preference. In one study conducted among 2500 army men, researchers found that, while over two-thirds felt that veterans should get as much as ten extra points added to examination grades, the percentage was as follows in support of the following statements:

Veterans should get first chance at any government jobs they can do, even if some nonveteran can do the same work *much better*	32%
Veterans should get government jobs ahead of nonveterans only if they can do the work *about as well*	50%
Veterans should be given government jobs only if they can do the work *better than* nonveterans who are trying for the same jobs	17%

[26] *The Federal Government Service*, p. 183.

[27] *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service*, pp. 114–115. The Hoover Commission itself (Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government) did not second these proposals of the Task Force, but it did not attack them and it did urge a substantial reduction in veteran retention rights in layoffs.

[28] "Is Veteran Preference the Answer?" *Personnel Administration*, January, 1946, pp. 1–7.

Furthermore, 79 percent agreed that veterans should have to *pass* examinations to get government jobs.[29]

The full effects of current veteran preference provisions are not yet being felt in the public service. Veterans who have not had satisfactory careers in private enterprises will turn increasingly to the security and privileges offered them in civil service positions. They will be further handicapped in private competition because of advancing age. To say that the continuing preference now prevailing in the Federal Government and most other jurisdictions would in such cases maintain a public service that would benefit the public at large, including the great majority of veterans who necessarily remain in private employment, is to ignore the issue. The taxpayer, veteran as well as nonveteran, is bound to lose by continuation of a procedure that handicaps the merit system in siphoning the best minds and skills into public employment.

If recommendations such as those that follow from the readjustment aid concept were uniformly accepted, the worst features of veteran preference would be eliminated. It is appropriate to close with a constructive note as expressed by Leonard D. White. Early in 1944 Dr. White laid out a four-point program for public policy on veterans in public employment: (1) no veterans' monopoly, (2) maintenance of entrance standards, (3) preference concentrated on entrance and layoff, and (4) full acceptance of legally established veteran preference.[30] He found a "saving grace" as well as a danger in the "enormous volume of potential veteran employees." He pointed out that these veterans include "every talent and quality which the public service needs," and added: "It is our business, as educators and civil service officials, to put a due measure of these talents to work for government." It is apparent, however, that the methods for carrying this out which White was thinking of were, to all intents and purposes, the same as those advocated by the American Assembly and the Hoover Commission Task Force of 1955, on which he served. It is to be hoped that legislators will give these constructive ideas more heed in the not too distant future.

III. CERTIFICATION AND SELECTION

The setting up of eligible lists is the initial step in the employment process. If the examination system worked perfectly, that is, ranking eligibles in the order of relative efficiency as demonstrated after appointment and taking into account those variables and intangibles of a personal character which may go far toward making an appointee acceptable or unacceptable, subsequent steps in the process would be of no great importance.

[29] Ira H. Cisin and Jack Elinson, "Do Veterans Want Preference?" *Personnel Administration*, May, 1948, p. 27.

[30] *Veterans' Preference—a Challenge and an Opportunity*, Civil Service Assembly, Pamphlet No. 17, May, 1944 (Chicago: 1944).

Although such factors as personality, appearance, and initiative—all the so-called intangible factors—are not usually rated by the examining procedure with any degree of reliability, they may mean the difference between success and failure in particular positions. These are factors of no little importance if each eligible person is to be fitted into the work in which he will operate most effectively.

The process of getting employees into the public service under a merit system, after an eligible list has been established, consists usually of three steps: (1) requisition, (2) certification, and (3) appointment. A department or office having a vacancy in its classified positions applies to the central employment agency on a "requisition" form or "request for certification." This usually includes information concerning the number of openings, the title of the position or positions, duties statement, qualifications required, the salary, the location (department, bureau, office, field service), and, at times, the sex preferred. Upon the basis of this information, the agency certifies to the appointing officer the names of eligibles from the best available register.

The requisite mutual understanding on the nature of the positions being filled is all but impossible without a comprehensive classification scheme which is thoroughly mastered by both parties to the transaction. Even if the examining agency is thoroughly acquainted with the particular requirements of the position to be filled, it is usually restricted as to the number of eligibles whose names may be certified. In the Colorado state service, for example, the civil service commission is required by the rules in force to certify for appointment only the highest-ranking name on the list. The most common procedure is to certify the names of the highest three on the eligible register,[31] while in a few jurisdictions five or more names are certified when a vacancy occurs.[32] In case of two or more vacancies it is usual to certify, according to standing on the list, a number of names sufficient to give the appointing officer a choice of two more than the number of positions to be filled.[33] In case all names certified to the appointing officer are rejected on the basis of interviews or other information, he is ordinarily called upon to present his grounds for such rejection to the personnel agency. If these are approved, further names will be submitted.

There are still a few who argue that the merit system would be undermined if any other than the top man were certified.[34] This position is based

[31] Required by the law or rules in the Federal service and in most states and cities. The certification of one was at one time required in Illinois, Rhode Island, Chicago, and Detroit. This "rule of one" still prevails in the Canadian Federal service.

[32] Five are certified for original appointment in the Maryland service, while in Cumberland the number is seven. Rule 39, *Rules of the State Employment Commissioner* (1948).

[33] This varies somewhat from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In Maryland, for example, four more names are certified than there are vacancies. *Ibid.*

[34] In the Federal service the rule of one would probably be unconstitutional because of appointing authority being vested in department heads. See 13 *Op. Attorney General*, 516, Aug. 31, 1871. The certification of only one eligible per vacancy has now become rare.

on what we consider to be a false assumption, namely, that the testing program is perfectly valid and reliable. There is no denying that appreciable advances have been made in the perfecting of tests, and there is reason to hope that in the course of time psychologists may devise such personality tests of an objective character that the present level of reliability will be materially raised. Nevertheless, some latitude and responsibility in selection on the part of the official who is going to be responsible for the employee's work would seem highly essential if such officials are going to be held responsible for the success of the line operations of government.

Nowadays, instead of centering on certification of one or three names, the issue is whether it should be three or substantially more. Attention has already been called to the fact that, in the Federal service, the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 has placed the rule of three in statutory form, whereas it had previously been a rule of the Civil Service Commission. It is significant that the Civil Service Act itself had not required such a procedure. The importance of flexibility in the certification process is clearly established by the first Hoover Commission's concern with the matter. This body proposed for the Federal Government that all applicants should be rated and grouped into such categories as "outstanding," "well qualified," "qualified," and "unqualified." Selections would then be made from the names in the highest category until the names in that group had been exhausted. Veterans would be considered ahead of nonveterans within each category only.[35]

This procedure had long been followed with considerable success by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is exempt from the Civil Service Act and the rules under it. With the emphasis now on positive methods of good personnel selection and management, and less need to set up defenses against patronage, the desirability of some such procedure as that proposed by the Hoover Commission is self-evident. The U.S. Civil Service Commission at one time picked up the concept and incorporated it into its legislative recommendations to Congress. This proposal was as follows: use of the broad category ratings ordinarily for higher-level and technical and professional positions; use of numerical ratings with certification of five names for middle-grade jobs; and retention of the rule of three for most lower-grade, routine jobs.[36] Such a proposal would seem to be a happy compromise. There is no question that the Hoover Commission's primary concern in suggesting the category ratings was for flexibility in technical and executive positions. Many appointing officers themselves felt that referral of more than three names per vacancy for the routine jobs at the bottom of the salary schedule would cause more confusion than good.

[35] *Personnel Management*, A Report to the Congress by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, February, 1949 (Washington: 1949), pp. 18–19.

[36] Released in a letter to Senator John L. McClellan, cited in *Progress on the Hoover Commission Recommendations*, Sen. Rep. No, 1158, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), p. 60. *66th Annual Report*, U.S. Civil Service Commission, fiscal year ended June 30, 1949.

Of basic importance, even under a good classification system that is fully understood by the personnel agency and appointing officers, is the selection of the register of eligibles from which names are certified. With the increasing number of specialists in present-day governmental service, it is almost unavoidable that examiners will be called upon to exercise more or less discretion in the selection of a register, but even under such circumstances considerable flexibility may be desirable; as, for example, when a mechanical engineer is desired who is specialized in the design and development of precision instruments.

In order to meet conditions of this sort, selective certification, as previously referred to, appears to be a valuable solution. Its use started in the Federal service. The persons so certified stand not necessarily at the top of the register but may be picked out from the whole list of eligibles with reference to the special requirements of the position. It is conceivable that a procedure of this sort might open the gate to abuses, but if operated by officials of personal integrity and devotion to the cause of merit, selective certification brings about much more effective selection and relieves the examining agency of the necessity of holding a broad range of examinations, which, under modern conditions, financial limitations are likely to make impossible. Selective certification was probably one of the most important advances made in the policy of the Federal commission in the 1930's.

Another device, used in Wisconsin and in the Federal service, primarily for occupations in which the demand ordinarily exceeds the supply, is that of "block certification." Under this procedure all interested users have the entire eligible list available to them from which to choose appointees. This puts it on a first come, first served basis. Since there are usually more vacancies than there are eligibles, and therefore all on the register have prospect for an offer of employment, there is no point to going through the usual rule-of-three procedure.

It should be kept in mind that, so far as the Federal service is concerned, certification is not handled alone by the central personnel agency. The decentralized boards of examiners made up of experts from the departments serve as the examining and certifying units, under the commission's supervision, for many positions peculiar to individual departments.[37] The first Hoover Commission proposed extension of this system by adding all high-level administrative, professional, and technical positions to those handled by the individual departments, so that central recruitment and examining would be confined to lower-rank positions and those common to a number of agencies.[38]

Often, whether in the extensive Federal service or in the service of smaller jurisdictions, the staff of the central personnel agency is so absorbed

[37] See further details on these boards in Chapter 23.

[38] *Personnel Management*, p. 17.

in the examinations and in setting up eligible lists that it fails to maintain close contacts with line executives and their personnel requirements. No classification takes into account all the specific peculiarities of individual positions, including the idiosyncrasies of the supervisors themselves. Not alone the information which has been brought together by the personnel agency on various candidates, but also the skill of personnel technicians, should be made available to both supervisor and appointee in order to adjust individual candidates to individual jobs.

In the Federal service the "apportionment" provision frequently complicates the handling of eligible lists. The original civil service law of 1883 contained a provision to the effect that applicants for the public service in the departments at Washington "shall be apportioned among the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia, upon the basis of population as ascertained at the last preceding census." This provision has been elaborated by various executive orders. The rules of the commission now provide: "Subject to such modifications as the Commission finds to be necessary in the interest of good administration, appointments to positions in agencies' headquarters offices which are located within the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C., shall be made so as to maintain the apportionment of appointments among the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia upon the basis of population."[39]

Although the apportionment provision supplies another instance of the perpetual conflict between the demands of political expediency and those of sound administration, it is not so important as is sometimes believed. In the first place, the apportionment is to be carried only so far as the conditions of good administration warrant. Thus, during the last war the apportionment rule was waived completely. In the second place, the restriction applies to only a tenth of the positions in the competitive service, namely, those in Washington.

At the same time, this law has served as an obstacle. In administering it, the commission has had to develop a complicated procedure under which eligibles residing in areas below their quota are certified ahead of eligibles who are less fortunate in their choice of residence. Even so, it has proved impossible to maintain the relative positions of the various states and territories.[40]

In the past, merit system laws have been enacted largely as a result of pressure from one or more citizen groups, occasionally through the support and leadership of enlightened legislators and chief executives. But in the main, legislators have looked with unfriendly eyes on a move to pass a merit law, as it is devised to debar the use of public positions as party spoils.

[39] Civil Service Rule II, ¶ 2.3 (in Executive Order 10,577, effective January 23, 1955).

[40] See U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Apportionment and Residence . . . Their Effect on Federal Civil Service Appointments* (Washington: April, 1947).

In view of this, it is not surprising that many a law has been emasculated in the process of administration.

Perhaps the most customary and effective method of breaking down the law is the use of provisional appointments. These are legally provided for when an appointing officer puts in a requisition for an eligible list and learns that no list is available. In such a case he is authorized by the examining agency to make an appointment for a limited period until a suitable list has been established. Under the Federal rule, if one or two names, but not three or more, are on the eligible list, appointment must be made of such candidates on a provisional basis or good and sufficient reasons submitted for their rejection.

Undoubtedly provisional appointments are necessary at times, although their number should be small if a properly staffed central personnel agency is on the job. Being "on the job" means forecasting and anticipating the probable requirements of the service, on the basis of both past experience and contacts with appointing officers, who can pretty accurately foretell their requirements. There is ample evidence, especially during the early days of merit systems, of abuse of the provisional appointment rule. In some cities such appointments even exceeded in number those made competitively, and a goodly number subsequently became permanent. Obviously this procedure, in combination with a policy of starving the commission for funds with which to keep up its examination program, can be rather effective in circumventing the merit system. It is to the credit of the better-run jurisdictions, however, that these extreme conditions did not exist.

The rules of various jurisdictions set up certain restrictions on the use of provisional appointments. Of these the most common is the limitation on the period of service for such appointments. Logically, this period should be long enough and not much longer than the time necessary to announce, conduct, and grade an examination which would result in an appropriate eligible list. As soon as a list is promulgated, permanent appointment would immediately follow. In most of the laws the limit set is final; that is, no extension or reappointment to the same position on a provisional basis is permitted. Without such a restriction, not only is it conceivable, but it has actually happened, that one provisional appointment follows another of the same person for the same position.

There are two other types of appointments upon which brief comment is called for. In practically all jurisdictions the rules provide for temporary and emergency appointments. Temporary appointments are ordinarily defined as appointments to temporary positions. As in the case of provisional appointments, the limitation upon the length of time for which the temporary appointment may be made is crucial. It is obvious that, in the absence

of such a restriction, these appointments might automatically become permanent and thus undermine the merit system.

Emergency appointments are made by the appointing officer without regard to eligibility, and are usually strictly limited in point of time.[41] They are provided to meet sudden emergencies, such as forest fires, in which the requirements of the service demand immediate appointment without the delay attendant upon the usual requisition and certification procedure. In case of emergency, a vacancy can be filled, as a rule, by the appointing officer alone, even though an eligible list exists for the position involved. The length of time for which emergency appointments may be made is usually shorter than that for either provisional or temporary appointments. With few exceptions, emergency appointments cannot be extended.

In spite of the possibilities of abuse, these various conditional types of appointment are essential to a flexible personnel system.

IV. PROBATION AS A STEP IN THE SELECTION PROCESS[42]

Almost without exception, the various civil service laws or rules provide for a probationary period before an appointment becomes final. Although the length of this period of trial varies somewhat from one jurisdiction to another, and even from one group of positions to another within the same jurisdiction, the most common provision is for six months. A few use three months. The United States Civil Service Commission now prescribes a one-year period but may use six months for specified positions. Thus, the laws recognize the need of supplementing the formal examination process by providing a period of trial on the job as an essential step in selection and placement. To use the definition of the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel, "Probation is the policy of considering no appointment final until the appointee has demonstrated his capacity in his work."[43]

The probationary period should be more definitely regarded by administrators as a part of the testing program than it customarily is. It affords these officers, as well as the placement officers of the personnel agency, an opportunity to gauge those intangible factors and personal qualities not assayed by formal testing procedures. Indeed, it is a check upon the whole selection and placement procedure and provides a means by which a

[41] Not all three types, provisional, temporary, and emergency, are found in all jurisdictions. These terms are not well standardized.

[42] The most complete treatment is in *Placement and Probation in the Public Service*, Reports Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly by the Committee on Placement in the Public Service and the Committee on Probation in the Public Service (Chicago: 1946). Part II of this volume comprises the report of the latter committee, which was under the chairmanship of Oliver C. Short.

[43] *Better Government Personnel* (New York: 1935), p. 48.

square peg can be removed from a round hole or more completely fitted into a square one.

Despite its potential importance, the probationary period is not ordinarily employed as such. In only exceptional cases does the appointing officer take any cognizance of the probationary period and exercise his right to reject an unsatisfactory employee by a mere statement of his objections during this period. These officials fail to appreciate that in the last analysis the power to appoint is in their hands, not in those of the personnel agency. Since the personnel agency in most cases keeps no systematic check upon probationers and does not even notify the appointing authority when the probationary period is nearing its end, the whole procedure is usually allowed to go by the board and the appointment becomes almost automatically permanent.

In the Federal service an efficiency rating report is required on every employee six months after he enters on duty or changes to an entirely new job. This has the effect of providing a reminder to the supervisor that the probationary period is a critical one in the employee's retention on the job. The Civil Service Assembly committee recommends that appointing officers "be required to take positive steps either to accept or reject the probationer at the end of the probationary period."[44] This is, in effect, what a number of the more recent state and municipal civil service laws and rules have established—a positive probationary period. Under most situations employees completing their trial periods become permanent automatically. Under the positive procedure an employee is automatically *separated* from the service at this time *unless* his appointing officer has certified that his work has been sufficiently satisfactory to warrant his continuance in the organization. This system forces the appointing authority to give greater consideration to a new employee's performance on the job in order to make a definite decision to retain him. It avoids the attainment of permanent status by default.[45]

It is generally concluded that too few separations occur during the probationary period.[46] That this probably still operates to the detriment of the public service cannot be gainsaid. However, some attention should be given to other positive uses of the probationary period, namely, for training, indoctrination, adjustment, improved placement, and the like. Further,

[44] *Placement and Probation in the Public Service*, p. 178.

[45] International City Managers' Association, *Municipal Personnel Administration* (Chicago: 1950), pp. 132–133.

[46] Although admitting the absence of satisfactory criteria for measuring the adequacy of trial periods, the Civil Service Assembly committee concluded that there was "reason to believe that more separations should take place during the probationary than is now typical."—*Placement and Probation in the Public Service*, p. 199. Under the positive procedure the state of Maryland has experienced a substantial increase in separations during the probationary period. See U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Merit System Methods*, No. 98 (April, 1955).

as the Assembly committee put it, "no perfection of probationary techniques can substitute for weaknesses or failures in other features of a sound, progressive personnel program."[47] The need for sound orientation and induction methods for all workers who receive new work assignments, regardless of their particular employment status, is self-evident.

SUMMARY

Although a major and continuing source of candidates for positions in the service, lists of eligibles should not be viewed as the only or even as the main source for the service as a whole. Actually, in the normally well-run organization there may be three or four internal placements, involving selection from among present employees, to every placement from outside the organization. Employment lists are of primary importance in filling positions at the lower rungs of the various broad occupational categories, leaving those above to be filled most often from within the service. The public relations significance of such registers is highly important, however, when we consider that they constitute one of the principal areas of contact between government agencies and the general public. Therefore, reduction in the amount of time taken in establishing the lists and in making use of them for appointments once they are established is a prime objective toward which all public jurisdictions should be working. A trend toward keeping registers in use on a continuous basis, instead of limiting their life arbitrarily, is noticeable in a number of places. This coincides necessarily with keeping lists open for new applicants to be placed on them from time to time.

No more perplexing problem in appointments to public jobs has arisen than that of veteran preference. Many legislators and veterans' groups have been relentless in demonstrating their interest in what they judge to be a powerful political force. Students of public administration are torn between their interest in seeing a genuine merit system remain untarnished and their recognition of the special uses that can be made of veterans' skills. World War II, instead of resolving the issue, only accentuated it, but few have been courageous enough to be openly critical of veteran preference policies. The states have followed almost blindly the path laid down by the Federal Government, with several even pinning down preference in state constitutions. The most significant conclusion which the author can draw from the varied shades of opinion on the subject is that veteran preference must be viewed as a readjustment aid rather than a reward and therefore

[47] *Placement and Probation in the Public Service*, p. 201. Some thoughtful personnel people, such as those at TVA, argue that *fixed* probationary periods are undesirable in that they foster unrealistic assumptions of permanency once the period is successfully completed. They point out that the necessity of meeting work standards should be a *continuing* requirement in all jobs.

be pointed *only* toward those forms that serve the purposes of readjustment. To take any other position is to open the doors to mediocrity, since it will be primarily those veterans who fail at other lines of endeavor who will seek the special privileges and security of public service some years after their return to civilian life.

The most important development in relation to the time-honored rule of three in certification of eligibles to appointing officers has been the proposals of the first Hoover Commission for category-rating and certification in the Federal civil service. Already tested to some extent by the pioneering selection system developed by TVA, this approach bids fair to lay the groundwork for reform of many merit system staffing practices, particularly for administrative and technical positions.

The final but by no means the least important stage of the selection process is the probationary or trial period. Its principal weakness lies in its disuse by supervisory officers, who should take this occasion both for positive development of new recruits and for weeding out those who do not measure up fully to the demands of the job. A conscientious and thoroughgoing utilization of the opportunities provided by a period of trial, under which all parties understand the tentative character of the appointment, can be the capstone to a well-rounded examining and selection program.

7

Selection: From Inside the Service

Promotion is as important an aspect of the selection process in public personnel administration as original recruitment.[1]

As indicated at the outset of the preceding chapter, the process of selection for staffing is primarily one of filling positions, regardless of the source of the candidates. The fact that staffing from within involves a source closer at hand and requires special methods of recruiting and selection is ample reason for separate treatment of that subject in this chapter. Even more important, however, is that filling positions from among persons already in the service implies movement of personnel by *promotion and transfer.*

In initial recruitment we are not fully concerned with the morale of the entire recruitment field, that is, the general public as a whole, except to maintain good public relations. In selection from within, on the other hand, we must be very much concerned with the morale of the whole recruitment field, namely, the employee group which comprises our organization. Opportunity for advancement and the chance to make the best possible use of one's capacities form one of the wellsprings of human motivation. The proper determination of positions which can be filled by selection of the ablest employees for advancement, the development of employees to their maximum usefulness, and the proper balance between inside and outside recruitment lie at the very heart of good personnel administration.

Many public jurisdictions have made considerable progress toward the goals just enunciated. As many or more, however, still fall far short of a

[1] *Placement and Probation in the Public Service*, p. 80. Part I of this volume constitutes the Report Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly by the Committee on Placement in the Public Service, Samuel Board, Chairman (Chicago: 1946). It deals with the full scope of the placement function, embracing initial placement, promotion, demotion, transfer, and employee adjustment.

reasonably good system. Even among those that have achieved some success, such as the more progressive state and municipal governments and a number of departments in the Federal service, there is considerable disagreement over form and method. Much is said in the Federal service of the need to develop a "promotion program." But there is still much vagueness about what is meant. From the nature of the generalizations on the subject some personnel and employee groups would appear to assume that all employees are to be *guaranteed* promotions to new responsibilities from time to time; others seem to jump to the conclusion that outside recruitment is undesirable except for the *lowest* rung in the civil service structure. Few see a "promotion program" as merely part of a general staffing policy, a policy for filling positions with the ablest available talent, of which outside recruitment is another integral part at many levels in the structure.

It is significant that some highly inbred governmental organizations take satisfaction in a tightly knit promotion-from-within policy. Yet they are far from the best-run agencies in their respective jurisdictions. Too often there has been an overemphasis on seniority. The one-time office boy has eventually become bureau chief or "chief clerk." Occasionally these individuals are near-geniuses at things administrative and achieve brilliant success as outstanding executives, as did, for example, Mr. W. A. Jump, long-time Director of Budget and Finance for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. But more often they are dismally unfit for top posts. Overemphasis on "years of experience" still plagues many agencies in their effort to achieve objectivity in selections for promotion. Quite often the highly touted "twenty years of experience" is merely one year of experience twenty times. Many are the clerks in executive jobs who are still operating them as clerical posts.

The condition was manifested in the Federal service during the early days of the New Deal, in the beginning of World War II, and during the Korean emergency. Much very fine talent was drawn from within the service to man the new functions that had to be established in a hurry. During the Roosevelt era the outstanding records in public administration were created chiefly by the "new blood" brought into government employment by such units as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Farm Credit Administration, the National Youth Administration, the Social Security Board, the Office of Emergency Management, the Office of Price Administration, the National Housing Agency, to name only a few of the giants of the New Deal and war years.[2] "Old-line" departments which might have taken over some of these functions from the start (and subsequently did

[2] Some of these, like NYA and OPA, have ceased to exist; others, like the Social Security Board, have been absorbed into larger agencies; and still others, like NHA, have been changed in name and function.

in a few cases) were considered at the time too lacking in top leadership and imagination, too "inbred," to be trusted with challenging new tasks. Although other factors, strategic and political, undoubtedly played a part in the passing over of these agencies, we cannot escape some indictment of the brand of personnel administration that existed at the time in the oldest, most inbred departments.[3]

Lest the picture appear too black, we should not overlook the many fine older agencies which have succeeded in using promotion from within but also in avoiding the pitfalls of stagnation, inbreeding, and idolization of seniority. Examples that come to mind are the U.S. Forest Service, the Food and Drug Administration, the Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and various branches of the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture, a list to which many others could properly be added. Similarly, one could name a number of state and local services that have kept on their toes, so to speak, without constant turnover or injection of "new blood" at the top or the middle. The most frequent instance of success appears to have developed in unifunctional organizations built around a particular profession or related group of professions.

The experiences with inbreeding do not contradict the importance of selection by promotion. Instead, they demonstrate the need for careful attention to ways and means and for avoidance of the oversimplified concept of promotion which results in little more than the progressive advancement of mediocrity. From our observation, those promotion-from-within systems that have failed to maintain live-wire organizations have lacked the following essential ingredients of sound selection policy: (1) adequate qualification standards for key positions; (2) adequate records and machinery which provide a means for "finding" the best candidates within the organization; (3) adequate measures of overall competence and potentiality; (4) comprehensive training programs to keep the staff alert to new developments and to prepare promising men and women for advancement and for supervision; (5) promotion and transfer *across* divisional lines within the department or bureau, providing as broad a field of selection and promotion opportunity as possible; and (6) clear distinction between clerical jobs, requiring certain manipulative skills and aptitudes, and executive jobs, requiring superior training, imagination, and ability, so that the latter are not automatically filled from the ranks of the former but are filled by men with the education, the capacity to deal in generalizations as

[3] In addition to *Better Government Personnel* by the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel in 1935, and the 1937 *Report* of the President's Committee on Administrative Management, a less well-known official treatise on Federal promotion policy appears in the *Report on Promotion and Transfer Opportunities and Methods in the Federal Service*, President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement, Vol. 121, Part II, August 16, 1939 (Washington: 1939). Since then the problem has been discussed largely in periodical literature, and the first Hoover Commission took up the subject again in its 1949 report *Personnel Management*.

well as with "things," and the gifts to lead and advance that ought to be required of all executives.

With these limitations and admonitions in mind, we must not lose sight of the fact that in the public service as a whole there probably is still too little emphasis on selection from within rather than too much. It is important, however, in our advocacy of ideas which affect the motivation of human behavior, that we be aware of perversions of the idea as well as the real thing. Hence, what has been said in the foregoing paragraphs does not vitiate the importance of policies involving promotion. Rather it underlines the need to give careful attention to methods and approaches which contribute to the larger end result—high morale, productivity, and alertness of the working force.

Even the Federal service, which probably has had the greatest success among public jurisdictions in providing real careers in many professions and in various departments, is lacking in fully developed policies and practices on filling positions from within. This is evidenced by the renewed emphasis on the subject given by the first Hoover Commission, which urged not only that "practical programs designed to facilitate the promotion of career employees" be worked out within the individual departments but that "administrative" positions be more clearly identified for career possibilities and that the Civil Service Commission facilitate transfer of competent career personnel—particularly in the technical, scientific, and executive areas—from one agency to another.[4]

Of particular concern in the United States government is the matter of career opportunities for executives. Although discussed more fully in a later chapter, note should be taken here of the increasing interest in providing more flexibility for shifting "generalists" from agency to agency. The idea of an "executive pool" has been suggested, in which the normal restrictions of the position classification system and of transfer policy would not apply. Proposals along this line by the American Assembly and by the second Hoover Commission are especially worthy of attention.[5]

For convenience in discussion, the remainder of this chapter is designed to deal with the following topics: (1) the scope of promotional opportunity, (2) the area of selection and promotion, (3) methods for internal recruitment and selection, and (4) the use of reassignment and transfer for employee development or readjustment.[6]

I. SCOPE OF PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Any discussion of the question of promotion must concern itself at the very beginning with the general problem of how far it is to the interest

[4] *Personnel Management*, pp. 22–23.

[5] See Chap. 8 below, Section III.

[6] See also O. Glenn Stahl, "Perspective on Promotion Policy," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1954, pp. 115–121.

of the service to fill the higher positions by promotions from the ranks or by recruitment from outside. Its satisfactory answer depends not only upon considerations of efficiency and morale but also upon the character of the established system of recruitment and selection, upon the area from which promotions may be made, and upon the training program.

The advantage of filling higher positions from within is fairly obvious. Only if such a procedure is usually followed does the service offer career opportunities designed to attract capable juniors. Moreover, the effect upon the whole force of the knowledge that vacancies in the higher positions will be filled from their ranks cannot be overemphasized. The most important of all nonfinancial incentives is the opportunity for growth and the stimulus to grow. For a young person, indeed, this often outranks any other consideration. The effect of a general policy of filling higher posts from within, then, should be reflected not only in the morale of the working force but equally in the character of the personnel recruited into it.

One factor limiting the possible scope of the promotion policy in many American jurisdictions has been the tendency to select candidates for original entrance upon the basis of existing skills rather than of capacities or broad abilities. Traditional procedure has been to fill particular and often highly specialized positions without much regard to their relationships with other positions or to promotional possibilities. Legal requirements that the qualifications established and the tests employed shall be demonstrably related to the particular position to be filled have been especially limiting in this respect.

Also, a large number of top positions are still filled by political appointment, particularly in the states and in many municipalities. This is less true in the Federal service in view of the broad coverage of the merit system under the executive orders made possible by the Ramspeck Act of 1940, discussed in an earlier chapter. In 1938 Macmahon and Millett discovered political considerations to have been determining in the choice of only six (9.6 percent) of the sixty-two Federal bureau chiefs then in office. They found that 80 percent of the total number could be legitimately considered career men.[7] Even after the change in party leadership in 1953 this picture did not change markedly. Many bureau chiefs and even a few posts equivalent to that of assistant secretary remain in the career service.

Nevertheless, the Federal service still has not gone as far as the British service in this regard. Whereas the latter have confined political appointments for the most part to the Cabinet ministers themselves, with career ranks running up through that of permanent undersecretary, it is still traditional in our national government for assistant secretaries and numerous personal assistants, as well as for undersecretaries, deputy ad-

[7] Arthur Macmahon and John D. Millett, *Federal Administrators* (New York: 1939), p. 447. In 1926, 18.5 percent had been chosen for political reasons, as compared with the 9.6 percent reported above. *Ibid.*, p. 448.

ministrators, and the like, to be selected on the grounds of their political relationship to the chief. Many such political selections have included able men and occasionally career men. The Task Force of the second Hoover Commission in 1955 recommended continuation of this policy of allowing department heads wide freedom in selection of top deputies and assistants but not including the bureau level.[8]

In all the above respects the situation has been changing, particularly in the larger jurisdictions. The directions of that change have been indicated at numerous points throughout this book. The recognition of "training grades" in the Federal service, to which young people are appointed with a view to their future advancement, constituted an important forward step. So did the creation some years ago of an intern program and the clarification of promotional lines in New York State. These are but two examples of a growing recognition of the importance of a policy of filling higher-grade positions from within the service.

It should be recognized that the promotional opportunity of the individual employee is also determined by factors other than the total number of promotional possibilities in the organization. The latter is the product of employee turnover, new work or work methods, and the nature of promotional policy. But the extent of individual opportunity depends also upon the character of the personnel practices and methods employed. If vacancies are called to the attention only of a favored few, opportunities will be decreased.

In spite of the values of promotional opportunity as a morale-builder, we must not lose sight of the necessity for looking outside the service to fill many types of positions at the same time that candidates inside are being considered.[9] This provides an opportunity to check on the range and type of experience of candidates from various sources. It is frequently essential if we are to fill a position with the "best available person." It is desirable procedure for technical and administrative positions and for any others for which only a few candidates in the service are qualified. This means that for most jurisdictions the majority of position classes may be set aside for exclusive staffing from within, but that others will require concurrent searching of registers of eligibles recruited from the outside. This brings us automatically to the subject of areas of selection from which promotions may be made.

II. THE AREA OF SELECTION AND PROMOTION

The extent of the area from which promotional candidates are to be recruited is affected by a number of factors. The most obvious is the size

[8] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), Chaps. 1 and 2.

[9] See the discussion in *Placement and Probation in the Public Service*, pp. 56–57.

of the particular service. Other things being equal, the appointing officers and the personnel agency will have wider choice in a large than in a small service. But more important are those limiting factors to be found within the particular service itself. These include the qualifications set up to govern the promotion, the restriction of candidates to certain grades or classes of the service or to certain departments or establishments, the methods of promotion employed, and the transfer policy.

At the outset, it should be clearly recognized that promotion placement is as dependent upon a sound duties classification as is original placement. Only when the positions within the organization have been grouped in logical relation to one another, when lines of promotion have been clearly indicated upon the basis of the duties of the various positions, can the promotion policy be administered intelligently. The presence of a classification scheme means order; it facilitates a bird's-eye view of all positions and their interrelationships. For promotional purposes the positions in the British standardized services are grouped into a relatively few broad classes. On the other hand, the American practice results in a rather large number of minutely described and highly specific classes or grades. The classification in Britain assumes much greater flexibility of assignment within each grade and provides correspondingly broad salary ranges. Obviously, the difference clearly reflects the much greater emphasis in this country upon specialization.

The character of the classification plan has a direct effect upon the area from which promotional material is to be recruited. It is immediately apparent, for example, that restriction of candidature to employees in the next lower class would mean one thing in the United States and another in England. Although the typical American classification plan has advantages, which will be discussed in a later chapter, it may be questioned whether it is so useful for promotional purposes as the British. The typical American scheme is built up from the duties of existing positions rather than upon a broad analysis of the types of work to be performed in the government service.[10]

Another serious restriction on the area of promotion, from the standpoint not only of the quality of candidate promoted but also of its effect upon the whole service, is the restriction of competition for a higher position to those in the lower grades in the department or bureau in which the position is located. Such a limitation of the promotional area, particularly when coupled with an inflexible transfer system, has a number of serious consequences. At the outset it may be recognized that "the wider the area of selection, the sharper the competition and the better the ultimate

[10] See Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., *Government by Merit*, Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel (New York: 1935). This work contains a penetrating critique of existing classification practices as well as of the promotional procedures based upon them.

choice." Any general policy which narrows the field of candidates may thus be open to question. In the second place, such a policy results in great inequalities in the promotional opportunities in various branches of the service. It thus restricts the advantages in improved morale and efficiency which follow from a policy of promotion from within to certain establishments, while in others which have fewer promotional opportunities, either because of the nature of the work or for some other reason, a feeling of hopelessness pervades the employees.

Customary practice in this respect may be ascribed to a variety of influences. First, it is in the line of least resistance. There is a natural unwillingness to disturb a team of workers in one unit by advancing one of the team to another unit. This may lead to resentment on the part of the section head that will not be outweighed by the opportunity given to the person promoted and the probable contribution to the efficiency of the unit to which promotion-transfer is contemplated. It should be taken for granted, however, that the administrators and the personnel office will give due consideration to all these features, as the guiding principle is the best interest of the service taken as a whole. Secondly, workers in the unit where the vacancy occurs naturally feel that they have a kind of vested right in their branch of the organization. Finally, the work of various units is so different that employees of the same class in other departments will be unacquainted with the work to be done.[11] In this connection it may be said that an adequate series of tests or comparison of records will not fail to take these differences into account. For the most important part of promotional tests is designed to discover "the knowledge of and ability to perform the duties of the position in question."[12] If, in spite of the experience in, and intimate acquaintance with, the work of the unit in which the vacancy has occurred, applicants from this unit are unable to meet the competition of those from other units, it seems clear that the abler candidates should be preferred in the name of the good of the service—the ultimate criterion. Furthermore, the fact that employees from other units are promoted into posts over one group of employees simply means that there are wider horizons for the latter also.

[11] This argument has been unusually well developed in *ibid.*, pp. 164 ff.: "Any method of promotion," says Wilmerding, "based on the premise that interdepartmental promotions, or even interdepartmental transfers, can ordinarily be made is suspect." This is due, he believes, to the fact that "experience, the *sine qua non* of competence, diminishes rather than enhances a man's transferability." For a complete and fair exposition of this point of view the reader should consult the monograph.

[12] Wilmerding also questions the validity and reasonableness of basing promotions upon competitive examinations: "Formal examinations are at best no more than tests of probable competence; long experience of a man's work enables competence to be determined with certainty."—*Ibid.*, p. 165. Against this position it may be argued that there has been no "long experience of a man's work" in the position to which he is seeking promotion and that the test results are never the sole basis for promotion.

This problem is much less pressing if transfers may take place freely from one establishment to another. Although it has long been recognized that there should be as much fluidity as possible in the assignment and transfer of personnel, progress has been slow in the application of this principle. The reasons are numerous, but one of the most important has been the paucity of personnel data. There has been inadequate information relative to the character of positions to be filled and to the qualifications of employees who might fill them. The first is a matter of improved classification administration, the second of improved personnel records and procedures.

The problems in the Federal service have been especially acute, owing to the size of the establishments, the inadequacy of staff in the Civil Service Commission, and the endless variety of experience to be found among two million employees. Indeed, the assembly of adequate information about so large and heterogeneous a service seems almost a physical impossibility.

In passing, it should be noted that within the larger Federal establishments the problem is only slightly less staggering. There are ten agencies with over 25,000 employees each.[13] Many are made up of numerous bureaus or subsidiary constituent agencies. Movement across bureau lines is usually accomplished by relatively informal means—interchange of information between personnel offices, announcement of vacancies, or some policing of promotions by a central personnel office. Occasionally there is use of qualifications indexes on punch cards, but only rarely are promotional examinations used across bureau lines.

Within individual bureaus and major units of these big departments, however, very substantial promotion programs are often well established. Many such units now have excellent qualifications indexes as a basis for developing promotional "panels," and some utilize written or oral tests td supplement performance records. In view of the size of these organizations, which often include from five to twenty thousand employees, it is sometimes questioned whether much is to be gained by extending *formal* promotional areas beyond their boundaries. After all, by comparison, only the very largest state and city governments reach such size. There is a point of diminishing returns, both to management and to the employee, in applying the promotional system across such a gigantic entity as the Federal Government (if indeed it may be called an entity) or even across one of the major departments. *So long as there are ample opportunity for advancement for the employee and an adequate field of selection for management, the objectives of good personnel policy are being met.* On the other hand, Federal employees are scattered all over the United States. There is still room for

[13] Defense, Post Office, Veterans Administration, Treasury, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, Justice, and General Services Administration. Defense alone has over one million civilian employees; Post Office over half a million.

more coöperation among Federal agencies within a given location on promotion and transfer.

It does not follow, therefore, that what may be good for a state or municipal service is exactly applicable to the Federal service as a whole. Instead, the situation more comparable to a state or local government would be any one Federal department or major bureau, or all Federal units in a given location.

In general, transfers from one unit to another are quite easily accomplished in private industry. This not only facilitates the training of executive personnel but aids materially in bringing the best-qualified men to the top. In the public service, on the other hand, the difficulties in the way of securing a transfer bespeak a separatist attitude which is a bar to the production of good promotional material for the service as a whole.

To summarize at this point: Good practice requires that the promotional area should not be artificially restricted by section, bureau, or departmental lines, except when such restriction is demonstrably in the interest of the service as a whole. At the same time, considerations both of justice and of morale would suggest that fully qualified employees within an organizational unit, other considerations being equal, should have first call upon promotional opportunities there.

III. METHODS FOR INTERNAL RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

In considering the administration of the promotion policy, the question immediately arises whether control of selection from within should be in the hands of the central personnel agency or of the various appointing officers. This question has been another center of controversy and has been debated wherever a centralized personnel system exists. Opinions on it range all the way from a belief that the administrative officer should have absolute discretion in making promotions to the view that every promotion should be controlled by the central agency. The latter idea has found expression in rules in many jurisdictions requiring all promotions to be made upon the basis of examinations held by the personnel authority.

There are few more crucial tests of the success of the personnel program than the handling of promotions. Whether one has formal tests or simply a comparison of the records of competitors, this observation holds true. In original selection more or less standardized methods, including tests of general ability, information, and the like, play the major role. But in the case of promotions the chief test will be more often than not the achievements and behavior of the competitors on the job. These are, in the first instance, better known to the executives in the department than to the personnel agency. The former, too, are better acquainted with the duties to be performed and the qualities necessary to perform them than the latter. It is, therefore, natural that executives should consistently cry out to the

civil service commission: "Hands off the promotions in my department." It has been maintained that any interference with or restrictions upon the appointing officer in regard to promotions is destructive of administrative responsibility and so of good administration.

There is little question that, as a general principle, good administration requires that the administrator have considerable freedom of choice in this matter. On the other hand, if a uniform promotional policy is to be adopted throughout the service, and if the procedures are to be formalized and standardized, the inevitable result is some restriction on his power of selection. This is true if nothing more is required than that the past record of the employee be considered in making the promotion. Thus, the practical argument is not between unrestricted selection, on the one hand, and some other absolute, on the other, but is rather a question of degree. So long as lines of promotion are prescribed and formal bases of selection set up, the appointing officer has no absolute freedom of choice. The answer to this question, then, is to be found in the degree to which such formalized bases and procedures are desirable. Perhaps the general rule can be laid down that, subject to the requirements established as bases for promotion throughout the whole service, the administrative head should be the final authority.

But the logical sphere of action of the central personnel agency is in connection with the establishment and supervision of the formal requirements for promotion. Thus, another apparent conflict is to be resolved by coöperation between the personnel authority and the administrative officer. As already stated, only by complete coöperation on all sides can a well-integrated personnel system evolve.

The words of Lewis Mayers, written over three decades ago, are still appropriate: "The devising of formal methods of selection for promotion which shall effectively pick out the best qualified is one of the most difficult problems in the whole field of personnel administration. The difficulties are far greater than those encountered in devising formal methods of recruitment; and the consequences of improper selection far more serious." This is true not only because the positions to be filled by promotion are of greater importance but because the problem is entirely different, with the result that "rigid or mechanical methods can be much less confidently and generally employed than in recruitment."[14] The bases for judgment are more numerous in the case of candidates for promotion, and it should be emphasized that formal test results should not be used alone for determining who is to be promoted.

In a well-planned career program, analyses of employee aptitude and potential should be conducted early in employment and followed at appropriate intervals with further appraisals of development. Although an

[14] Mayers, *The Federal Service* (New York: 1922), p. 317.

employee may be very well qualified for the position or occupation for which he was originally selected, he may have potential for different types of positions in which he can perform even better. Although actual performance on many jobs gives the best indication of how well a person can fill them, we cannot rely on such experience to demonstrate all of an employee's capacities. First, there are so many types of positions in most public agencies that it simply would not be practical to try employees in each type. Second, many positions require special knowledge or skills which must be developed through training or experience before any employee can perform satisfactorily in them.

Fortunately, there are much better opportunities for evaluating employee aptitudes and potential than there are for evaluating applicants' qualifications for initial entry to civil service positions. One of the reasons for this is that, in a good employment situation, the employee's interests can be probed more deeply than the applicant's because of the opportunity for closer observation and periodic interviewing.

Also, applicants usually attempt to convince prospective employers that they are particularly well qualified for the specific kind of position to be filled. Consciously or unconsciously, they tend to bias their statements and test answers to reflect qualifications for such positions. But after an employee has been oriented in an organization and has learned that it is concerned with developing and placing him where he can make an optimum contribution and can gain the rewards of higher positions, his greater cooperation can be assured. A wider variety of tests can, therefore, be used and more valid information can be obtained for employee placement and development purposes than for initial selection. When such a long-range program exists, ample and accurate information will be available for use in making promotions.

A. MEASURES AND BASES FOR PROMOTION

Any single factor is inadequate as a measure of promotability, and appropriate combinations must be devised for each instance. Among the factors demanding consideration are education and experience, length of service, performance, written and oral test results, and such intangibles as leadership, personality, and coöperativeness. In general, the methods and bases for selection may be examined under the following headings: (1) comparative performance, (2) seniority, (3) examination, and (4) trial on the job.

1. **Comparative Performance.** If employees are to be advanced to higher posts on the basis of their performance and demonstration of potentiality in the lower ones, two conditions would appear to be essential: (a) good, up-to-date records of the performance and qualifications of all employees;

and (b) an efficient method for finding those employees who should be considered for a given vacancy.

a. *Personal Achievement Records.* Comprehensive records are the basis of any successful program of promotion and transfer. These should cover examination records, performance reports, special abilities, education and training, experience, hobbies, interests—anything that may be of probative value from the placement standpoint. They should, moreover, be kept current. Information concerning the acquirement of a special skill or interest, completion of a training course, admittance to the bar, certification as a public accountant, and similar matters should be recorded at once. It may easily be the deciding factor in the selection of a candidate for promotion.

Many departments request that employees inform the personnel office of all changes in their qualifications and interests which might conceivably have a bearing on promotion, layoff, and similar matters. The whole burden of keeping personal records up to date should not be placed upon the employee, however. The maintenance of adequate records is a personnel function of basic importance and should therefore be the responsibility of the personnel office. Where a central file is maintained and a system of interorganization transfers and promotions has been set up, the task will naturally fall to the central personnel agency. In other instances it may be the responsibility of the departmental personnel officers.

In any event, positive steps have to be taken to assure that the records are reasonably complete and up to date. Perhaps this is best done through periodic surveys of employee qualifications. Such surveys are now standard procedure in many jurisdictions, and some Federal offices have developed forms for this purpose. To avoid duplication it is advisable to construct the form in such a way that it elicits information only about qualifications or attainments acquired since the last report. Finally, it has been suggested that periodic surveys be made once a year, but that individual employees be encouraged to report changes in their records at any time.

b. *Index to Qualified Candidates.* Even though records are up to date, they are of little use unless there is some easy method of finding all those that would be relevant in reviewing candidates for a particular vacancy. In large organizations this process can be facilitated by the application of punch-card methods. Such methods do not, of course, increase the reliability of the records, but they do enhance the certainty that when a vacancy occurs all persons in the organization reporting the possession of the necessary qualifications will be considered. In smaller organizations other devices may be employed. Many Federal agencies have successfully used a cross-occupational card index system, which catalogues each employee under all the occupations, skills, and kinds of positions he seems to

be qualified for. The catalogue is a supplementary record device which enhances the value of the personal information on file.

Whatever the device for finding all candidates who meet minimum qualification requirements for the job, this step is merely one of developing the recruitment field. The punch-card data or occupational index card should not be used as the primary basis for screening the candidates turned up by this method. They are merely a means to pull the full records on each employee. The latter then constitute the basis for the referral of the best candidates by the personnel office and for final selection by the appointing officer.

The principal Federal departments and numerous state and local jurisdictions operate their major areas of promotion by a similar index system. The systems vary in accuracy and reliability, but they provide the maximum possibility of reconciling two principles: (1) selection of current employees on the basis of their record with the organization rather than of formal tests, and (2) assuring that all qualified employees get considered rather than just the one or two known to the appointing official. They do not, however, always provide an adequate check on the *potentiality* of employees for work different from or higher than that which they have been performing. This failure is particularly observed in the lack of measures (and failure to use those that exist) of supervisory skill and aptitude, when promoting nonsupervisory workers to supervisory jobs. As indicated in various places in this book, the need to stress better supervision and therefore better selection of supervisors is a prime requisite of modern personnel administration.

2. Seniority. The simplest and most time-honored basis for promotion is the length of service of the employee. The seniority system is still practiced widely in industry and in many public agencies, including the U.S. Post Office field service. In most cases, however, seniority is used in conjunction with other criteria for promotion. Some public units give seniority, for example, an arbitrary weight on promotional examinations or ratings, but the vast majority of jurisdictions merely provide that seniority shall be given consideration.

Advocates of promotion by seniority assume that long and efficient service is a guarantee that one is qualified for handling the work of an advanced position. This is often a false assumption, for the character of the work in the lower grades may neither call into play nor develop the superior capacities required in the higher.

The point is, of course, that there are various types of duties and that length of service differently affects their performance. In promoting from one routine position to a comparable one, it may justifiably be given considerable weight. Generally speaking, however, seniority should be a decidedly subordinate factor in promoting to different or more responsible

duties. If it is given any weight in such circumstances, that weight should be small. Perhaps its chief use should be in choosing between candidates all of whom appear to be on a par. When other things are equal, it may be determining.

3. Examination. The general subject of tests has been treated in an earlier chapter. In the United States, those jurisdictions which have adopted the merit system place considerable reliance upon promotional tests of either the competitive or the noncompetitive type.[15] Where the latter are employed they take on the character of efficiency bars and, of course, constitute a less drastic restriction upon the freedom of choice of the appointing officer than if competitive tests are resorted to.

But the purpose of any promotional examination is to discover whether the candidate or candidates have both the knowledge and the qualities requisite for the higher place. The testing for knowledge is comparatively simple. The police sergeant can, with some application, gain the knowledge which the lieutenant must have at his disposal, as can the clerk in the assessor's office who aspires to assess property, or the draftsman who wishes to become a designer. With a proper training program the actual knowledge necessary to fill an advanced opening may be acquired and also tested. Similarly, as was pointed out earlier, various mental capacities and aptitudes can be tested with at least some assurance.

But in the matter of personality traits, which play a larger role as the responsibilities of positions increase, there is no immediate prospect of conclusive tests. Here must be included such dynamic traits as leadership, judgment, initiative, resourcefulness, and coöperativeness. It is in the determination, the definition, and the testing of qualities of this category that progress is most mandatory in the interest of sound methods of promotion.

Competitive examinations are still widely used as the principal means for selection for promotion in many municipal and some state jurisdictions. Some feel that they are the only way to discount prejudice and the limited knowledge of candidates on the part of selecting officers. This approach to the problem, however, obviously lays greater reliance on the validity of tests than on the observation of actual work performed and aptitudes demonstrated on the job. In spite of the risks, no one has yet found a substitute for human judgment, fallible though it is, when it comes to

[15] In this respect we offer a considerable contrast to most other countries. In England, except in the customs service, promotional examinations are seldom used. This is true also of France. In the German service, promotional examinations are employed for the lower grades, but for the higher grades of the service the basis of promotion is the *Personalakt*—personal records kept by the supervising officials. See, among others, White, *The Civil Service in the Modern State.* In most of the state and city services of this country, on the other hand, where the merit system has been adopted, examinations are definitely included as one of the bases for promotion.

assessing some of the more intangible qualities of employees whose work behavior the responsible official has had some opportunity to appraise. This opportunity may have been direct observation, study of performance reports, or consultation with those who have supervised the candidate in question.[16]

Nevertheless, formal examinations do have a useful place in the promotion process. They are especially desirable where the bulk of the candidates, though qualified, have not had direct work experience in the precise operations required in the job to be filled and prediction of their success is necessary. An example would be movement from nonsupervisory to supervisory work.[17] Competitive examinations are also useful in a very large organization, such as a mass clerical or mechanical operation or a metropolitan police force, where a number of positions may be filled at one time and the number of eligible candidates within the organization is substantial. In situations like this the formal competitive test is greatly to be desired and is widely used. It is even found occasionally in the Federal service, which is otherwise known for its more informal promotion policies.[18]

Before closing this section on examinations, we should say a word about psychiatric tests. Even the most progressive public personnel divisions have failed to appreciate the utility of psychologists and psychiatric specialists in connection with personnel administration. Experience has proved their value, particularly in connection with the discovery of promotable material. R. H. Macy and Company long ago adopted the policy, for example, of making no promotions to executive positions without a psychiatric examination.[19] The investigation goes well beyond the use of psychological tests. It involves the detailed study of the job to be filled, of the qualifications required, of the whole individual, covering physical, psychological, and social attributes and peculiarities. Such an investigation will obviously go beyond those considerations which ordinarily determine the decisions of an appointing head. Who will question that the availability of such data would markedly improve the "batting average" of those responsible for promotional appointments?

4. Trial on the Job. No test or series of tests can measure fitness for any position to the same degree as actual trial on the job can do it. For this reason, the device of temporary assignment to the duties of the higher posi-

[16] A way in which evaluation can be combined with examination is illustrated in the Wisconsin system. At least two supervisors participate in appraisal of a candidate's general abilities and fitness, including human relations skills; these appraisals are given a numerical value and counted in as part of the test. See Civil Service Assembly, *Personnel News*, January, 1955.

[17] For a summary of developments in supervisory selection methods see Milton M. Mandell, "Ways to Select Supervisors," *Personnel Journal*, November, 1954.

[18] See the discussion of tests for supervision in Chapter 11.

[19] V. V. Anderson, *Psychiatry in Industry* (New York: 1929), pp. 51 and 56 ff. This work is an early summary of practices adopted and results achieved through the aid of psychiatrists and psychologists. This field still needs exploration by public personnel managers.

tion is valuable in determining promotability. Although the opportunity for this sort of thing will be limited, it has unexplored possibilities in most organizations, particularly in the higher reaches of the service. It provides an opportunity for relatively objective analysis of those intangibles which are often important in filling the more responsible posts and for observing the facility with which various candidates adapt themselves to the requirements of higher positions. Temporary assignment of this sort is most revealing when made in the ordinary course of operations, as when a superior is away on vacation, rather than as a competitive trial spin on the eve of promotion. If the employee knows that he is being considered for advancement during the assignment, his morale may suffer seriously if no promotion is forthcoming.

B. THE PROBLEM OF PUBLICITY

The problem of method in executing promotion policy cannot be dismissed without some attention to the question of publicity given to promotional opportunity. That there should be general publicity within the organization on lines of possible advancement and on the prerequisites for higher positions cannot be gainsaid. This can usually be accomplished through the device of employee handbooks, bulletin board announcements, and occasional flyers reminding employees and supervisors alike of the knowledges and skills required for various kinds of work and outlining training opportunities available both on and off the job.

There is considerable dispute, however, over the wisdom and necessity of publicizing vacancies as they occur. Employee organizations and many personnel specialists urge the following arguments in support of posting and advertising vacancies within the organization. First of all, no record or mechanical selection system is infallible. There may always be qualified individuals who have been overlooked and who should have consideration. Moreover, employees are not going to believe the system is infallible, even if it is, and are likely to be suspicious of unpublicized promotions. Secondly, the knowledge that promotions are regularly being made is an incentive of real potency. Conversely, there is nothing so deadly as the impression that an organization is static. Publicizing of promotional opportunities thus serves to bring to the attention of the staff whatever movement of personnel exists. Finally, the task of weeding out the applications of unqualified persons is not, in most instances, so formidable as to be decisive. It presents, moreover, an excellent opportunity for calling the attention of the more ambitious employees to their deficiencies and to the means of overcoming them. Rejection can thus be turned into a positive asset if properly handled.

On the other hand, the arguments usually advanced against publicizing vacancies as they occur are (1) that the record system is so well devised

that all qualified persons are known to the personnel office, (2) that general publicity produces such a mass of applications as to handicap seriously the selection process, (3) that knowledge of vacancies to which they are not appointed merely makes for unrest and dissatisfaction among large numbers of employees, and (4) that many able employees are not disposed to apply when the initiative is left entirely to them. As to this last point, professional pride, particularly among technical and higher-level workers, leads many to feel that their qualities should be known and appreciated by top management and that they should not be reduced to the humiliation of "selling their wares" in order for management to discover them. This is an understandable reaction of sensitive and competent people of high education and attainment. Even among the rank and file, it is far from true that ambition and aggressiveness in promoting one's progress are in direct correlation with one's ability and skill.

These are potent and reasonable objections. The work of the organization must go on, and the filling of vacancies must not be unduly held up. As in many other personnel policy issues, the problem is not a simple black-or-white alternative. Under some conditions, as where special vacancies exist that are not filled frequently, it may be desirable to supplement existing candidate-finding systems with publicity which will elicit voluntary applications from interested employees. However, where similar jobs in relatively large numbers are periodically vacant because of normal turnover, it seems idle to post vacancies on bulletin boards in any precise sense. Such announcements would invariably be out of date as soon as they went up. The possibility of employee application may be better encouraged by dissemination of the general information that certain types of positions are filled from time to time and that the qualification requisites are thus and so.

The foregoing remarks on the subject of promotion indicate what a complex process it is and how futile is the expectation of finding some simple and automatically operating measure. Here are problems to test the capacity of the most skilled administrator and to provide ample scope for that coöperation between the departments and the personnel agency without which the personnel system is of little value. In the last analysis, promotion, like all placement, must be handled upon the basis of careful individual judgments, although the establishment of formal bases of selection, if not too rigidly prescribed, aids the administrator by narrowing his problem.

It has been said that an ideal promotion policy would provide for "the maximum amount of advancement in responsibility and salary commensurate with the employee's capacity and ability." This, in turn, would "most favorably affect employee morale, and contribute to the highest

production." Such an ideal is perhaps out of reach in most public jurisdictions, but it should be the goal at which to aim. It will be approached to the extent that the following general principles are observed:

1. Higher positions should be filled from within the service wherever high-quality candidates are available inside.

2. Understudy training programs and trial on the job should be developed for the higher positions.

3. The promotional area should be restricted only to the extent dictated by the good of the service as a whole. Interbureau and interdepartmental promotions should be encouraged wherever possible.

4. The principle of equality in relation to public employment should apply to promotional opportunities as well as to original entrance. From this it follows that all qualified employees should have the opportunity of being considered for the small number of high positions and that procedures and practices should be developed which will make this possible.

5. No single criterion is adequate as a measure of promotability, and the well-devised promotion system will provide for a maximum of flexibility in the methods employed.

6. Finally, the role of the supervisor is a crucial one. Much can be done by personnel officers in devising record systems and procedures for determining which employees are qualified for advancement and in bringing them to the attention of department heads or other supervisory officers. In the last analysis, however, the operating officers must have the authority to determine, within reasonable limits, the persons to be promoted in the organizations for which they are responsible.

IV. REASSIGNMENT AND TRANSFER FOR EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT OR ADJUSTMENT

Whereas a promotion usually implies an increase in compensation, its distinguishing characteristic is that the employee is assigned to new duties involving increased responsibilities. A transfer, on the other hand, involves the movement of the employee to another position of the same class in another organization unit. This is a horizontal movement. Its distinguishing characteristic is not a change of duties but a change from the jurisdiction of one executive to that of another. Finally, assignment or reassignment is a change of work, not involving increased responsibilities, in the same office.

Transfers may be the result either of organizational demands or of individual misplacement. In the first instance they are produced by the expansion or contraction of the organization, by seasonal loads, by changes in work methods, and by shifting policies. Such transfers are closely related to reassignment of duties and are made at the instigation of the administrative officers with a view to the better adjustment of personnel to work load.

On the other hand, there is a type of transfer related more directly to what has been termed "adjustment placement." Original placement cannot, of course, wholly assure that the appointee is fitted to his job. There are always possibilities of round pegs in square holes, and these possibilities are increased by the fact that workers themselves may change. The employee perfectly adjusted at a given time may grow completely out of harmony with his job a year later. Progressive administration therefore requires that placement be a continuing process. We have already considered one aspect of the process in the discussion of promotions. We now turn to other methods by which the better adjustment of the employee may be secured.

The various organization units in the government service are traditionally separative, and the tendency is for them to be mutually exclusive. This is accounted for, in part at least, by the conditions of their creation and existence. Creatures of legislatures, they are continually treated as isolated units. This results in interdepartmental and even interbureau barriers which are difficult to break down and has contributed as much as anything to the inflexibility of some government workers. Its effects upon personnel administration have been uniformly bad, leading to a narrowness of official outlook and an aggravation of maladjustments which have done much to perpetuate the sins and omissions of bureaucracy.

But in spite of quite general recognition of this fact, transfers in the public service are too infrequent, partly, at least, because little machinery has been set up to facilitate them, and existing rules almost universally restrict the process. At the outset, however, a distinction should be made between intradepartmental transfers and interdepartmental ones. The former are arranged much more easily and ordinarily can be made by the department head without reference to the central personnel agency.[20] On the other hand, the usual procedure requires transfers between different departments to clear through the personnel authority.

In the latter case, the conditions in many jurisdictions are such as nearly to preclude the possibility of movement from one unit to another. The ordinary requirements are that an interdepartmental transfer shall take place only with the approval of the two department heads concerned and the civil service commission.[21] It is usually further provided that no employee shall be allowed to transfer until he has been in the service six months, and, of course, transfers from the exempted to the competitive service may take place only upon examination. In the Federal service interorganization

[20] This is not always true, however. For example, in several jurisdictions *all* transfers require the approval of the commission.

[21] To this the Cincinnati rules offer an interesting exception. They provide that only the personnel agency and the head of the unit to which transfer is desired need approve.

transfers have been possible for many years without approval of the commission, provided minimum qualification standards are adhered to. This condition did not always hold, even in the Federal service. Public jurisdictions generally, however, reveal a lesser movement of personnel than would ordinarily be found in business organizations of comparable size.

There is little need to comment upon intradepartment transfers or reassignments within the particular office, both of which can ordinarily be undertaken by the appointing authority alone. It should be pointed out, however, that the requirements of good placement necessitate paying more attention to these processes than has been customary. The personnel agency should definitely take the initiative in stimulating the interest of the administrative officials or departmental personnel officers when maladjusted cases are discovered by the agency. A special transfer file should be maintained by every departmental personnel office, and employees should be counseled regarding personal problems and transfer possibilities.

In the case of interdepartmental transfers, the commission or other authority should have a positive program, including any necessary machinery, to help arrange transfers on its own initiative. The recognition that "lack of flexibility in transfer defeats the object of good placement" should be made the cornerstone of a positive program. Only thus can equal opportunities be established throughout the entire service and the highest efficiency obtained. It should also be recognized that a flexible transfer policy may be a source of economy through permitting adjustments in the numbers of employees in various establishments to correspond with seasonal and other fluctuations in the volume of work, and that, intelligently administered, it could greatly reduce the number of layoffs and dismissals.

Every central personnel agency should give official attention to transfers and, where practicable, should maintain a service-wide transfer file, including the qualifications of persons desiring transfer and their reasons therefor. In large jurisdictions a transfer unit will be necessary, to which the departments can turn in filling vacancies. The establishment of such a unit, it has been pointed out, would "result in more effective placement of employees, in correcting maladjustments, and in creating greater opportunities for service among employees." These are all important ends of the well-conceived staffing program.

SUMMARY

No area of personnel policy and practice is more important, and yet more fraught with difficulty, than that involving the present staff as a source of recruitment for the higher jobs in an organization. Like several other aspects of administration, it is constantly in danger of pseudo solution by the "gadgeteers." The latter are those so-called experts who have a pat

answer, a device, or a procedure to solve knotty problems. When the inherent conflicts in a subject like promotion policy are encountered, they resort to gadgets and panaceas.

But in this area no neat system can work successfully without the good will and best intentions of all selecting officers. We must avoid the stagnation of no promotional opportunity and, at the same time, avoid the dead hand of inbreeding. Also, we must assure the filling of positions with the best available persons and guarantee fairness to all current employees. This is no small order. Not all public jurisdictions are coming close to the ideal today.

Whatever the basis for selection of employees for promotion, we must first make certain that promotional opportunity for reaching the higher levels of the service is an actuality. This calls for continuous extension of the merit system upward and outward in those jurisdictions where it is now too limited.

Next, we must make certain that we have the machinery to permit sound selections from as wide an area of the service as is practicable. With few exceptions, this usually means, as a minimum, all the jobs of one jurisdiction in a given location and often in all locations. This selection area has practical limitations, however, in the sprawling Federal service. The important key lies in adequate records and methods for discovering candidates. It means relying on publicity regarding vacancies wherever it is practicable for management and of value to employees.

The relative value of competitive examinations, comparative service, seniority, and trial on the job as the measures or bases for promotional selection is not nearly so vital to good administration as the judicious use of these methods in combination, balancing their advantages and disadvantages and suiting their attributes to the conditions of a particular service or to particular positions. Likewise, due attention must be given to facilitating movement of personnel among departments and bureaus, whether or not promotions are always involved. A liberal policy in this respect is valuable in the development and continuous adjustment of employees.

The whole philosophy of promotion policy, as a vital but nonetheless partial phase of filling positions with able people and as a crucial aspect of morale, must permeate the thinking and the belief of every appointing officer in the service. Unless this is taken seriously enough to make it a part of the training of every executive, the perfection of instruments of candidate-finding and of selection is likely to be disappointing. If we are to respect the need for considerable latitude on the part of selecting officers, then our major hope for a good operation, so far as promotion and transfer are concerned, lies in the development of these key people to a common point of view of constructive value to the whole service.

In closing this chapter, one note of caution should be entered. Promotion policy is not something to be predicated on a high-powered sales technique. Employees should not be whipped into a continuous frenzy over promotional opportunity. No organization is so constructed that all can expect eventual promotion to the top few rungs of the ladder; in fact there is room for only a small minority to climb beyond the middle levels. Besides, many employees are perfectly content to stay in their existing positions and, if let alone, will continue a high order of efficiency. Any program that overemphasizes the necessity for "getting ahead" may only make many employees feel a sense of inadequacy and may eventually decrease their overall usefulness. Here, as in so many fields, "moderation" is the watchword.

PART III

Career and Pay Concepts

For nothing less than the cultivation of whole men is what our kind of society is dedicated to. Nothing less than this, therefore, has to be shared as a responsibility by administrators who themselves have become wholesome enough to know their labors combine the creative demands both of self and of society.

—Ordway Tead, *The Art of Administration* (New York: 1951), p. 208

8

Career System Patterns

The term "career" is an old one. It has been widely used to connote the progression of an individual in a field of work throughout the employable years of his life. A career in business or in a profession is a commonly understood concept. Sometimes it means devotion to a specialty; sometimes it means a series of employments which are only loosely related to each other. In either case, it usually implies some degree of success. "Career" is a pleasant term. It is something that everyone who expects to work for a living would like to have.

For many years public services have sought to embrace within their personnel systems the concept of careers. Consciousness of its importance in the United States was accelerated at the time of the report of the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel in 1935. This body fostered, particularly for the Federal civil service, the idea that a merit system for selection was not enough. It urged the creation of conditions that would provide true careers for those who entered the service, with careful selection of young persons at the various levels of graduation from educational institutions and with real opportunities for satisfying advancement to retain them in the service for a lifetime.[1] This philosophy has continued to influence the planning of public personnel systems since that time. Paralleling the efforts of private industry and the military services, emphasis has been placed on the "holding power" of the employer. Early recruitment, independent retirement systems, competition in pay, and other factors have evidenced this endeavor.

In most government jurisdictions, the typical career has been within the confines of a single department or bureau. The larger the jurisdiction, the more common this appears to be. In the United States government this compartmentalization of careers is further demonstrated by the separate career systems that exist outside the general civil service system—four

[1] *Better Government Personnel* (New York: 1935), *passim.*

different military systems,[2] the Coast Guard, the Foreign Service, the Public Health Service commissioned corps, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the separate merit systems existing for such agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Atomic Energy Commission. Because of its different pay system the gigantic field postal service, representing one-fifth of all Federal civilian workers, is really a separate career service. Even within the general civil service there are many lifetime careers entirely inside such specialized bureaus as the Forest Service, the Social Security Administration, the Bureau of Standards, and the Internal Revenue Service. Careers in state and large municipal services are likewise commonly limited to individual units—a department of health, a water department, a highway or street department, and the like. There are, nevertheless, particularly among the occupations that cut across agencies in a jurisdiction, many persons who move from department to department and bureau to bureau as they climb up the career ladder.

In recent years increasing attention has been given to the concept of careers that even bridge the gaps among public service jurisdictions and between the public service and private employment. In commenting on the Federal service, for example, the Sixth American Assembly concluded that "a closed, self-contained system is not in the American tradition." Government employment, it stated, "should be open to interchange with the other fields of American life—business, trade unions, universities, the professions, state and local governments." Of benefit to all these groups as well as to the United States Government, such exchanges were viewed as especially desirable to meet emergency needs and "to improve relations between those in and out of Government."[3] Thus, the monolithic career, identified with one institution or government, may be less emphasized in the future than in the past. A fine example, of course, of a kind of career which involves movement from one jurisdiction to another is that of city manager, for which the whole advancement tradition has been one of progression from smaller municipalities to larger and more important ones.

The foregoing introductory comments alone are sufficient to suggest that there are considerations relating to career systems besides the more obvious functional aspects concerning selection methods, promotion devices, and insulation from political party manipulation. Modern public personnel administration must concern itself with the patterns through which careers operate. Should they be monolithic, providing lifetime service in one organization in one place? Should they involve all units in a particular state, municipality, or other governmental entity? Should the public service be

[2] Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marines.

[3] Sixth American Assembly, Columbia University, *The Federal Government Service: Its Character, Prestige, and Problems*, final ed. (New York: 1954), pp. 8–9.

viewed as a wholly distinct place for careers in contrast to private employment, education, or the professions? Can careers best operate within the scope of a position classification scheme or will they flower only under plans like those used in our military services? Obviously, there are no single right answers to these questions in application to all situations. Conditions as to the breadth and limitations of given occupations, size of organizations, personal interests of individuals, methods of compensation, status and prestige, tenure, and various other factors all combine to influence what career system patterns should be like and what they can be like in given instances. With full recognition of the diversity of conditions under which application can be made, this chapter is devoted to an analysis of some of the kinds and problems of career systems found in most public organizations.

I. CLASSIFICATIONS OF CAREER SYSTEMS

Depending on the point of view, career systems may be classified roughly as to either their scope, their limitations on entrance, or their orientation for reward and rank. The first two methods of classification may be disposed of comparatively briefly. The matter of orientation of the system will require more extended treatment. These approaches to different kinds of career systems are not mutually exclusive; any one career system may be subject to classification by each approach separately.[4]

A. PROGRAM CAREERS AND ORGANIZATION CAREERS

As already indicated in the first pages of this chapter, a career system may be built on the idea that men are going to stay in a certain program—such as insurance regulation, highway construction, employment service, or scientific research—or they may be geared to permit or encourage the movement of men among various programs throughout a large diversified department or among various agencies in a governmental jurisdiction. The scope of a career system may even be designed to permit and encourage movement among jurisdictions themselves, as suggested by the American Assembly.

Various conditions of employment affect the degree to which movement of employees is permitted or encouraged. A common system of job identification and pay is a most important factor. Ability to transfer from one unit to another through open competition, or noncompetitively (that is, without having to recompete through a competitive examination), may be another one. When movement between departments or governments is involved, the transferability of retirement rights and eligibility becomes significant.

[4] For an intelligent and insightful discussion of career systems, see the paper by Everett Reimer, "Modern Personnel Management and the Federal Government Service," in *ibid.*

The presence or absence of such conditions can extend or limit the likelihood of an employee's choosing his next point of advancement outside his existing organization.

Of course, modern technology and the proliferation of occupational specialties make it unlikely that the majority of people will find their careers in more than one or a few agencies in any governmental jurisdiction. The most common limitation on how far or how widely a man can move is the scope of his own occupation. A chemist is not likely to find a place in a finance office; a tax specialist could hardly expect to work in a laboratory. Except in top commands, even the military services have had to modify drastically their longstanding view of the role of the career officer as a generalist who could be expected to carry out almost any assignment. The age of specialization has circumscribed the orbits within which any officer can be expected to serve competently, in accordance with his own education, training, and experience. Certainly the schemes of rotation are vastly different from what they were a half-century ago.

Nevertheless, there are many occupations which do exist throughout an entire governmental service or at least in more than one agency. Examples of the more obvious variety are stenographer and secretary, general clerk, accountant, personnel officer, and attorney, to name but a few. Many career systems could be improved by establishing conditions which encourage the movement of personnel, even those in highly specialized occupations, across bureau and department lines. Also, the possibility of logical progression from one occupation to another—such as personnel officer to general executive, or secretary to administrative assistant—is often overlooked by the artificial fences that are built into some personnel systems.

The immense value of coöperative endeavor or exchange of specialists between Federal and state or local governments is already amply illustrated in the fields of agriculture and public health. There is probably more contact and movement between governmental levels in these two professional areas than in any others, because liberal legislation at various levels has permitted a variety of patterns: service in state posts by Federal health officers; hybrid positions (partly Federal, partly local) such as those of county agents; and some movement back and forth, as in agricultural extension work. Stumbling blocks that still stand in the way of careers having intergovernmental scope are (1) limitations—some of them imposed by practice rather than law—on lateral entry into a service, (2) absence of reciprocal exchange of retirement benefit eligibility, and (3) disparity in salary scales. The retirement problem may some day be partially solved by the extension of national old-age insurance coverage as a floor under all public retirement plans.[5] It should be recognized that even the salary problem is not all one-sided; that is, the Federal Government is by no means uniformly the most

[5] See Chapter 21, "Retirement and Disability."

generous employer. Some of the larger states, like New York and California, and even large cities, like Detroit and Los Angeles, have higher pay scales than does the national civil service.[6]

B. CLOSED CAREERS AND OPEN CAREERS

Through the device of low maximum age limits for entrance and the filling of upper-level positions almost entirely from within, some career services are referred to as having a "closed" system. Although this is uncommon in state and local public services, there are numerous instances of it in the United States Government. The officer corps of each of the military services, except in time of war, are almost invariably replenished by the commissioning of new junior officers at the second lieutenant or ensign rank, with practically no intake at middle or senior levels. The Foreign Service and the Public Health Service commissioned corps provide further examples of the closed career system. These systems are based on the concept that substantial opportunity for advancement can be insured only if the hierarchy is refueled personnel-wise from the base, preserving upper ranks for the competition of those already in the service. Something approximating this idea was apparently in the minds of the Commission of Inquiry in 1935 when it stressed the recruitment of young people and retention in the service as the prime requisites of a career system. In fact, organizations with closed systems characteristically appropriate as a designation for their plans the generic phrase "career system," as if to say that only by such a scheme can careers truly be achieved.

Along with the above features, a closed system usually includes provision for "selection out." As in the military services and the Foreign Service, officers upon reaching a certain moderately high rank must either meet certain standards, expressed in evaluations by their superiors or in special examinations, to merit further promotion or be retired prematurely from the service. This "selection out" requirement customarily applies after the officer has been passed over for promotion two or three times.

The open type of career system, as the term implies, permits entrance at any or all grade levels (by rank or position) in the service. Such entrance, of course, is still governed by whatever qualification requirements and competition the particular jurisdiction prescribes for each occupation and level. This is the career condition which generally characterizes the civilian public services in this country, although in the British "administrative class" and in western European and South American countries we find more evidence of closed systems. In the open system opportunities for advancement are afforded through the natural advantage that insiders have when vacancies

[6] See the generally more favorable salaries prevailing in California communities, as brought out by Henry Reining, Jr., in "JMA versus Jobs at Home," *Personnel Administration*, March, 1955, pp. 8–9.

are to be filled, but infusion of new blood at middle and upper levels is not precluded. In time of emergency or other sudden expansion, even the closed career system loses its character and becomes indistinguishable from this more distinctively American open system.

It should be acknowledged that even under an open career system the influx of outsiders at middle or higher levels is never likely to be large except in times of rapid expansion. In the Federal civil service, specific bureaus or professions may operate to all intents and purposes as if they were closed. The U.S. Forest Service, for example, rarely fills its professional ranks at any but the junior level. Nevertheless, the greater flexibility of the open systems, allowing for more infusion of new personalities and ideas at levels where they are likely to count and with almost as much opportunity for advancement evidenced in actual practice, is ordinarily to be preferred over the closed, self-contained personnel systems.

C. JOB-ORIENTED CAREERS AND RANK IN THE MAN

The third major classification of career systems is by their orientation as to reward and rank. In the one type, the focus of the plan is on the assignment—the job to be performed, and the fitting of an individual into the job. Careers for individuals derive from a succession of such assignments, usually unplanned. In the other type, the focus is on the person, emphasizing his development, utilization, and rank. Careers are viewed in terms of the individual rather than in terms of a hierarchy of positions. This distinction is so complex and so important that it warrants a fairly intensive analysis, which constitutes the next section of this chapter.

II. THE POSITION AND THE PERSONAL RANK CONCEPTS

One of the principal differences between the administrative practices of large civil organizations in the United States and those of most other countries in the world (the nations with systems most like ours are Brazil and Canada) lies in the distinction between the "position concept" (common in our public service and in large private industry) and the "personal rank concept" (the prevailing basis for personnel systems in most other countries as well as in the military services[7] of all countries, including our own). The

[7] One might also include the Foreign Service of the United States under the rank concept, although in recent years marks of the position-and-duties idea have modified the system. See the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (P.L. 724, 79th Cong., 2nd sess., August 13, 1946). This law, in Section 441, requires that the Secretary of State "classify all positions" in the Foreign Service and "allocate" them to the classes set up in the act. Such special commissioned groups as those in the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce are predominantly based on the military rank idea. The Public Health Service, however, has incorporated duties-control and merit-promotion features common in regular civil service systems. Regulations issued in 1948 for the Public Health corps included the following: "After considering the relative importance of the duties and responsibilities of a position in relation to the duties and

personal rank concept, which we shall hereafter refer to simply as the rank concept, centers attention on the individual and his status (pay, prestige, rights, etc.) relative to other individuals in the organization; the position concept centers attention on the work assignment of the individual (the "position") and the status of that assignment relative to other assignments in the organization. Both concepts embrace the idea of movement of personnel, but such movement to other assignments is considered more flexible under the rank concept, where status inheres in the individual. On the other hand, the rationalization and systematization of assignment (closely following the development of mass production methods and refined specialization of labor) are more characteristic of the position concept.

The position concept is the newer of the two. The sharpness of the difference in approach between these two administrative philosophies has been pointed up in (1) the military service versus the civil service in the United States and in Canada and (2) the problem of integrating the thinking of American personnel specialists with that of Europeans, Asiatics, and South Americans in the establishment and operation of international administrative organizations (e.g., the Secretariat of the United Nations and its various affiliated organizations). The theoretical differences between the two concepts can be so drawn as to make them seem utterly incompatible. Actually, in recent years the application of each approach in many places has been so modified with features of the other that conceptual compromise seems inevitable. However, to understand the differences in emphasis and the possibility of reconciliation between the two ideas, it may be well to examine their theoretical distinctions.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE PLANNING

The position concept has an intimate relationship with organization mechanism. A position is a segment of an organization plan. Gearing every aspect of management to the collections of duties assigned to individuals obviously rests on working out aims, organization, and methods in advance —the essence of planning. Under this theory the position, and hence the plan, must exist before work can start. The job concept is a logical corollary of narrow specialization of labor and systematic subdivision of responsibilities.

This is not to say that the rank concept is the antithesis of administrative planning. Indeed, one can argue that it is more attuned to long-range planning, whereas the position approach, being tied in with the vicissitudes of organization arrangement, is suitable only for short-range planning.

---

responsibilities of other positions occupied by commissioned officers, the Surgeon General may determine that such position requires the services of an officer of a certain grade and may designate such position as a graded position."—Executive Order 9993, August 31, 1948, sec. 21.128.

The rank idea says: "Hire broadly qualified people, and work out their assignments from time to time to suit the needs of the enterprise and the aptitudes of individuals. Let their progress and recognition be based on the length and overall quality of their service, regardless of the significance of individual assignments which they periodically assume." Thus, for the sake of the long-range good of the program, many feel that the rank system produces greater flexibility, greater loyalty, and greater adaptability to human strengths and weaknesses.

B. COÖRDINATION

As implied above, the definition of and focusing of attention on the work assignment fit in nicely with the needs to define lines of responsibility and jurisdictional areas and to avoid conflict and overlapping in administrative operations. This is vital to good coördination. It is one of the strongest points in favor of the job concept. Clearly, the acts of describing and classifying positions bring to light many points at which coördination or reconciliation is necessary.

At the same time it can be argued that a high degree of specialization, as implied by most position classification systems, makes more difficult the coördination of work, communication between classes of specialists, and development of broad-gauged managerial talent. Hence, from this point of view coördination becomes even more essential under the position concept than when general perspective beyond an assignment and identification of individuals with an organization as a whole are promoted by rank in the person.

Responsibility can readily be defined, furthermore, within the realm of the rank concept. For example, the general principles of "line" and "staff," "span of control," and various other attributes of systematic organization, definition, and control were first evolved in military services, the bulwark of the rank idea. Focusing attention on the individual does not require that we ignore functional charting or efficient meshing of the gears. It is doubtful, however, whether as much attention today in the military services would be given to detailed definition and coördination of functions were it not for the influence of the position concept. During and since World War II all branches of the military have done more and more to define the responsibilities of particular posts and to specify and limit the nature and importance of assignments to be made to individuals of given rank.[8]

[8] The Army and the Air Force undertook extensive programs of job analysis, covering commissioned and enlisted assignments, as a basis for relating rank and qualifications of men more nearly to duties performed. In 1949 the Secretary of Defense announced that private personnel management concerns would be used in "a scientific occupational classification program" to apply to the entire National Military Establishment. This was found especially

C. PAY

The most important single manifestation of the difference in application of the position and rank concepts is in the matter of compensation to the individual. Under the position concept, the basic pay ranges are synchronized with classes of positions. Under the rank concept, pay ranges are based on attributes of the service of the individual. It was the quest for an objective criterion for pay that first gave the position approach its impetus in the public service.[9] "Equal pay for equal work" is still a meaningful slogan. The rank idea, with equal claim to objectivity, ties its compensation in with the seniority and performance (and frequently with the needs) of the individual.

Actually, however, this is the point on which there has been the greatest compromise between the two. Most compensation schedules geared to position classification plans provide room for pay advancement and adjustment on the basis of length and quality of performance. Also, many rank systems are modified[10] by providing rapid and temporary change in the individual's rank because of change in the nature of the assignment, as well as for brilliant performance. Furthermore, there is room for considerable flexibility in job classification itself. Some jurisdictions, like the Federal, give administrators wide latitude to establish and change positions. Where the nature of an individual's work is such that his qualifications can leave an imprint on it, the job can be created or changed around the individual. The resultant classification may permit promotion of the individual, but this is sometimes affected by the rules for competition in the particular service.

Finally, there has been a movement in recent years to reduce the number of levels ordinarily recognized in position classification plans, so that they tend to come nearer to the smaller number of ranks in most rank systems. Thus, in pay administration, the two concepts seem to be getting closer together.

At this point it should be said that the influence of these two ideas on each other is not independent either of the development of collective bargaining or of pay on the basis of prevailing wages. Elements of both concepts are likely to exist under a negotiated pay plan. The fact that labor and management get together to agree on pay, following scales prevailing in the vicinity, does not mean that a third concept of pay—foreign to either the rank or the position concept—is being used. It is true, however, that more earmarks of the position concept than of the rank idea are de-

---

necessary after unification of the armed forces because of need for a "common job and qualification system for all military positions" both "for present efficiency" and "for mobilization requirements in the event of a future emergency."—Washington *Post*, May 29, 1949.

[9] See the discussion in the next chapter.

[10] See footnote 8 above.

tected in collective agreements. Comparison with other industries or jobs in the area is easier, though not perfect, when done in terms of duties performed than when made on the basis of arbitrary personal ranks.

D. OTHER FACTORS

Partisans for either of the two concepts, in extolling the advantages of their particular system, are inclined to exaggerate the faults of the other, but careful examination of experience with both plans suggests that neither is inherently as bad as its opponents make out. For example, certain doubtful practices, especially in military forces, have long been associated with the rank concept—namely, pay and advancement strictly on the basis of longevity and seniority, assignment without regard to the wishes or interests of the individual assigned, and undemocratic social stratification. The inherent characteristics of the rank idea, however, by no means require these appurtenances. In fact, the only inherent feature of the rank concept is that status (pay, prestige, rights, etc.) inheres in the individual regardless of the nature of his assignment.

On the other hand, systems of position classification are often criticized on the grounds that they create too many fine occupational distinctions and too many levels of pay, require labored and very detailed job descriptions, demand a special jargon of mystic phrases, and interfere with variation in pay on the basis of individual performance. Again, the objections are being leveled at tangential applications of an idea rather than at the idea itself. The core of the position concept bears repeating: it is simply that status depends upon the work performed rather than upon the previous service of the individual. Further, it requires a system of putting positions into classes on the basis of their duties and responsibilities. Even a system of position classification does not require that *pay* be governed strictly by assignment. Thus, the proposal that top-level career executives in the Federal service be permitted to transfer from job to job without loss in pay status, regardless of the classification of their positions, can be made compatible with a framework in which integration of position classification with pay is the accepted order for the bulk of the service.

The extended application of the position concept in the American public service, as found in the system of position classification and in its integration with salary scales, suggests that we give more attention in this book to that approach than to the rank concept. Nevertheless, we must bear in mind the evolution of this quite modern idea. Its relation to compensation especially must be examined thoroughly but with a critical eye. At the same time, we must recognize that strict seniority rank systems are becoming so diluted with the duties-assignment and advancement-based-on-merit ideas that they are scarcely recognizable as springing from the older of the two concepts. Indeed, the real reason for studying carefully the duties

classification idea is its probable permanent effect on administrative method, whether or not the concept of rank and seniority continues to one degree or another in the American public service and in international administration. This does not mean that position classification need be held up, in doctrinaire fashion, as the all-pervasive source of good personnel administration, to be applied willy-nilly to all situations. Rather it should be examined for its essential contributions, for its most fruitful uses, for the limits of its application, and for its features where technique needs to be improved.

III. THE "SENIOR CIVIL SERVICE"

Before we turn to a detailed examination of the position concept, as evidenced in American position classification systems, it may be well to note briefly the interest that has developed in recent years in providing a system built on the rank concept for career executive personnel in the Federal civil service. Brief references to such an idea were made in the 1950 edition of this book, and since that time specific plans have been proposed by Corson, Belsley, the American Assembly, and the second Hoover Commission.[11]

The essence was captured by the Sixth American Assembly when it said:

> The higher ranks of the career civil service should be so constituted as to permit each department head to have greater opportunities than at present under the civil service to transfer individuals from position to position. This is needed for two reasons: (1) to give the department head an opportunity to work through individuals in whom he has confidence, and (2) to assign individuals to positions where they may be most effectively employed.
>
> Establishment of this group and the facilitation of transferability of these civil servants suggest three steps: a) the attachment of rank and compensation to the man rather than to the job; b) the use of a central unit to facilitate the transfer of competent civil servants from one department to another; c) the identification of

[11] See John J. Corson, *Executives for the Federal Service*, A Program for Action in Time of Crisis (New York: 1952), Chap. 8, "A Pool of Career Administrators"; G. Lyle Belsley, *Federal Personnel Management in Transition*, A Special Report Prepared for the Public Administration Clearing House (Chicago: 1953), especially pp. 41–43; G. Lyle Belsley, Part II of *Prescription for a Better Public Service*, Personnel Report No. 541, Civil Service Assembly (Chicago: 1954), pp. 14–15; the Sixth American Assembly, *op. cit.*; Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel and Civil Service*, A Report to the Congress (Washington: February, 1955), Recommendation No. 6, and *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), Chap. 3, "Strengthening Top Management: The Senior Civil Service."

A brief but cogent analysis of the issues involved in this kind of proposal first appeared in the background paper prepared by Paul T. David, "The Development and Recruitment of Administrative Leadership in National and International Programs," published in Robert A. Walker (ed.), *America's Manpower Crisis*, Report of the Institute on Manpower Utilization and Government Personnel, Stanford University, August, 1951 (Chicago, Public Administration Service: 1952), pp. 154–156.

civil servants of demonstrated competence in the higher ranks to give prestige to achievement in the Civil Service and to make known for transfer those of special competence.

. . . It is especially important that the Federal Government develop an effective group of "generalists," who may be shifted from agency to agency as needed.[12]

This idea was enlarged upon by the Hoover Commission when, acting on a detailed plan worked out by its Task Force, it proposed a "Senior Civil Service" to apply to 1500 to 3000 top career executives calling for personal rank status like that for commissioned officers in the armed forces, flexibility in assignment, obligation of members to serve where needed, political neutrality, and more liberal salaries not necessarily geared to current positions held. Such a pool of administrators was to be under the operational control of a Senior Civil Service Board of five members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The plan, as worked out by the Task Force, entailed selection from among outstanding civil servants and provision for maintaining members' salaries when temporarily unassigned. Tenure for a senior civil servant was to be in the service, not in a specific job.

The Senior Civil Service was conceived not only as a personnel device more suitable for treatment of executives but also as a means of providing a dependable and flexible supply of top-level career people that would at the same time (1) give political department heads more latitude in assignment and utilization of people and (2) preserve a strong career tradition for higher civil servants, thus insulating the career service more tightly from the temptation of political tampering. The security of tenure of a career man exposed to direct relationships with political leaders would not be dependent upon his retention in any particular position. Political executives, on the other hand, in making changes would not be deprived of the knowledge, skill, and continuity provided by a corps of career people. They would, however, be obligated to use senior civil servants in top career posts.

Some objection to the Senior Civil Service proposal is expressed on the grounds that it would create an elite group or caste that would tend to work against the traditional openness of the American public service. Comparisons with the British "administrative class" as indicative of a comparable group are made. Significantly, however, the Hoover Commission recommendation does not embrace the notion of recruitment at an early age as the only or main channel for staffing the Senior Civil Service. It would not represent a vertical siphon in the service, with replenishment only from limited sources. It would simply constitute a horizontal identification of top assignments and personnel, the latter replaced as needed by selection from all avenues of the civil service, with a special personnel system so far

[12] Sixth American Assembly, *op. cit.*, pp. 4–5.

as pay and tenure are concerned applying to this top layer of the service. In this respect, even though utilizing the rank concept, it would be unlike such systems as exist in the Foreign Service, the Public Health Service officer corps, or the armed forces.

Some will argue that a great deal of mobility of managerial talent already exists under the general Federal classification and promotion system. This is undoubtedly true. The three principal conditions now missing, however, which circumscribe and inhibit that mobility, are (1) systematic planning and control of executive needs and utilization, which derives from the "pool" approach; (2) rank in the person; and (3) strengthening of tenure in the service and reduction of tenure in a job.

Since development of a Senior Civil Service in the United States government would require legislation, its establishment or the adoption of any of its features must await a greater receptivity in Congress than so far appears to obtain. In the meantime, there is every reason to believe that its principles would also be applicable to the larger state and municipal services. A modest application in Washington plus a trial in one of the states would provide worth-while experimentation in the operating aspects of the plan.[13]

SUMMARY

Apart from the staffing arrangements discussed in Part II of this volume, there are various patterns that have developed in practice for career systems in the American public service. Disregarding minor variants, we see that these systems may involve careers in specific programs or careers in broad organizations; the systems may be open or closed; and they may be oriented to the job or to the man.

Of growing importance in the development of career system patterns is the recognition of the public service as a place for parts of careers as well as for some lifetime careers. The movement of persons, particularly those in the professions, research, and managerial fields, among industrial, educational, and public places of employment is a particularly American phenomenon that can be expected to increase rather than decrease. Instead of blighting career opportunities in any one place, this trend enlarges the scope of such opportunities. More important, it augurs well for the mutual enrichment of and understanding between public and private employment. At the same time, greater encouragement can be expected for movement among the three levels of public employment—Federal, state, and local.

The distinction between the position concept and the rank concept, and the idea of tenure in the service together constitute the major difference between many of our career systems. Actually the "position concept" in management, to be developed more fully in the next chapter, is a relatively

[13] For two sides of the issue see the articles by Leonard D. White and Herman Somers in *Personnel Administration*, January–February, 1956, pp. 4–19.

modern one which has influenced the whole approach to personnel administration. The rank concept, even though modified by duties-analysis principles in many applications, persists as a major force in personnel systems and finds its most recent support so far as the civil service is concerned in executive posts. In addition, it may be useful for scientific research work and for such across-the-service jobs as personal secretaries to executives. The proper balance between the position-oriented and person-oriented approaches will continue for some time to be one of the challenging problems of public personnel administration.

9

The Classification of Positions

> The ideally perfect constitution of a public office is that in which the interest of the functionary is entirely coincident with his duty. No mere system will make it so, but still less can it be made so without a system, aptly devised for the purpose.
>
> —*John Stuart Mill*[1]

The term "classification" as used in connection with public employment has two connotations. The first, which has been dealt with in an earlier chapter,[2] applies to the division of a public service into classified and unclassified employees upon the basis of the jurisdiction of the civil service commission or merit system. This usage goes back to the Civil Service Act of 1883. In state and local governments the term "jurisdictional classification" has been used to cover this meaning. The U.S. Civil Service Commission, however, has dropped the term and refers instead to the "competitive service."

The second use of the word "classification" is more modern, having become current around 1912, when the city of Chicago set up what is commonly called a duties, or occupational, classification. This means the organizing of positions into groups or classes on the basis of their duties and qualification requirements. It is with this occupational type of classification—its history, its uses, and its limitations—that the present chapter deals.

I. THE CLARIFYING ROLE OF CLASSIFICATION

Duties classification represents one of the most far-reaching steps taken in the public personnel field since the inauguration of civil service laws.[3] It carries in its train influences that affect almost every branch of employ-

[1] *Representative Government*, Vol. II (1861), p. 194.

[2] See Chapter 4.

[3] The most complete and authoritative work on the subject is the report by a committee of the Civil Service Assembly, under the chairmanship of Ismar Baruch, *Position Classification in the Public Service* (Chicago: 1941).

ment procedure. As Oliver C. Short once put it, "Recruiting and the many and varied other personnel problems are as unscientifically and blindly handled in the absence of a duties classification plan as would be the construction and furnishing of a building without plans and specifications."[4]

The slogan of both the classification movement in the public sphere and the "job analysis" or "job evaluation" movement in private business is: "The *job* is the thing." By concentrating attention on the actual duties of a position, and setting an appropriate scale of pay for the work, the incumbent's title, for pay-roll purposes, corresponds to the duties he performs. If he is engaged in the work of a file and record clerk he is not called an "Italian verifier," an "awarder," an "adjuster," a "boss painter," an "editor," a "special expert," or a "telegrapher," titles actually used at one time to designate those engaged as file and record clerks, according to the report of the Congressional Joint Commission on the Reclassification of Salaries.[5]

Every classification study that has been made has produced additional data to support the conclusion that without a duties classification a confusing and bewildering array of titles is used for pay-roll purposes, making fiscal control all but impossible! The Joint Legislative Committee on Classification of Positions in the New York State civil service found a tendency, for example, for rates of pay to vary "according to what the positions are *called*, rather than what the employees do."[6] This may explain the following high-sounding titles for senior account clerk: "confidential investigator," "correspondence censor," "camp and information director," and "accountant and statistician." On the other hand, the committee discovered 110 distinct classes of positions all covered by the title "clerk."[7] No wonder the commission concluded that the titles in effect were serving as "red herrings across the trail" and operating to a large extent "to subvert the application of the Civil Service Law."[8]

The quandary of a conscientious councilman of Philadelphia was facetiously outlined in *Citizen's Business* in the twenties. His problem was to decide whether he should approve or disapprove the request of a department head for a salary increase of $120 for one of his "clerks." Not knowing what the clerk in question did, and finding that there were 284 "clerks" in the city who were receiving twenty different rates of pay, ranging from $720 to $4000, the hypothetical councilman was confronted with an im-

[4] "The Classification Survey of Positions in Industry and Commerce in Baltimore and Cumberland, Maryland: Objectives; Purposes; Ways and Means; Progress; Results," *Proceedings*, 4th Eastern States Regional Conference of the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada (New York: 1932), p. 18.

[5] For a list of the 105 titles of Federal employees doing the work of file and record clerk, and for many similar absurdities, see the report of this commission (1920), pp. 46 ff.

[6] *Report*, Joint Legislative Committee on Classification of Positions in the Civil Service (1932), p. 13.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 24–28.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

possible situation.[9] The diversity of titles which develops under such an uncontrolled situation is found in a succession of reports over the years on many jurisdictions, reaching into current times.[10]

Neither the financial nor the personnel agency can properly perform its functions unless titles and their definitions describe the duties and responsibilities of the various positions and indicate the qualifications necessary to fill them. This need is apparent not only in connection with the problem of pay but also in the matters of selection, placement, promotion, transfer, and training. Both the interest of the government and the interest of the workers dictate some grouping of positions on the basis of functions and responsibilities. This fact underlies the rapid expansion of the classification movement, the general objective of which has been "to lay the foundation for equitable treatment for public employees by the accurate definition, orderly arrangement, and fair evaluation of positions in the public service."[11] It should be pointed out, of course, that the military rank system can likewise produce standardized titles but not necessarily on the basis of duties.

A duties classification is not the same thing as a pay plan. Duties classification may be a vital element upon which a compensation structure is based and administered. But compensation, as we shall see in a succeeding chapter, must also be governed by other factors, such as quality of performance and length of service, as well as by basic economic and social considerations; furthermore, classification serves many uses other than governing pay. The fact that the two are distinct is best illustrated by the fact that compensation can be changed without affecting the classification plan, and classes of positions can be rearranged on a pay schedule without changing the schedule.

II. THE CLASSIFICATION MOVEMENT

The need for a classification of positions by duties and the gearing of salaries thereto was recognized in the Federal service over a hundred years ago. On the insistence of a number of government clerks urging equal pay

[9] Philadelphia Bureau of Municipal Research, *Citizen's Business*, July 13, 1926. As late as 1942, six months prior to completion of a classification study, the Philadelphia Committee of Seventy described municipal titles as "chaotic." The clerical problem had progressed to where there were 291 "clerks" under eighty different rates of pay. This situation was rectified in the plan subsequently adopted. See Edward B. Shils, "Philadelphia Streamlines Personnel Plan," *National Municipal Review*, July, 1943, pp. 369–370. The most recent plan has not been publicized.

[10] For example: Griffenhagen and associates, *Report on Classification and Compensation of Positions in the Service of the Commonwealth of Virginia* (1937), pp. 41–42. Similarly, the illogical array of titles in the municipal service of New York City is still a source of confusion. See Maxwell Lehman, "Why New York City Job System Must Be Overhauled," *Civil Service Leader*, November 9, 1948, p. 13. Reports of this type may be found by the hundreds in the surveys by private consulting firms and by Public Administration Service.

[11] Leonard D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* (New York: 1955), p. 353.

for equal work in 1838, the United States Senate was moved to pass a resolution instructing department heads to prepare a "classification of the clerks . . . in reference to the character of the labor to be performed, the care and responsibility imposed, the qualifications required, and the relative value to the public of the services of each class as compared with the others."[12]

Although this problem frequently presented itself in more or less acute form from 1838 on, Congress did not see fit to take comprehensive action until 1923. As will be pointed out later, classification of positions in the Federal service diverges in several respects from that found in other jurisdictions.

The movement for the occupational classification of public service personnel has been rapidly extended since the first classification plan was adopted by the city of Chicago in 1912. At present, most large cities and about fifteen states have comprehensive job classification plans.[13]

Among the numerous factors which contributed to the origin and development of this important movement, several stand out prominently. The first of these was the adoption of the merit system itself. If positions were to be filled upon the basis of merit, it became necessary to know what constituted the duties of various groups of positions and what qualifications were required. Logically, the merit system itself demanded some form of occupational classification. This factor was linked at the end of the first decade of the century with a general demand for increased governmental efficiency. Reform was in the air, and across the land there was a renewed interest in governmental problems. While Lincoln Steffens and his fellow muckrakers turned the searchlight of publicity on American politics, and reform administrations were winning power in the cities, administrative reform was not neglected. The formation of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research in 1906 was another indication of this reawakened interest in government and administration and signaled the beginning of the so-called efficiency and economy movement.[14]

The classification movement fitted admirably into the wider aims of the efficiency and economy program. It not only was a means to more expert selection and management of personnel but contributed directly to the accomplishment of the broader aims of efficiency and economy. Thus, if

[12] Sen. Res., 25th Cong., 2nd sess., March 5, 1838.

[13] For extensive accounts of the early aspects of the classification movement the reader is referred to *Position Classification in the Public Service*, pp. 7–31; Edwin O. Griffenhagen, "The Origin of the Modern Occupational Classification in Personnel Administration," *Public Personnel Studies*, September, 1924, pp. 184–194, and "Standardization of Public Employments," Parts I and II, *Municipal Research*, Nos. 67 and 76 (1915, 1916); and Fred Telford, "The Classification and Salary Standardization Movement in the Public Service," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May, 1924.

[14] See Chapter 2.

the organization setup was to be rationalized, if lines of authority in the administrative hierarchy were to be clarified, if more direct control was to be exercised over the flow of work, it became necessary first of all to study the duties of the various positions involved and to discover the lines of authority and the relationships existing among them. Moreover, the new principles of centralized financial control also demanded classification if their full possibilities were to be realized. Uniform accounting required a uniform job terminology in place of a hodgepodge of nondescript and conflicting titles.

Thus, each of these movements, in reality parts of a whole, contributed to the development of the other, and jurisdiction after jurisdiction felt their impact. At the same time they were accompanied by the renewal of an old demand on the part of the employees, the demand for equal pay for equal work. Disregard of this principle was the cardinal vice at which the classification movement was directed.

Parallel with the pressure for equal pay for equal work by public employees, especially during and after World War I, management in many large industries was taking up job analysis with increasing enthusiasm. The stimulus here came largely from the desire to systematize and improve factory operations down to the point of specific tasks and steps in an individual worker's job. Job analysis went hand in hand with time and motion study. Although at first looked upon suspiciously by employee unions as a device to get around collective bargaining, job evaluation has gradually come to be widely accepted as offering the most solid ground for common understanding of the jobs for which rates were being set and for job-to-job comparison. It is often less palatable, however, to the craft-type occupational unions than it is to the industrial-type unions, since the former fear occasions under which occupational comparisons would place their particular craft at a disadvantage.

Job analysis in industry, therefore, was first used to increase efficiency and production; secondarily and later its use for standardization and equalization of pay became evident. Thus, job "analysis" led to job "evaluation" or "classification." In government the chronology was generally just the reverse. The first emphasis was on pay, with incidental recognition that defining job classes facilitated recruitment and examination. Only in recent years have other uses of job evaluation and classification—as a vital technique and source of data in organization and procedures improvement, in training, etc.—been stressed in the public service.

Although no full record seems to be available of the number of cities or states that have adopted classification plans, it is safe to assume that the concept has expanded rapidly in the small and medium-sized cities but slowly in the states and counties—following a pattern similar to that of merit system adoption.

The history in the United States Government covers, for the most part, abortive efforts to introduce classification until the Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries reported in 1920 on the deplorable lack of uniformity in titles and pay in the departmental (headquarters) service. Compromise between the recommendations of this joint commission and those of the Bureau of Efficiency culminated in the Classification Act of 1923—one of the great milestones in public personnel legislation. Creating a central Personnel Classification Board, to enforce its provisions in the departmental service, this law clearly established the principles of grouping positions into classes on the basis of their duties and responsibilities and of "equal compensation for equal work, irrespective of sex."

Subsequently its provisions were made applicable to the field service (1928 and 1930), with department heads exercising the authority there, and the functions of the board transferred to the Civil Service Commission (1932). Although a number of depression-born agencies were exempt from the act, most of these set up comparable voluntary plans. The Ramspeck Act of 1940 authorized the President to extend the Classification Act provisions to most other groups of positions not yet covered. During World War II the Civil Service Commission, under the authority of executive orders, tightened its control over standards for classifying field positions. Significant improvements in the pay scales and in other provisions of the Classification Act took place on more than ten different occasions between 1923 and 1955.

The old act was completely replaced by the Classification Act of 1949.[15] This product of the Eighty-first Congress carried out in good measure, with a few notable exceptions, the recommendations of President Truman and the Civil Service Commission on extension of coverage of the act and on fundamental revision of the classification plan and pay structure. For the first time, it made a clear distinction between establishment of job evaluation standards (a task assigned to the Civil Service Commission) and classification of individual positions (a function left to the departments and agencies, subject to the commission's postaudit and power to correct misclassifications). As amended in 1954, the act also eliminates the former occupational "services" by setting up just one schedule of grades called the General Schedule, consisting of eighteen grades.

But the act of 1949 was more than a classification and pay measure. It was, in fact, a major statute governing administrative management of the Federal service. It crystallized the trend toward department responsibility for personnel transactions, with the central personnel agency becoming a standard-setting and reviewing agency. It codified the laws relating to

[15] 63 *U.S. Stat.* 954, October 28, 1949.

employee efficiency evaluation and ordered the commission to make further recommendations on the system. It also ordered the commission to study the problem of additional compensation for hazardous employment and invited the President to make annual recommendations with respect to pay rates. Finally, it provided for a "management improvement plan," under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget, which called for special awards to supervisors (and their subordinates) of units which show outstanding records of economy and efficiency. This latter provision has been superseded by a consolidation of awards legislation in the Incentive Awards section of the Fringe Benefits Act of 1954.[16]

Pay and classification features of the Classification Act do not apply to the field Postal Service, which is governed by separate legislation, or to blue-collar jobs paid prevailing rates set by Federal wage boards.

III. BASIC PRINCIPLES AND USES OF CLASSIFICATION

It is not to be wondered at that conditions in America in general and the nature of our approach to personnel problems in particular should have strongly influenced the character of the duties classification developed in this country. The emphasis, already noted in the discussion of recruitment and selection, upon *expertise*, upon the selection of prior-trained technicians and workers with special skills, strongly influenced the general character of the classification.

Because of this, the point is sometimes overdrawn that classification has developed along quite different lines in the United States from those in the United Kingdom. This is true in the clerical-administrative area, where the British recruit generally qualified individuals, upon the basis of broad educational tests, and then train them to do specialized work. It is accordingly necessary to have only a few broad services—typists and shorthand typists, writing assistants, clerical, executive, and administrative classes—geared into the several stages of the general educational system. For the larger part of the British service, however, including professional and technical positions, postal jobs, and industrial classes, the classifications are about as detailed as they commonly are in American jurisdictions.[17]

Nevertheless, with systems of recruitment and selection that are generally different, a relatively precise type of occupational classification is more characteristic of the United States than of any other country. Positions, of course, may be classified upon a number of bases—according to geographical location, organization unit, and so forth—depending upon the use that is to be made of the classification. But the purpose of a duties

[16] 68 *U.S. Stat.* 1112, September 1, 1954.

[17] For the best description of the British classification systems see *Position Classification in the Public Service*, pp. 20–27.

classification is to aid in the handling of such personnel problems as salary administration and the recruitment process, the determination of entrance qualifications, and the nature of the testing program.[18] The classification, therefore, must be based on those characteristics which render positions similar or dissimilar from the standpoint of these purposes of personnel management. These differentials are relatively narrow and specific in the United States.[19]

Basic to the duties classification are the concepts of *position* and *class*. A position, which may be either occupied or vacant, must be clearly differentiated from the incumbent of the position. It is characterized by certain *duties* and *responsibilities*, which call for the time and attention of some one individual. *Of course, an incumbent's capacities or lack of them may be the reason why his position contains the duties it does.* Nevertheless, duties and responsibilities are the characteristics of positions, which are to be looked upon as the bricks in the classification wall. The personal characteristics of the individual who at the time occupies the position are extraneous, as are the departmental location of the position, the civil service status of the incumbent, the present salary, and so forth. A position involves certain specified duties and responsibilities and to it is assigned a distinguishing and perhaps a conventional title.

If positions are the raw materials of classification, the class is the operating unit. As defined by a technical committee of the Civil Service Assembly, a class is a "group of positions sufficiently alike in respect to their duties and responsibilities to justify common treatment in selection, compensation, and other employment processes, and sufficiently different from positions of other classes to justify different treatment in one or more of these respects. While defined as a group of positions, a class may sometimes consist of but one position where no others of the same kind exist in the service being classified."[20]

[18] See Personnel Classification Board, *Closing Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, p. 135.

[19] It is maintained by advocates of the type of classification used by the British for administrative areas that the American type is too narrow, that it places employees in a strait jacket and too rigidly restricts the lines of promotion. This problem of the degree of refinement to which the classification should be carried is not easily solved by rule. As one expert has pointed out: "If the classification is too refined it will impose a staggering burden on the commission in the form of numerous examinations to establish eligible lists and lead to the charge of poor judgments by bureaucrats. If the classification is too broad . . . it will probably be hailed with joy by those who swear by 'elasticity in administration,' but the commission will find it impossible to choose qualified persons by using the same tests for all positions in the class."—Fred Telford, "The Theory and Practice of Classification," *Proceedings*, 14th Annual Meeting of the Civil Service Assembly (Minneapolis: 1921), p. 26. As in many other connections, it is necessary to find the happy medium. For a vigorous indictment of the American system of classification see Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., *Government by Merit* (New York: 1935), pp. 48–63.

[20] Preliminary Report of Section A on the "Development, Adoption and Administration of Classification and Compensation Plans," *Proceedings*, 20th Annual Meeting of the Civil Service Assembly (Buffalo: 1927), p. 118. This definition is still standard, although in 1951

To summarize, the principal uses and advantages of position classification may be listed as follows:

1. Facilitating other personnel objectives:
   a. It provides a rational criterion for control of pay levels, by making it possible to equate whole *classes* of positions with common salary ranges.
   b. It reduces a variety of occupations and positions to manageable proportions, so that recruitment, qualification requirements, examination, and selection can be made for whole classes of positions at a time.
   c. It defines in objective terms the content of jobs—or what is expected—against which the performance of incumbents—*how well* it is done—can be measured.
   d. It furnishes job information upon which the content of orientation and other in-service training can be based.
   e. Although it does not of itself guarantee a good promotion and placement policy, it supplies a systematic picture of opportunities and position relationships, which is essential to an orderly promotion and placement procedure.
   f. It provides a foundation for common understanding between supervisor and employee as to the job and pay, which facilitates employee-management relations.
2. General aids to an organization:
   a. By use of standard class titles, it establishes uniform job terminology.
   b. It clarifies, by requiring definition and description of duties, the placing of responsibility in each position.
   c. It provides an orderly basis for translating needs for positions into fiscal terms, thus facilitating budgetary procedures.
   d. It provides information on job content that aids in the analysis of organization problems and of procedures, by bringing out points of duplication, inconsistency, and the like, in the work process.
3. Particular values in the public service (the foregoing points apply to all organizations, public or private, whereas two others have special significance in government):
   a. It assures the citizen and taxpayer that there is some logical relationship between expenditures for personal services and the services rendered.
   b. It offers as good a protection as has been found against political or personal preferment in determination of public salaries.

Both of these last points assume that the pay plan is definitely governed by a system of position classification.

IV. DEVELOPMENT AND INSTALLATION OF A CLASSIFICATION PLAN

The central personnel agency has often been charged with entire or partial responsibility for the initial classification of positions, but in many instances some other agency or an outside organization specializing in this

California broadened the meaning to embrace several levels of work with different pay ranges (facilitating movement of personnel among similar jobs without competitive promotion examinations) and in 1955 the Federal Government established use of pay steps above the minimum in recruitment for hard-to-fill occupations.

work has taken the full responsibility. If the task is not undertaken by an outside group, the personnel agency is certainly to be preferred as the classifying unit to any other staff agency, such as the financial authority. The latter has a narrower interest than that of the personnel organization and does not have as wide and as intimate acquaintance with the employees and their duties.

In case the civil service commission or central personnel officer is given the task of making the initial classification, the question arises whether it should call on some outside agency for assistance on the ground that its staff is not qualified to carry on what is recognized as a more or less technical undertaking. This has been done quite frequently in many of the larger jurisdictions, although the personnel agency sometimes employs its own staff or recruits a special staff for this purpose. The sound policy is usually to entrust the work to the local personnel agency, empowering it to call in such assistance as it may need in order to do the work effectively and expeditiously. In moderate-sized jurisdictions, with populations of 100,000 to 500,000, it is frequently necessary to employ only a single outside expert, who can give the regular members of the personnel staff the necessary preliminary training and supervise the conduct of the investigation. So far as the staff members are concerned, such procedure has the advantage of equipping them to develop better standards throughout the whole range of employment procedures and to keep classifications up to date.

Speaking generally, the processes employed in the development of a plan include four basic steps: (1) analyzing and recording the duties and other distinctive characteristics of the positions to be classified (job analysis and description); (2) grouping the positions into classes upon the bases of their similarities; (3) writing such descriptions or specifications for each class of positions as will indicate its character, define its boundaries, and serve as a guide in allocating individual positions to the class and in recruitment and examinations; and (4) installation by allocating individual positions to the classes thus described.[21] Three of these have to do with the setting up of the plan; the fourth, with the initial step in its administration.

Certain preliminary considerations are important in the process. Since the classification plan will be useful only to the extent that it is understood and accepted by management and employees and is kept on a current basis, it is important that all parties have a real share in its development. This calls for careful explanation to department and division heads of the objectives and processes of classification, for meetings with employees of

[21] Personnel Classification Board, *Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, p. 22. See also Fred Telford, *Classification Manual* (privately published, Washington: 1937). This gives a thoroughgoing description of all the individual steps involved in setting up a classification, including instruction sheets, sample definitions, and even a draft of a bill authorizing legal adoption of a plan.

each unit for the same purpose, for bringing in representatives of employee unions in the planning stages, and for opportunities for all to contribute suggestions and criticisms at various stages in the study. In various jurisdictions representative workers' committees have aided in the process.[22] Furthermore, it is necessary that the technicians who conduct the study acquaint themselves with all the organizational and functional information about the governmental entity to be classified as may be derived from such sources as budgets, charts, annual reports, pay rolls, laws, and ordinances.

A. JOB DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

The development of a classification plan, the determination of lines of promotion, the application of the principle of equal pay for equal work, all depend upon the adequacy of the information with respect to individual positions. This information needs to be of three basic sorts: (1) information concerning the duties of the position—the tasks ordinarily assigned to the incumbent; (2) information concerning the responsibilities of the position—the degree of supervision under which the work of the position is performed, the extent to which the exercise of independent judgment is required, and the like; and (3) information concerning the knowledge and skill necessary for adequate performance of the duties of the position.

In seeking this information it is not enough to study the work of the various positions in isolation. No adequate picture of authority or responsibility can be secured without an analysis of the work of the particular organization units in which the positions under review are located, or without comprehension of the relationship of the individual position to other positions and to the whole hierarchy of authority.

This necessary information may be secured by various means and from a number of sources. In the first place, certain basic facts regarding the general organizational setup, the broad lines of authority and similar matters, may be gathered from preliminary study as suggested above, which will at best offer only leads and signposts. The really fundamental data can be secured only by interviewing organization heads, administrators, and supervisors, and by study of the individual positions themselves.

The latter procedure, which is most basic to the classification process, may take several forms. The first and most usual one is to study the position through the employee himself—that is, to ask each employee to fill

[22] During the survey of the Federal departmental service in 1919–1920, committees selected by the employees themselves brought a number of valuable suggestions to the joint commission. For purposes of the 1931–1932 survey in New York State various employee occupational groups nominated representatives, who were in turn officially appointed to advisory committees by the chairman of the joint legislative committee undertaking the project. This committee subsequently commended the work of these advisory bodies (*Report*, Joint Legislative Committee on Classification of Positions in the Civil Service, New York State, pp. 40 f.).

out a questionnaire or duties card, describing his duties and responsibilities. Because of the complexity of the classification task, and in view of considerations of expense and expediency, the questionnaire method of obtaining basic data has been widely followed.

Much could be written on the various forms of questionnaire that have been tried out in various jurisdictions. The earlier forms tended to be of the open-end type, giving general instructions on what was to be included and asking for a narrative description of each task, showing the percentage of time spent on each. Later there was a trend toward more detailed questionnaires, which listed numerous items to be checked or questions to be answered, all of them intended to assure more concrete and uniform responses, not tinted by any particular employee's literary skill. The need to keep a questionnaire of the check-list type within manageable proportions naturally led to separate, specialized questionnaires for individual occupations. Thus, a draftsman would fill out a different form from that of a file clerk, a janitor a different form from that of a mine inspector. Individual occupation questionnaires have been used frequently over a period of years in many places, but their usefulness in initial surveys is largely confined to occupations which are found in almost any organization, such as typists and stenographers, or to relatively homogeneous or unifunctional organizations, such as a police department or a fire department, where there is no great variety of occupations. Otherwise the specialized questionnaires require too much preliminary analysis of the positions to be covered if they are to be relevant and are to go to the right employees. Hence, it is common to find specialized questionnaires used for part of a survey and more general forms for the rest of it. Whatever their form, job analysis questionnaires must attempt to elicit information on the nature of the work, the knowledge required to do it, its complexity, how it is carried out, what supervision is exercised by others over it, and what responsibility for the work of others is inherent in the position.[23]

The usual approach in use of a questionnaire in initial surveys is to have each completed form reviewed by the supervisor of the employee who prepared it and, in turn, by the division or bureau chief. This serves the purpose of correcting misstatements or overstatements and providing supplementary information that the incumbent of the job may not have explained. However, even with this check some experts argue that the questionnaire yields results of dubious value if what is intended is an unbiased, true picture of a position.[24] They point out not only that different employees

[23] For a more complete discussion of questionnaire forms and uses and an excellent bibliography on the subject, see *Position Classification in the Public Service*, pp. 169–181.

[24] Scott, Clothier, and Spriegel say of this method that such "questionnaires, although they seem at first to offer the simplest and least expensive method of procuring the facts, usually yield data which are misleading and that involve such careful reanalysis and study that the expense saved in procuring them is more than lost in interpreting them."—*Personnel Management* (New York: 1954), p. 148.

will use different terms to express the same thing but that some will be taciturn, some prolix, some self-deprecatory, and some inclined to exaggerate. Hence it has been urged that basic descriptions be prepared only by skilled job analysts following desk audits and interviews with employees and supervisors, with differences in interpretation or understanding worked out in three-cornered discussion. This, in turn, is questioned on the ground that it is too time-consuming and expensive.[25] Furthermore, the questionnaire method probably provides the best opportunity for each employee and supervisor to participate in the process of job analysis and to recognize that he has had an active part.

As in many administrative problems, what is apparently a dilemma can usually be met by a combination of two alternative procedures. The questionnaire can be used for the basic data. Following preliminary review of this material, classification technicians can then round out the picture by spot-check interviews, particularly where more than one job of a kind is found. This is not a perfect solution for one-of-a-kind positions, but at least those with the most inadequate questionnaire responses could be singled out for subsequent desk audit. In the case of multiple jobs of a kind—such as stenographers in a pool, card-punch operators, patrolmen, claims examiners, file clerks in a large file room—a device that has been found useful is to invite the employees whose questionnaires have been reviewed to select one or two of their number to represent them in the interview with the job analyst. This procedure, supplemented by discussion with the supervisor, has the advantages of securing the necessary first-hand information, getting the benefits of numerous interviews out of one, and giving employees as full an opportunity to participate as is consistent with an economical survey.

One principle which deserves stress in the development of a classification plan, as in many other phases of personnel management, is that the formulation should be a coöperative effort, with wide participation by the people most affected—the supervisory officers and the employees. Apart from an actual change of salary rates there is nothing that comes closer home to both groups than the classification of their positions. Stimulating their interest and enlisting their coöperation in the first stage—the job description and analysis—is therefore very important.

B. ARRANGING POSITIONS INTO CLASSES

When the job analyses and descriptions have been completed and the classifying agency is thus equipped with a blueprint of each position, the stage is set for the actual arrangement of positions into classes. Any classification is the systematic arrangement of items into groups upon the basis

[25] See Griffenhagen, *Report on Classification and Compensation of Positions in the Service of the Commonwealth of Virginia*, p. 243; and Lewis Meriam, *Public Personnel Problems* (Washington: 1938), pp. 20 ff.

of common or distinguishing factors, to the end that the mind may more readily grasp what would otherwise be an anarchy of detail. As applied to position classification, the aim is to arrange the variety of individual positions into groups of various sorts upon the basis of similarities and dissimilarities; to distribute positions into classes, and classes into such occupational groups as are necessary for purposes of easy use and reference.

A "class," as previously defined, is a group of positions sufficiently alike in respect to their duties and responsibilities to justify common treatment in the various employment processes. Thus, all positions the duties of which are, "under general direction, to stand watch at a public bathing-beach of a state park to prevent drowning and other accidents" are in the lifeguard class in one of the state classification plans. The class is the basic unit, the *sine qua non* of modern classification. The decision whether or not individual positions are in fact "sufficiently similar" to be grouped together in a class is the very essence of classification.

Individual job descriptions are tentatively distributed according to the principle of "like to like, giving due attention to both similarities and dissimilarities." This means first grouping those of like occupation together (accountants, typists, engineers, and the like) and then breaking each down into levels or zones of difficulty, namely, classes. The information on the questionnaires, supplemented by interviews, provides the basis upon which the tentative groupings can be made.

Such a distribution will usually result in the establishment of several hundred classes, perhaps four or five hundred in a moderate-sized city. The original classification of the Federal departmental employees in Washington, covering some 108,000 individuals and 50,000 different positions, resulted in 1762 classes. As indicated in an earlier chapter, the number of classes in the Federal Government now approximates 10,000 for the approximately 1,000,000 positions subject to the Classification Act. Fewer than 500 classes are found in the Michigan classification system, and Alabama has less than 600. Most of the state plans provide for larger numbers of classes, however. Connecticut and Minnesota have in the neighborhood of 800, while in New York, California, and New Jersey the system approximates or exceeds 2000 classes. The number of classes varies, of course, with the coverage of the plan, the nature of the jurisdiction, and the refinement of the plan. Nevertheless, these figures give some indication of the saving of time and energy on the part of the personnel agency when a duties classification is adopted. Instead of dealing with thousands of individual positions, the personnel staff is confronted with a few hundred fairly distinct and clearly specified classes.

The process of classification is one that requires discrimination and judgment. It is a far cry from any mechanical procedure. Persons unfamiliar with the problems involved would be surprised both by the variety

of governmental positions and by the difficulty of determining likenesses and differences among them. Many borderline cases invariably appear. The question will arise, for example, whether a telephone operator who spends one-third of her time on routine typing should be classed as an operator or as a clerk, or whether a special clerk-operator class should be formed. Generally speaking, the effort should be made to have as limited a number of classes as is consistent with the purposes for which the classification is designed.

Although borderline cases of this sort are not in any sense unusual, they can ordinarily be classified without serious difficulty. Greater difficulties are usually involved in discovering and evaluating the factors that distinguish a position from, or render it similar to, others in the same occupational field. Most activities are represented in the public service in various degrees of difficulty and responsibility, and at this point the discrimination and judgment of the classifier are taxed to the utmost. What factors, for example, cause a position to be classed as assistant biologist rather than as biologist of higher class? As a basis for these determinations, careful analyses have to be made of the kind and degree of supervision from above, of the kind and degree of supervision exercised over others, of other responsibilities, such as the need for independent judgment, and of the relative difficulty and importance of the work.

These so-called "allocation factors" or "classification factors" are the stock in trade of the job evaluator's technique. In attempting to relate a position to other positions or to a previously established class of positions, he must consider such matters as knowledge and skills required to perform the work, decisions that have to be made, variety and scope of the work, intricacy, status of the work when presented to the employee, latitude in determining tasks and priorities, originality required, control by others, consequences of actions taken, responsibility for planning, responsibility for work of others, and often various other elements or subelements. The permutations and combinations that are possible and that add to the complexity of the classifier's task, demanding the utmost in analytical logic, are almost infinite.

The usual approach to this process in the public service is to rely heavily on abstractions and on subjective judgment. In industry, where factory and office jobs have been peculiarly susceptible to quantitative measurement, personnel men have been more enamored of the mechanical, mathematical type of techniques. Numerical weights are often assigned, for example, to given degrees of each particular job element, all of which may be added up, averaged, or what not, to arrive at an overall "weight" for the job. The class itself then would be largely defined in terms of a range of figures. When total job weights fall in that range, they are in that class. This is an oversimplification of many well-thought-out job evaluation plans that are

peculiarly useful when applied to manual work.[26] But great care must be exercised in accepting them as precise measuring tools merely because they use mathematical terms which sound very scientific. More often than not the basic evaluation must still rest on certain judgments of intangibles, certain arbitrary estimations of value and difficulty. The evaluation of positions is not an exact science. It is an orderly application of system and logic to what is otherwise chaos and confusion. It need not be made to appear precise in order to be defended.

The processes involved in the actual classification must be checked at every point by further excursions into the offices to secure additional information on borderline cases and by first-hand observations of the work of employees at their benches or desks.

What these steps so far achieve is a tentative set of classes.

C. THE PREPARATION OF THE CLASS SPECIFICATIONS

After the duties statements have been analyzed and the tentative classes established, the task of writing the class specifications is taken up. This calls for the capacity to generalize from a considerable number of details. The objectives are to define a class in such a way as to distinguish it clearly from every other class and to provide a clear and sufficient guide for the allocation of positions to classes.

A class specification is usually composed of at least four parts: (1) the class title; (2) a definition of the duties and responsibilities covered; (3) a statement of typical tasks or examples of the work performed in the positions in the class; and (4) the statement of minimum and desirable qualifications necessary to perform the work. The class title is a brief, descrip-

[26] Some of the best discussions of industrial job evaluation are in the following: for the best all-round treatment see U.S. Employment Service, *Industrial Job Evaluation Systems*, with annotated bibliography (Washington: October, 1947); for general reference purposes see Charles W. Lytle, *Job Evaluation Methods*, 2nd ed. (New York: 1954); John A. Patton and Reynold S. Smith, *Job Evaluation* (Chicago: 1949); Jay L. Otis and Richard H. Leukart, *Job Evaluation: A Basis for Sound Wage Administration*, 2nd ed. (New York: 1954); and John W. Riegel's studies, *Wage Determination* (Ann Arbor: 1937) and *Salary Determination* (Ann Arbor: 1940). Emphasis on white-collar jobs is found in Life Office Management Association Clerical Study Committee, *Clerical Salary Determination* (New York: 1948). An example of the mathematical approach is found in Eugene J. Benge, Samuel L. H. Burk, and Edward N. Hay, *Manual of Job Evaluation* (New York: 1941). One of the best critiques of "point rating" and "arithmetical ranking" systems is Morris S. Viteles, "A Psychologist Looks at Job Evaluation," *Personnel*, February, 1941, pp. 165–176. A good primer for the trades is William Gomberg, *A Labor Union Manual on Job Evaluation* (Chicago: 1947). Ralph W. Ells describes a new system of rules and definitions for a middle-of-the-road approach to job evaluation in *The Basic Abilities System of Job Evaluation*, Wisconsin Commerce Reports, Vol. III, No. 2, University of Wisconsin (Madison: 1951). The mechanics are considerably simplified compared to the more quantitative methods. The long and assiduously prepared descriptions of duties and responsibilities found in the job ranking and classification methods are also avoided and replaced with analyses of abilities and knowledges required, defined as skills or semi-skills.

tive name applied to the class and to all the positions within it, such as *junior audit clerk*. The chief purpose of class titles is to provide a common job language which can be employed for all personnel purposes by all agencies involved. The definition of duties and responsibilities is intended not only to describe the "preponderant and characteristic" duties of positions in the class but also to define the boundaries of the class so that it can be clearly distinguished from other classes. Not all specifications succeed in meeting this requirement. Examples of work serve to clarify the nature of the duties covered. They are usually concrete and specific illustrations. Finally, the statement of minimum qualifications sets up the lowest hurdles that a person must be able to clear in order to qualify at all for positions in the class. Normally these should be confined to the skills and knowledge necessary, leaving somewhat flexible the fixing of the education or experience requirements which evidence those abilities. These are drawn up without regard to any special abilities or disabilities possessed by the present incumbents.

Such a class specification is tentatively arrived at by analysis and then synthesis of the positions which appear to be similar enough to be classed together. This tedious process requires great skill and objectivity to seek out the significant "allocation factors" and to so combine them that they form a logical progression of classes. Often it leads to revision of the original rough grouping of classes.

There is considerable discussion among the technicians as to the proper uses and form of the class specification. The traditional thinking has been that it should be an all-purpose tool: a guide to psychometricians in the preparation of tests; an official source of information for the legislative body, the employees in the jurisdiction, and the general public; a basic outline for in-service training activities; and a measuring rod or standard for the use of classifiers who have to evaluate positions in order to determine if they fall within the class. In recent years some classification analysts have suggested that the specification should be recognized as primarily their tool, that the other uses are more illusory than real, and that a standard that provides more precision should therefore be employed.[27] Thus, some have urged the use of charts which present each factor in a class on a scale, facilitating the analytical process of the classifier when he is checking a specific job against the class definition. Actually this approach is not very different from that in common use in private industry. Here we find the class standard definitely taking a more mechanical form, with mathematical weights often assigned to factors present in varying degrees, so that the process of evaluating an individual position becomes partly

[27] See, for example, Frank J. Waldenfels, "The Class Specification on Trial," and Donald McGinnis, "Classifying by the Evaluation Chart," both in *Personnel Administration*, April, 1946.

arithmetical. This tendency is more noticeable in industry because of the great emphasis on factory and office jobs, which lend themselves especially to quantitative measurement.[28]

D. THE INSTALLATION OF THE CLASSIFICATION PLAN

Once the duties classes have been established, the class specifications prepared, the various classes arranged into groups and series for purposes of convenience, and the whole plan set down on paper, the next steps are those of installation and administration. Here are involved: (1) adoption of the plan; (2) determination of the agency to administer the plan; (3) promulgation of the class specifications; (4) initial allocation of positions to classes; (5) adoption of formal rules for the administration of the classification; (6) provision for, and hearing of, appeals on allocations.

Several of these aspects require scant comment. The classification may be adopted by either administrative or legislative action. The only difficulty with administrative adoption is that among the most important employment matters is the pay policy, which is usually controlled by the legislature. Unless the appropriating body has adopted the classification plan, it may or may not follow the standardized salary scheme which fits into the plan. Under ordinary circumstances, therefore, the situation in respect to classification is unsatisfactory until the plan is adopted by statute or ordinance, indicating that the legislative body is willing to make use of the classes set up and hold to the salary rates recommended.

At the time of the adoption of the plan it is necessary to decide upon the agency of administration. The central personnel agency is the logical one for this purpose. It is already charged with the functions of recruitment, certification, and the like, and occasionally with that of recommending wage rates, matters most directly affected by classification. In the majority of jurisdictions in the United States in which a duties classification has been adopted, the personnel agency is, in fact, charged with its administration. There are, of course, some exceptions to this policy.

It has been maintained that, once a good classification plan has been developed, the allocation of positions to the designated classes can be left entirely to the departments. This is a sound assumption, as the experience of the Federal Government has illustrated, only if the action of departmental officers is subjected to standards and check by the central agency in the interest of uniformity throughout the service and if each line department has a professional personnel staff or officer with whom the central agency may coöperate. This situation is found today mainly in the Federal Government, where the Civil Service Commission and the personnel directors are working more and more as a team. Under the act of 1949 the

[28] See discussions and examples in the works cited in footnote 26 above.

commission's authority is concentrated on setting standards and on post-auditing classifications. This points the way to a development that must ultimately take place in all large-scale jurisdictions, namely, that the operating agency shall carry out personnel operations, following standards and procedures set down by the central personnel agency, these to be established in consultation with line executives. In such circumstances the problems of maintaining uniformity and bringing about standardization will abate, without destroying operating speed and flexibility.

Final postaudit authority, however, must be lodged in a single agency, which may also serve as an appeals body to which an employee may turn in case of dissatisfaction with the classification of his position.

One point worth stressing in the otherwise routine step of first promulgating the class specifications is the necessity for issuing a tentative set of specifications for criticism by both top management and employees. As indicated earlier, it is important for the whole development of a plan to be a coöperative affair, since its future effectiveness depends critically on its being understood and accepted in the organization. This is one of the points in the process at which participation can be encouraged. The give-and-take in full-fledged hearings and discussion on criticisms of the proposed specifications will serve as much as anything to impress all parties with the complexity of the problem, with the desirability of compromise at proper points, and with the continuing need for strict objectivity and impartiality in application of the plan. Such discussion can best take place *before* an announcement of the list of individual position allocations to each class, thereby focusing attention in the first instance on the general guide rather than on where John Doe's position falls.

Sound administration requires also the provision of facilities for hearing appeals and grievances concerning allocations or other aspects of the classification, whether the complaints come from departments or from individual employees. As was pointed out above, few personnel matters more seriously affect the individual worker than his classification. It is imperative, therefore, that he be given an opportunity to be heard if he feels that his work has been improperly classified. This not only is a means of enhancing employee coöperation but may also serve to bring to light mistakes in classification which might otherwise long remain unnoticed.

Although most jurisdictions make some provision for appeals on classification, the degree of formality in the specified procedures varies widely. In the vast majority of cases, few or no formal procedures are followed.

Finally, even though the classification plan has been adopted through legislative action, there will still remain the necessity for detailed rules of administration to supplement the provisions of the law. These should de adopted at the outset by the agency charged with administration anb given proper publicity so that all persons affected may be acquainted with

them. A committee of the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada has prepared a model set of rules, which may be adopted by any jurisdiction, subject to such modifications as local conditions may dictate.[29] These rules cover the following points: (1) definition of terms; (2) interpretation and effect of class specifications; (3) official copy of the classification plan; (4) installation of the classification plan; (5) allocation of positions to classes during the continued administration of the plan; and (6) amendment of the classes and class specifications.

V. CONTINUOUS ADMINISTRATION OF CLASSIFICATION

So far we have been talking about the various steps and techniques involved in the development and installation of position classification in government offices where no plan had existed. Of equal importance is what is done on a continuous basis after that. *Some of the most serious classification problems, from the standpoint of administration, have to do with keeping the classification up to date and abreast of changes in the service.* Administration is a continuous process, and constant effort is required to keep even the best classification plan serviceable. Because of changes in personnel, in governmental functions, and in the structure of the public service, no sooner is a classification plan adopted than its revision and adaptation must be undertaken. We know well that the public service itself is not static, nor are the personalities of those who are appointed to operate and direct it. A road engineer who was once asked how soon repair crews should be set to work on new highways, replied, "The day they are open to the public." So it is with a duties classification. As soon as it is installed, revision is called for.

Although the various aspects of administration cannot be treated in detail within the scope of a single chapter, a few of them warrant some comment. At the outset it should be emphasized that successful administration depends upon close coöperation between the operating departments and the personnel agency. The maintenance of a current record of changes in the character of positions, occurring through either the creation of new positions, the reassignment of duties within an organization unit, or the assumption of increased responsibility by an incumbent, depends in the first instance upon the operating authorities' awareness of the changes and their promptness in reporting them to the classification agency. It is therefore essential that the rules for administration specify that no substantial change in the duties or responsibilities of existing positions shall be made, or new positions created, without notification to the classifying authority, whether within or outside the operating department.

[29] See Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, *Report of Technical Committee on Rules for the Installation and Administration of Classification and Compensation Plans.*

Logically, the supervisors and foremen occupy the best observation posts for perceiving changes in the duties performed by their subordinates and for initiating moves looking toward the reclassification of one or more positions. For this reason supervisors should be given some training in the elements of classification—not that they should necessarily be competent to classify, but only that they should discover and report the need for action.

In spite of the most conscientious efforts to maintain the classification through these means, unreported changes are almost certain to occur. Because of this, periodic audits or resurveys are essential to keep the classification in tune with the facts of the situation. Indeed, the accepted policies of some jurisdictions call for a continuous reclassification survey. In Detroit, for example, the civil service commission attempts to survey and reclassify one-fifth of the positions in the Detroit service each year, so that all the positions are reclassified every five years. The central and regional offices of the U.S. Civil Service Commission conduct many spot-check surveys periodically for postaudit purposes.

Still other approaches to keeping up with duties changes are found in various jurisdictions. In the Federal service, for example, there is a widespread practice of checking on the classification every time the incumbent of a position changes. This is, in effect, a check to see whether the duties about to be assigned are actually the same as those which influenced the current allocation. If not, the position is redescribed and reëvaluated to see if it still falls in the same class. This is an opportune time to effect corrections without jeopardy to employees already carrying out the duties.

Then, of course, every *new* position must be studied and classified. Operating heads must think through the position thoroughly, in order that its duties and responsibilities may be clearly enough developed for evaluation purposes, before assignment of an incumbent can take place.

By far the most satisfactory method for keeping classifications current is the periodic survey or audit, mentioned above; only under such a procedure can the interrelationship of all jobs in a given organizational unit be studied all at once, with the least duplication of effort and with the maximum yield of job information. This procedure is fortunately possible in combination with the others that have been presented.

Whatever the method, the necessity to keep up with the dynamics of an organization is the point on which many classification plans go awry. The budgetary approach to "positions," for example, often leads to using for recruitment and pay purposes a position authorized many years earlier for quite a different purpose than currently contemplated—making perhaps the title, the class, and the qualifications required inappropriate to the current need. This happens because executives overlook the evolution that takes place in job duties and fail to reread an initial description of the

job before saying, as they scan a list of titles, "We should fill this position right away." Once a classification plan is adopted, it is pointless to do anything less than provide for continuous, painstaking maintenance on a current basis, else positions, once different, that have actually become similar to each other remain in different classes, and some cognates that have become quite different continue in the same class. Such a program often seems expensive. The United States Government, for example, where jobs are subject to the Classification Act, probably averages one classifier for every three to five hundred employees. But to stint too much on this *out-of-pocket* cost may create still higher hidden costs growing out of lowered morale, poor production, delayed operating programs, excessive pay for simple work, and low pay for responsible work (resulting in poorly qualified executives and professional men)—all normal concomitants of inadequate, hasty, or out-of-date classification.

Most job analysis occurs in this day-to-day continuous application of classification to new or changed positions. Most of the position classifiers in the public service—particularly those in the Federal Government—have had no experience in developing or installing a classification system. They have only worked on keeping what exists in line with a previously established plan. Nevertheless, the techniques of position analysis and comparison, the use of "allocation factors," the reasoning and judgment and weighting involved in the initial evaluation, are necessarily applicable to new positions, to resurveys, and to reappraisals. *Hence everything that has been said in this respect under "Arranging Positions into Classes" applies to the long-range, continuing task.* There are some special problems, however, of particular concern to the classifier who is keeping job allocations up to date, such as evaluating positions that have duties of varying class ("mixed positions") and positions that vary in importance with different seasons or periods ("cyclic positions"), maintaining continuous understanding of classification objectives and methods on the part of employees and supervisors, and protecting the integrity of the classification plan.[30]

Discussion of continuous administration should not be concluded without recognition of one other important point—the need to keep the plan itself current. The class specifications themselves are not necessarily timeless standards. They are susceptible to change because of technological changes, because of changes in occupations themselves (in knowledge required, scope of subject, professionalization, machines used, or the like), and because of changes in the nature and scope of public functions, to say nothing of change simply because of a better understanding or keener evaluation of the field of work. Thus, the plan—the body of class definitions—itself evolves. The importance of this point is too frequently overlooked.

[30] The most complete discussion of these and related problems appears in *Position Classification in the Public Service*, particularly pp. 131–141 and 285–335.

Some plans have persisted for several decades with few or no changes. The basic structure of the former Federal plan continued for over a quarter of a century. Everything that has been said regarding the initial development of the plan—including participation of line management and employee groups—applies with equal force to keeping it fresh and realistic.

VI. JOB STANDARDIZATION AND CLASSIFICATION

As previously stated, unlike the emphasis in the classification movement, one major purpose of job analysis in private industry has been to increase production. Thus, it has often involved careful and painstaking time and motion studies. There have been other and important by-products, some of which have also been accepted as objectives of the classification movement in public employment. But the public classification movement has concerned itself but little with job standardization in this sense or with the development of unit standards of output. The possibility of utilizing such units as a means of improving the character of the service is beginning to be recognized in various services with the application of standards of performance.[31] Although some of the earlier advocates of time and motion studies carried standardization and routinization too far and gained thereby the opposition of organized labor, public personnel administration can profit by some use of the techniques of job standardization, without minute time and motion studies.

This involves going a step farther than the *what* of a position and includes the *how* and *how much*. It would require competent technicians who are trained to analyze positions with respect to optimum methods, work units and norms of output, physical and mental requirements, fatigue, and the like. Enlightened employers have sought the coöperation of workers in setting standards on the basis of such studies, to the advantage of all concerned. This is a phase of management that deserves more systematic attention than it has received in public circles.

A very large number of public positions lend themselves to standardization of this sort. For instance, the output of typists and stenographers, of office machine operators and file clerks, is being measured in many private concerns and governmental units; certain aspects of the work of investigators and inspectors lend themselves to measurement in numerical terms; even supervisory positions can be approached in terms of the numbers supervised, the annual expenditures under their control, and similar numerical indexes.

SUMMARY

The "position concept," evidenced in public service classification plans, is a relatively modern idea which has influenced markedly the whole ap-

[31] See Chapter 13, "Evaluation and Incentives."

proach to personnel administration. However, duties classification, for all of its significant impact, still is not a precise instrument and requires continuous scrutiny to eliminate flaws in the technique.

The major steps in development and installation of a classification plan have, over the years, become widely accepted and standardized, though many variations are possible in specific processes. Many jurisdictions overlook the importance, however, of continuous checking on job duties and evaluations to keep classifications up to date.

The principal difficulties encountered by classification stem from its lack of precision. This has tempted many technicians, particularly in industry, to seek comfort in systems which rely heavily on mathematical weighting and scoring to compare job with job or job with class. But no one has yet been able to eliminate the need for subjective judgment—discriminating, broad-gauged, logical judgment, but, nevertheless, human, fallible judgment—in arriving at reasonable, equitable classifications. No classification plan is operated without some misunderstandings and disagreements among employees, operating supervisors, and job evaluation specialists. Where a plan is operated most successfully there is likely to be considerable common understanding and participation among all these parties to the process. This calls for common training in aims and methods; it also points up the usefulness of advisory and appellate boards made up not only of classification technicians but of workers and leaders in the occupation in question. "Ivory tower" classification, keeping it a mystery for an anointed few, cannot win the acceptance necessary to impartial, honest job analysis and evaluation.

The many advantages of a uniform job language are fairly obvious. It is of service to operating officials in managing their departments; it provides a common means of communication between administrators and the personnel division; it is of incalculable value to the appropriating body and to the budget and accounting offices in controlling expenditures for personal services; finally, it is a necessity to the personnel agency if the various aspects of personnel management are to be effectively prosecuted.

By its very nature, language is the outgrowth of accepted conventional understandings. To bring such understandings about is a fundamental task of the classification force. It must select terms, define and interpret them, and then see to it that they mean the same thing to all who have occasion to speak the language, from employees to executives. This task is greatly complicated by the fact that in most systems descriptive titles consist of words and phrases taken from the common vocabulary but having many connotations. For this reason, the Federal service has eliminated "junior" and "senior" in class titles. For the classifier, all terms are to a degree symbols to be carefully defined and the definitions made acceptable. The classifiers in various Federal establishments in Washington and in

other centers meet frequently for the purpose of bringing about a common understanding and a common practice. If there is to be equal pay for equal work, if the manifold activities of a personnel division are to be handled intelligently and justly throughout a given unit of government, the problem of having all immediately concerned talk the same language and mean the same thing when discussing jobs and their relations to one another can be solved only through broad coöperative efforts and intelligent sustained leadership.

A duties classification makes it possible for the personnel agency to apply and administer the merit system. In its absence the tasks of mass recruitment and selection are all but impossible of satisfactory accomplishment. No personnel agency can deal effectively with thousands of individual positions, nor can sound tests be devised or placements made without comprehensive knowledge of the duties of the positions involved. Moreover, by arrangement of classes in series and by clarifying lines of promotion, the cause of a career service is advanced.

The process of classification is also instrumental in revealing organizational defects and inadequacies in the flow of work and thus is an important means for improving operating management. Finally, the classification is fundamentally important in the development of a sound compensation plan and for purposes of financial administration generally. Compensation may be a powerful incentive, but unless salaries are standardized upon the basis of an equitable classification plan, the wage policy may be a source of continuous and deep-seated dissatisfaction.

This is not to say that there is no place in a public jurisdiction for the "rank concept," but its special uses are discussed fully in the preceding chapter.

10

Compensation

> **A fair day's wages for a fair day's work: It is as just a demand as governed men ever made of governing.**
>
> **—*Thomas Carlyle*[1]**

In no phase of personnel administration is the possibility for misunderstanding and conflict greater than in that of compensation. This generalization applies with equal force to private and to public employment. In the latter case the citizens are the employers and, as taxpayers, have come to insist on an economy plank in every platform, in every campaign, irrespective of party. The administrator finds himself, therefore, confronted with conflicting pressures, one from the public servants desirous of a liberal wage policy, and one from the taxpayers eager to have running expenses reduced. Of course, the problem is not even that simple. Taxpayers want economy but they also want public services. Economy of program, the reduction of activities to their *bare essentials*, is one thing; an attempt to secure a wide variety of public services *cheaply* is something else. Taxpayers *should* want the kind of pay policy and levels that will secure and retain an able staff, public employees who can give the brand of service the citizen wants. To harmonize the interests of all groups and to retain their confidence and support is a challenge to the constructive ability of both legislator and administrator.

In the first place, payments for personal service constitute the largest single item in the operating budgets of state and local governments. In fact, this item was estimated to amount to 63 percent of the total operating budgets of all governmental units in the United States in 1926, and, apart from the Federal situation due to war costs, debt retirement, and veterans' benefits, there is little reason to believe that the proportion is any smaller today.[2] It is little wonder that every economy wave produces widespread

[1] *Past and Present*, Vol. I (1843).

[2] Mosher and Polah, "Extent, Costs and Significance of Public Employment in the United States," *National Municipal Review*, January, 1932, pp. 51–75. In determining operating budgets, debt service and capital expenditures of all sorts were excluded.

clamor for salary and wage reductions. The Bureau of the Census has estimated that there were, in October, 1954, approximately 7,233,000 public employees in the United States, exclusive of persons hired by private contractors. These employees received in payment for services over $23,900,000,000 in 1954.[3] Under such circumstances, not only is the interest of the taxpayer direct, but his short-time interest may become controlling.

There is little need to emphasize the concern of the civil servant with compensation. His annual earnings determine to a large extent his mode of living. For this reason the pay plan, if poorly or inequitably conceived, may be as productive of low morale and decreased efficiency as almost any other personnel policy.

In many American jurisdictions salary rates are frequently fixed by tradition or upon the basis of favoritism and political pressure. A principal influence in favor of rationalized pay scales in state services has been the merit system standards set by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for social security and other state programs supported in part by Federal funds. The failure to deal intelligently with this question more generally and earlier is explicable upon a number of grounds. At the forefront may be placed the influence of the separation of powers, leading to divided responsibility between the legislative and executive branches of government. Upon this rock more than one pay plan has come to grief. Also, political influences favorable to particular employees and well-organized pressure groups, as well as the inherent difficulties of the problems involved, have combined to bring about a chaotic wage situation in the smaller cities and in many states—and, to a considerable extent, in the Federal service.

The problem of compensation may be divided into two general parts: (1) that having to do with the basic levels of pay and fundamental pay policy, embracing such considerations as minimum and maximum limits of an overall pay schedule and the influence of various economic factors; and (2) that concerned with the specific construction and standardization of pay schedules and the administration of pay scales within an established schedule. The first of these phases of the subject is discussed in the first two sections of this chapter; the second receives attention in the remaining sections.

I. THE GENERAL LEVEL OF WAGES IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE

The cartoonists have so long portrayed the public servant as a nonproductive parasite living on the efforts of others, or as a tax-eater, overpaid and underworked, that a belief that civil servants are a highly paid group has at times taken root in the popular mind. The truth is far from that. Although the situation continually improves, in many jurisdictions public

[3] Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Government Employment: 1954* (Washington: 1955). The pay-roll figure covers the twelve-month period ending with October, 1954.

servants are paid relatively low wages. In 1954 the average annual compensation of all employees in state and local governments was estimated to be about $3670 a year.[4] In view of the substantial salaries in the larger jurisdictions, such as New York, California, and New York City, there must be many very low rates that keep this average down.

Data respecting the rates of remuneration for two of the more highly specialized and more hazardous public occupations, those of patrolman and fireman, show that municipalities have become more liberal paymasters. Scales of pay for these two types of position have been widely standardized. Although precise median or average salaries for patrolman and fireman are not available for recent years, a glance at tables of representative pay ranges published by the *Municipal Year Book* suggests a clustering of salaries around certain rate areas. Allowing for many exceptions either way, most moderate-sized municipalities appear to start their men in these two commonly equated occupations at anywhere from about $3400 to $4200 a year, with maximum rates for the entrance class normally ranging from approximately $3800 to $4600 per year.[5] These rates are considerably higher than they were ten years earlier. In the Federal service, salaries are probably somewhat higher than the public average.

TABLE 5. Average Salaries for Federal Employees, 1954

	Mean[a]	Median[b]
All employees in executive branch (continental U.S.A.) (including the General Accounting Office and the Government Printing Office)	$4155	$3910
Wage-board employees (prevailing hourly rates)	$4118	$4075
Postal employees	$3956	$4070
Classification Act employees (about one million)	$4221	$3655
Miscellaneous (executive pay act, statutory salaries, etc.)	$5070	$4240

[a] Arithmetic average.

[b] Mid-point salary (half of employees above; half below). The median provides a fairer comparison among these salary groups, because in using the mean the atypical salaries at the highest or lowest levels influence this average out of proportion to the numbers of workers who get them. Thus, in this instance the bulk of wage-board employees and of postal employees, as shown by the medians, are really better paid than the bulk of Classification Act employees, even though the means for these first two groups are lower.

SOURCE: Data from Federal Employment Statistics Office, U.S. Civil Service Commission, as of June 30, 1954. These averages obviously do not reflect the 1955 increases in salary scales.

Data on average pay should not be read without considering the distribution of employees among broad salary groups. It goes without saying that the vast majority of public employees are in the low- or moderate-

[4] Based on $306 per month average cited in *ibid.*

[5] *Municipal Year Book, 1955*, pp. 150–152.

income groups. Well over half of public employees in the respective groups are paid at rates below the averages cited.

Another characteristic of the government wage structure, particularly in respect to the Federal service, is the tendency for public wage levels to be somewhat above those prevailing outside so far as the lower brackets are concerned, and lower for professional and executive employment. Thus, salaries and wages in the public service are confined within narrower limits than those outside. The most serious aspect of this compression of pay scales is the lag in executive salaries in government as compared with those in industry.[6]

Following World War I, the money earnings of public employees steadily increased until checked by the depression. The trend of money wages has little significance, however, unless such factors as the cost of living (purchasing power of money) and general increases in the relative productivity of the country are taken into account.

The first Hoover Commission showed how even the most favorably paid public employees have not always found their income keeping pace with living costs,[7] in spite of the fact that a number of general increases for Federal employees under the Classification Act and postal employees were voted after World War II. Only in the period 1933–1935 were salaries reduced, by a series of descending percentage cuts ending in 1935 with restoration of the earlier scale.

The available statistics covering average annual pay in municipalities in the United States reveal a similar tendency for public salary rates to lag behind increases in the cost of living.

Although wage data for public jurisdictions in the United States, with the exception of the Federal Government, are spotty and difficult to assemble, several conclusions may be drawn at this point: (1) The principle of equal pay for equal work, although accorded lip service, is still not recognized in practice in many but the larger public jurisdictions; (2) there is no general or basic pay policy worthy of the name in the smaller jurisdictions; (3) the general level of salaries in the public service, though greatly improved in recent years, is still modest; (4) the most marked disparity between salary schedules in public and private employment appears in connection with the higher-grade positions, particularly those of an administrative and scientific sort, where the government is therefore at a

[6] Probably the most complete, factual article on comparison of executive pay in the Federal Government and in industry is Jerome M. Rosow, "Executive Compensation in the Federal Government," *Personnel*, March, 1953, pp. 390–401. See also John J. Corson, "The High Cost of Lost Executives," *Personnel Administration*, December, 1945, pp. 1–5. Only in such states as New York and California is executive pay likely to be more liberal than that in the Federal service.

[7] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel Management* (Washington: 1949), p. 25. Also in *Concluding Report*, p. 20.

marked disadvantage in competition with private industry; (5) government wages tend to increase less rapidly than private wages in times of advancing living costs and to fall less rapidly in times of retreating living costs; (6) although revealing a loose connection with prevailing "market rates," government salaries for white-collar workers have not been closely identified with them.

II. FACTORS IN DETERMINATION OF THE GENERAL WAGE LEVEL

Next we turn to the general factors and considerations involved in the determination of the wage level in the public service, and to a consideration of some of the general principles which provide a basis for a real pay policy. The first essential step is the decision as to the general level of wages which should prevail in the public service.

It must be recognized that there is no such thing as a scientific wage. Innumerable factors enter into the determination of compensation, including considerations of social policy, of tradition and custom, of worker or industrial productivity, of labor supply, bargaining power, and so forth. In general, however, most of these factors may be classed under the headings of economic considerations and ethical or social considerations. Much of the confusion in wage discussions arises from a failure to recognize clearly these two groups of factors and to realize that few wages are determined without some consideration of both. Although neither group can be completely divorced from the other, each will be treated separately for purposes of clarity.

A. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

One of the most complex problems in theoretical economics is that of determining the share of labor in the value of goods produced. It is not possible within the scope of this chapter to inquire into this problem, or to examine the various economic theories of value and wages.[8] However, it must be recognized that there is a vital relationship, first, between the total amount spent for wages and the total productivity, and second, between the amount spent for wages and the proportions of the total income going to the other factors of production. As society is economically or-

[8] There is an extensive body of literature on this subject, and the interested reader is referred to Thomas N. Carver, *The Theory of Wages Adjusted to Recent Theories of Value* (Boston: 1894); Paul H. Douglas, *The Theory of Wages* (New York: 1934); J. R. Hicks, *The Theory of Wages* (London: 1932); J. W. F. Rowe, *Wages in Practice and Theory* (London: 1928); Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *Industrial Democracy* (London and New York: 1920); William L. Valk, *The Principles of Wages* (London: 1928); and various articles in the *American Economic Review, Quarterly Journal of Economics, Economic Journal, Economica,* and *Journal of Political Economy.* Consideration of the problem is to be found also in the writings of Henry George, Locke, Marx, John Stuart Mill, Ricardo, Schumpeter, Adam Smith, Turgot, and others.

ganized at present, there is thus a practical limitation upon the height to which the general level of *all* wages can go—a limitation determined, first, by the total productivity of industry, and second, by the irreducible requirements of the various other factors in production. A wage set with due regard to these considerations is regarded as an "economic" wage, and private establishments paying "uneconomic" wages are likely to be forced out of business.

In the case of public enterprises, the situation is somewhat different. In most of the services which it supplies the government possesses a monopoly. It is not subject to the rigorous process of competition,[9] nor is it under the same necessity to accept the marginal productivity or commodity theory of labor as is private industry. The theoretical limit to what the government can spend in salaries and wages is determined only by the state of the taxpayer's pocketbook and by the extent to which it is advisable for the government to compete in the labor market. These are matters of judgment for which no objective criteria can be devised.

But although the government, in theory, could disregard some of the economic factors involved in wage determination, there are considerations which make it necessary for public services to fix wages with some regard to the "economic" levels set in private industry. Regardless of the theory of wages or of labor accepted by the investigator, the government competes with private employers in the labor market. Thus, assuming other things to be equal, if the general level of wages in public employment is *substantially* lower than that in private industry, the government will find it difficult or impossible to recruit qualified persons into the service. On the other hand, if the public scale is *substantially* higher, the result may be to drain the more efficient workers from industry, thus reducing its productivity. This is entirely aside from the ethical questions involved or from the question of expediency. From the latter standpoint, it is exceedingly doubtful whether sufficient support could be secured for a program which, in effect, meant unfair competition with private industry. Thus, although the "going" or "market" rate is objectionable on many grounds, it must be considered as one factor in the determination of a government wage policy.

Moreover, it is largely through some consideration of the "going" rates that the government can give weight to the major economic factors involved in wage determination. In the public services, as a rule, a relationship between wages and demand for the product of labor is impossible to discover because of the monopolistic character of most governmental activities. Governmental services, in particular, are not supplied in the open market. Wages cannot, then, be made to depend directly upon market

[9] This distinction between public and private enterprise has been increasingly blurred by modern industrial developments. See, for example, the brilliant work of Edward Chamberlin, *The Theory of Monopolistic Competition* (Cambridge: 1933).

demand for those services. Under such circumstances, the primary economic guide is supplied by the prevailing conditions in the labor market.

B. SOME DIFFICULTIES WITH "MARKET" RATES

The competitive market rate is not, however, a sure guide to the determination of wages in the public service. Still leaving ethical or social considerations out of account, there are two major difficulties encountered in basing a public wage policy primarily upon market rates: (1) the practical difficulty of determining what the market rate is for any particular class of positions and (2) the fact that large groups of public servants have no comparable counterpart in private industry.

The term "market" or "going" rate refers to an abstraction. There is no such thing as a single market rate. In the most extensive wage survey ever made by a public authority in the United States, covering some 500,000 individuals in private employment, the Personnel Classification Board found that "salaries for identical jobs varied from locality to locality, from concern to concern within the same industry and the same locality, and from individual to individual within the same concern."[10] There are, then, many going rates, ranging from those paid by the most niggardly employers to those paid by the most liberal. The problem of wage policy is not solved by discovery of the rates paid for various types of work in private circles. It is still necessary to make a choice. Such a choice will be influenced by reference to concerns which are known to maintain good employment policies, concerns with which the government might well and ought to compete.

This fact, however, does not invalidate the collection of wage data from private employers according to standard job specifications or the employment of such data as a factor in determining the general wage levels in the public service. Although it is apparent that the competitive market rates supply only a variable standard, some criterion is better than none. This has been recognized in many of the more progressive public jurisdictions, where surveys of wages paid in private employment have been made and used as suggestive guides in determining public wage structures.[11]

The second difficulty with the application of the competitive market rate to public employment arises from the fact that vast numbers of public employees are engaged in occupations without parallel in private employment. Of what use, for example, is the competitive market rate in determining the compensation of policemen, fire fighters, crop, meat, and dairy

[10] *Closing Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, p. 243.

[11] Mention might be made of the studies of the Reclassification Commission (1920) and the early Personnel Classification Board in the Federal Government, of wage boards, particularly in the Department of Defense, and of the jurisdictions of Cincinnati, Illinois, New Jersey, and Wisconsin, among others. The fact is that the Federal Government has had no comprehensive nation-wide wage survey since 1928–1929.

inspectors, and dozens of other classes of peculiarly public employments? In such cases, the pay must be fixed with regard to the going rates for work of comparable complexity and skill and the rates for other public employees whose positions are comparable to those in private enterprises. This requires cross-occupation job analysis.

The United States Army and Air Force, in setting rates for civilian employees under the wage-board procedure, recognized that only rough justice is possible even in the skilled trades for which "prevailing rates" have been a traditional guide in collective bargaining. After setting a "floor" and a "ceiling" on rates for a locality and discounting discriminatory rates for such irrelevant factors as sex, race, and religion, these organizations, in effect, make exceptions to market rates by the use of job evaluation, that is, seeing to it that each class of jobs bears a reasonable pay relationship to others in terms of complexity, responsibility, and skill.

The difficulty of applying the competitive market rate to large numbers of public positions led one student of public administration to suggest scrapping the idea that public wages should be set competitively. "No one will say," Dr. Upson once pointed out, "that teaching positions should go to the lowest qualified bidder or that policemen should be hired at a labor exchange. Competition cannot determine these rates of pay. Rather, pay is determined by the standard of living which we require of these public servants."[12] He recommended, then, a pay policy based upon paying public servants according to the social group in which they are expected to live. This suggestion is closely related to the concept of the living wage, which is discussed below. Without neglecting this factor, public jurisdictions must take into account the "going wage" for various classes of comparable positions as a competitive guide in the determination of wage standards.

C. SOCIAL AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Although from an economic standpoint the government is somewhat freer in the determination of its wage policy than are most competitive private establishments, from the social and ethical standpoints it is less free to do as it will. The State, charged with providing for the common welfare and with the establishment and maintenance of desirable social conditions, is under a special obligation to its servants that private employers may and often do overlook. Moreover, the bargaining power of public employees is limited, because of (1) the absence of effective organization among many civil servants, (2) limitations upon the right to strike and to engage in political activities, and (3) the specialized character of much government work, which makes it difficult for the civil servant to leave the service for private

[12] Lent D. Upson, "How to Determine an Equitable Pay Basis for Public Employees," *Public Management*, March, 1934, pp. 79 ff. See also the discussion of this article in Harvey Walker, "The Compensation of Public Employees," *ibid.*, pp. 99–103.

employment. Thus there is a special obligation upon the State to treat its employees fairly. The weak bargaining position in which many public servants find themselves produces a situation conducive to arbitrary treatment and discrimination. The chief restraint against unfairness must be self-imposed, on the ground that the government should be a "model employer." Unfortunately, such self-restraint has been noticeably absent in many public jurisdictions in this country. There is a crying need for the recognition and acceptance of general social principles as a basis for the wage policy. One of the most frequently advocated principles is the "living wage."

Most contemporary references to a minimum wage are, in reality, references to a minimum *living wage.* It is argued, for example, that the government should pay its employees a wage based upon what it costs them to maintain an appropriate standard of living. This approach to the problem of the general wage level has little in common with the "economic" approach based upon the marginal productivity theory. In fact, the arguments for the establishment of the minimum living wage are not primarily economic but ethical. They are based upon the contention that every citizen of a civilized community should be assured the means to a reasonable scale of living according to the standard prevailing in the community.

To determine the minimum living wage requires, first, a decision as to the general living standard to be provided and, second, the study of cost-of-living budgets as a basis for determining the amount necessary to maintain that standard. Both of these are intimately related to the question whether the minimum is to provide a living wage for a single man, a single woman, a married man, an average family, or some other unit. Obviously, what might be a living wage for a man with no dependents would not provide a living for a family of five.

One solution to this problem is the family-allowance system, under which a minimum living wage is set for a single person, to which increments are added for dependents. This has some advantages over a theoretical family standard, and, with the exceptions of England, Spain, and Portugal, most of the major European governments have at one time or another paid family allowances to their civil servants.[13] Moreover, commissioned officers in the United States Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service have been remunerated under such a plan for some time. Army officers between the ranks of second

[13] An excellent discussion of family-allowance systems, though now out of date, is to be found in Mary T. Waggaman, *Family Allowances in Foreign Countries,* U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 401 (Washington: 1926), and Paul H. Douglas, *Wages and the Family* (Chicago: 1925), Parts II and III. A strong statement favorable to family allowances is contained in Royal Commission on the Civil Service, Appendix IV to Minutes of Evidence, *Memorandum on Family Allowances* (London: 1930).

lieutenant and brigadier general receive different amounts of subsistence and rent upon the basis of whether or not they have dependents. If a living wage is to be adopted which will make provision for dependents, some application of the family-allowance system is practicable.

But whether the basis for determining the wage be a single individual or a family of four, the problem of the standard of living to be accepted as the minimum remains. Various standards have been recognized—"poverty" level, "minimum of subsistence" level, "health and decency" level, "comfort" level, "cultural" level, etc.—but it should be emphasized that none of these concepts is precise.[14] However, there can be agreement upon the general factors involved, and no public authority should desire to set a minimum wage which would not allow employees to live at least at the health and decency level.

Having determined some general living standard as the minimum (and the problems involved in this are not insuperable), the next step is the determination through cost-of-living and theoretical budget studies of the average wage necessary to maintain that standard. In general, this has been done in two ways: (1) through actual investigations of expenditures of a sample of the individuals or families in the class involved and (2) through setting up a minimum-quantity budget, compiled by including the goods and services comprising the living standard of a broad and representative group, and then investigating the current market prices of such commodities and services.[15] The second procedure was employed in the budget studies made for the Joint Commission on the Reclassification of Salaries in 1920. Later, in connection with the Federal field classification study, the early Personnel Classification Board, with the coöperation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, employed the first method in an analysis of the cost of living of 506 representative families of Federal employees.[16] Both methods can be used to advantage, although they possess rather obvious defects. The first does not take into consideration the fact that the expenditures of those investigated may have been unwise or that expenditures are largely determined by income. The quantity budget method, although generally regarded as the more desirable, assumes the adequacy of the standard of living of the group investigated as well as a considerable degree of standardization in the commodities and services which constitute it.

No one familiar with the subject will deny the many practical difficulties in the way of realizing and maintaining the minimum living wage. There

[14] These various levels have been defined in Douglas, *Wages and the Family*, pp. 5 ff.

[15] The reader is referred to the *Monthly Labor Review* and other publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as well as to the various publications of the National Industrial Conference Board dealing with the cost of living.

[16] See *Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, pp. 365–386.

has been opportunity to do little more than hint at them within the scope of this chapter.[17] Related to this area is the problem of pay ceilings. Private industry experiences some social pressures against excessively high salaries. But the public service experiences a much more insistent pressure, sometimes to the extent of unreasonable restrictions on top salaries. Every raising of public pay ceilings comes only after a bitter fight. From the arguments of some legislators, it would appear that this resistance is something of an effort to keep top public pay down to the level of the average man. A ten or fifteen thousand salary rate is attacked because it is higher than what some small-town grocers or lawyers are able to net. This attitude is an additional reflection of the "charity concept" of government employment. Nevertheless, ceilings on public pay schedules must be established somewhere. If they reflect due regard for social and economic considerations, they will probably recognize a spread in the public pay schedules between minimum living standards and the need to attract able executive talent.

In spite of the problems raised, the living-wage concept should be given considerable weight in the determination of public wage policy, because of its social desirability if for no other reason. Moreover, the principle has been recognized by Congress on several occasions and by various other public authorities in the United States.[18]

It is neither good ethics nor sound personnel practice to pay less than is adequate to insure employees an independent living in conformity with reasonable standards of physical, mental, and moral well-being. The private industry which cannot pay adequate wages is uneconomic and socially destructive; the State which does not do it is imposing a kind of serfdom on its workers. The government, both as a large employer and as the great exponent of human conservation, must recognize that a continuously higher standard of living is a necessary feature of a progressing civilization. No employer can successfully neglect social considerations in determining wage levels; for the State, they must be controlling.

The emphasis on the minimum living wage is justified on the ground that

[17] For more extensive analyses, the reader is referred to *Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, Chap. 2; Herman Feldman, *A Personnel Program for the Federal Civil Service*, 71st Cong., 3rd sess., House Doc. No. 773 (Washington: 1931), Chaps. 4 and 5.

[18] We have come a long way in the past century. A Congressional committee in 1844, concerned with government salaries, was afraid that paying employees anything above the bare minimum necessary for subsistence would have disastrous consequences. The Committee on Retrenchment, House of Representatives, in a report dated March 8, 1844, had this to say:

"A profligate use of money is demoralizing; extravagant pay induces extravagant living. Those in moderate circumstances are ever prone to ape the follies of high life; and, after getting into habits of indolence and extravagance, they are more apt to unlawful means to sustain their unnatural position.

". . . The more money allowed . . . the more time is required from the public service to spend it." Cited in *The Government Standard* (American Federation of Government Employees, Washington, D.C.), October 29, 1954.

the level of the minimum wage, the first rung of the wage ladder, will affect the relative position of all other rungs. The more recent problem in many jurisdictions—including the national government—has been providing a reasonable spread between minimum and maximum salaries. Legislative bodies in their anxiety to be generous to the rank and file—where most votes are found—often give short shrift to the top grades of the service. Flat dollar-amount salary increases give the lowest-paid employees a much greater increase percentagewise and cause a general compression of the pay schedule. Executives and other upper-bracket public employees must have a standard of living that enables them to maintain a certain dignity and respect in association with their counterparts in private pursuits. This is just as important an application of the social and ethical considerations being discussed as is an adequate minimum wage. The narrow range of some public pay schedules is shocking in view of the ordinary American tendency to reject such leveling, socializing trends.

D. ADDITIONAL FACTORS IN WAGE DETERMINATION

In addition to economic factors, considerations of general social policy, and the like, other things, such as leave provisions, hours of work, relative security of tenure, pensions, and retirement privileges, need to be kept in mind in determining the general wage level. The total remuneration to an employee may be but roughly measured by the size of his pay check.

These factors cannot be accurately gauged, however, and how much effect they should have on the wage level is pretty largely a matter of personal opinion. Moreover, it is difficult to decide upon the relative advantages of public over private employment in terms of such perquisites. In the public services generally, working conditions are probably somewhat better than in the *average* private establishment. On the other hand, the advantages of short hours, liberal vacations, security of tenure, and so forth are offset by perhaps lesser promotional opportunities and the complete absence of any opportunity for really large earnings in the public service. It is probable that, speaking broadly, neither public nor private employment offers substantial nonmonetary advantages over the other which are not matched by substantial nonmonetary disadvantages.[19]

Finally, in determining the general level of compensation, it is necessary to consider the incentive value of high wages. Owing to the experience of a number of private concerns, the "economy of high wages" has become widely recognized in private enterprise. Of course, high wages alone are not enough to induce good morale, but it is not easy to build up good morale under poor wage conditions. This fact needs to be considered, and the

[19] ". . . In fixing the basic compensation of public employees the intangible advantages of public employment about balance the disadvantages, and therefore may be ignored."—Upson, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

general policy advocated here is that government should by all means avoid niggardliness.

On the other hand, once the State has adopted the policy of a liberal wage for its employees, it is imperative that high standards of selection and work performance be maintained. Much more attention must be devoted to the maintenance of efficiency, to the setting of definite standards of performance in those positions in which production is measurable, and to the stimulation of interest and of morale. This is a task for management and the employees themselves.

III. AUTHORITY RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING AND ADMINISTERING THE PAY PLAN

Following determination of the broad lines of policy respecting wage levels and the factors to be considered in arriving at them, the next step is the development of a pay plan. Such a plan is composed of two parts: (1) the scales of pay set up for each class of positions and (2) the formal rules for salary administration. It provides the basis for the standardization of salaries to the ends that similar work shall carry similar pay and that varying degrees of job importance or difficulty shall be equitably reflected in the pay scales. Like the classification plan, upon which it depends, the pay plan is a structural blueprint of the whole service, but indicating, this time, the relationships between classes of positions in terms of pay differentials. Its arrangement should be such that it is definite, precise, and readily applicable to any class of positions, and that it clearly indicates the remuneration to be received by the incumbent of any position at any time during that incumbency.[20]

The development of the pay plan is an administrative function best performed by the agency responsible for the duties classification. If, as earlier recommended, the personnel agency is responsible for classification, it should also develop the pay plan in coöperation with the financial authority. The whole area of wage and salary administration offers excellent opportunities for coöperation, not only between the staff agencies of finance and personnel, but between them and the legislative body. Although the pay plan should be developed by an administrative agency, the final adoption of the salary scales is usually a legislative prerogative. This is not always the case. In the Federal service, rates of pay are administratively determined in certain exempt agencies like the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for most blue-collar jobs by wage boards in individual departments. Moreover, there is a trend in the direction of granting such discretionary power to administrative officers elsewhere. Even then, however, the appropriation of funds to meet the demands involved is a legislative

[20] Cf. Edwin O. Griffenhagen and Fred Telford, "The Principles and Technique of Preparing a Plan of Compensation for Positions and Employees in a Large Organization," *Public Personnel Studies*, January, 1925, pp. 16–25.

prerogative, as is the final determination of the general wage policy. Close coöperation between administrative officers and the legislature is therefore essential.

The question may be raised at this point whether the personnel agency, the fiscal authority, or some other staff unit should be charged with the administration of the pay plan. The relationships between the classification and compensation plans are so intimate that a single agency should administer both.[21] Moreover, compensation is one of the most important incentives available to management. A well-constituted personnel authority should certainly be in a position to see that salary administration contributes its share to the whole personnel program, that salaries are promptly adjusted to changing economic and employment conditions, that inequities between related positions are eliminated, and so on. If the fiscal agency undertakes this responsibility, it must duplicate some of the work carried on as a matter of routine by the personnel staff. Also the fiscal office has an entirely different background and approach from that of the personnel unit and is inclined to view the salary problem as one of reduction in expenditures rather than in terms of the provision of personnel incentives. This is attested by the experience of the Federal service with the Bureau of the Budget in the 1920's. Accordingly, the personnel agency should administer both the classification and the compensation plan, with the advice and assistance of the budget or fiscal agency.

IV. THE TECHNIQUE OF SALARY STANDARDIZATION

Like so many other aspects of personnel administration, salary standardization calls for the exercise of mature judgment and discriminatory powers, rather than for hard and fast rules. As a member of the personnel department of a large private concern once remarked, "Salary standardization cannot be equipped with any self-starting device, nor can it be expected to run smoothly without careful steering."[22] There is no single, clearly marked road to the establishment of a sound pay plan.

Nevertheless, experience over a period of several decades in both private and public fields has led to the recognition of certain general principles and to the development of more or less standardized techniques in this field. It is the purpose of the present section to consider some of these.

The first prerequisite to the formulation of any compensation plan is the

[21] See also President's Committee on Administrative Management, *Report with Special Studies* (1937), pp. 96–97, and the symposium in *Public Personnel Quarterly*, Autumn, 1940, pp. 181–185.

[22] Rita Hilborn, "Application of Scientific Salary Administration in a Large Office Organization," in *Salary Administration*, American Management Association, Report by the Committee on Salary Standardization of the Office Executives' Division (New York: 1925), p. 74. For discussions of the technique of salary standardization see, especially, New York State Temporary Salary Standardization Board, *Report* (1938); Joseph Pois, "Preparation and Installation of Salary Plans," *Public Management*, April, 1938, pp. 99–102; and Edward N. Hay, "Arranging the Right Pay," *Personnel Journal*, April, 1939, pp. 364–370.

collection and analysis of certain basic data. Generally speaking, the data upon which a sound plan can be based are of three principal sorts: those bearing (1) upon present conditions in the service involved, including such things as the classification and distribution of positions, information on present wage levels, working conditions, and labor turnover; (2) upon employment conditions outside the service, including information on wage levels in comparable private employment and in other public jurisdictions; and (3) upon living costs and standards of living generally. Without intensive data concerning each of these, it is next to impossible to develop an equitable and sound compensation program.

Information respecting present conditions in the service serves three major purposes. In the first place, it provides the basis for job rating and evaluation as a preliminary to the determination of pay scales. This important aspect will be discussed in greater detail below. Secondly, it indicates the existence of special factors, such as high turnover in a particular class of positions, which need to be considered in constructing the pay plan. Thirdly, it provides a basis for estimating the effect of the recommended plan on the budget.

Data regarding wage and employment conditions outside the service have a number of uses, some of which were indicated earlier. It is only upon the basis of such data that the government can hope to maintain any sort of equilibrium between its own wages and those of private industry.

The necessity for information concerning costs and standards of living has already been sufficiently elaborated. If the government is to recognize the principle of the minimum living wage, it can be carried into practice only upon the basis of extensive studies of costs and standards of living.

A. THE ASSEMBLY OF COMPARABLE WAGE DATA

The collection of truly comparable wage data is a difficult matter, particularly as between public and private agencies. Speaking generally, there is no real classification of positions in private employment. As a consequence, a greater hodgepodge of job titles is found in the average private concern than in many governmental organizations. The early Personnel Classification Board discovered in its survey of wage and employment conditions in private concerns that "titles of positions are meaningless, the number of combinations of duties and responsibilities are infinite, the degree of supervision given the employee, the initiative required of him, and the personality he must inject into his dealings make any comparison very difficult."[23] Conditions in industry have, however, improved since that time, particularly in larger concerns.

In general, there are two procedures which may be employed in the

[23] Personnel Classification Board, *Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, p. 66.

assembling of wage data. The first and more usual method, particularly in smaller jurisdictions, is to select as the basis of the wage study certain routine and standardized positions common to both public and private employment. It is much easier, for example, to compare wage rates for typists, stenographers, supply clerks, manual laborers, and office-appliance operators than for high-grade administrative or scientific or investigatory positions. Some additional standard positions which can be compared without serious difficulty are those of the following: janitors, hospital attendants, nurses, watchmen, firemen, elevator operators, accounting and file clerks, cashiers, chainmen and rodmen, draftsmen, engineers, and such professional positions as are found on university faculties.

The usual procedure in the collection of wage data for these positions is to prepare a questionnaire containing a precise job description for each position and calling for information concerning comparable positions. The requisite information covers at least the following points: (1) number of such positions; (2) basic wage for each such position; (3) working hours; (4) regulations regarding overtime; (5) provisions concerning annual leave, sick leave, retirement; (6) operation of any special bonus or incentive systems. It is obvious that wage rates can be compared only in terms of approximately similar working conditions. This fact considerably complicates the problem and makes it desirable to collect as precise information as possible concerning the employment conditions and policies of the firms studied. The questionnaires are then assembled and analyzed by the central staff, and follow-up letters or interviews are employed to clear up any doubtful points.

A more fruitful but much more expensive method of securing the necessary data is one which permits comparisons over a wider range of positions. Field investigators make a first-hand study of various positions in representative concerns, write job specifications for those positions just as though they were engaged in a classification study, or check the duties of the positions covered against the job specifications already prepared for the public agency, attach the necessary data regarding wages and working conditions, and send the whole to the central agency. The central staff then classifies the positions upon the basis of the job descriptions and in conformity with the classification plan in use. It is then possible to make direct comparisons. This procedure is particularly valuable in comparing data on administrative positions or on any others not of a routine character.[24]

The study of industrial wage information by the Federal service has been confined to the studies of the various wage boards, particularly those set up by the military departments, to gauge prevailing locality rates that will

[24] *Ibid.* For further discussion on wage data gathering, see Ismar Baruch, "Surveying Prevailing Salary Rates," *Public Personnel Review*, April, 1942, pp. 86–100.

guide the establishment of pay for skilled trades and unskilled jobs. There has really been no full-scale survey of wage data as a basis for white-collar salary policy in the Federal Government since 1928. Congress has had before it considerable data from time to time on rates of pay in private employment, but these presentations do not carry the weight and prestige of formal, systematic surveys for the express purpose of guiding Federal pay policy. This deficiency alone is an indictment of the haphazard and illogical way in which compensation systems in the Federal service have been revised in recent years.

B. DETERMINING THE RATES AND CONSTRUCTING PAY SCHEDULES

The setting of the specific rates comprising the salary scales is controlled, first of all, by decisions of general policy in respect to the wage level, the applicability of the minimum-wage concept, living standards, and so on. But beyond that, the determination of rates for specific classes of positions depends upon a number of other considerations. Chief among these are (1) the relationships among various classes of positions in terms of duties, responsibilities, and so forth; (2) the ease or difficulty of recruiting desired personnel for particular classes of positions; (3) the probable effect of the prescribed rates upon labor turnover; (4) the probable promotion rate. Each of these merits some comment.

The rating or grading of positions, while fundamental to salary standardization, is a delicate tool whose employment is fraught with difficulties. The problem of wage relativity has no simple solution.

Job grading is a process of comparison through which one class of positions is weighed against another in terms of a predetermined set of criteria or factors. As such, it rests first of all upon the classification plan and the precise description of the duties, responsibilities, and requirements of all classes of positions. In an unclassified service, wage standardization would be next to impossible.

Even with an excellent classification scheme, the difficulties involved in grading are numerous. There is, for example, the impracticability of making direct comparisons between many types of positions. As one writer once indicated, "a comparison of the duties and requirements of the occupation of piccolo player with the duties and requirements of the occupation of prize fighter does not indicate which occupation deserves the more pay, because the two occupations have so little in common."[25] There must be some common basis before comparison or grading is possible. Positions can be rated only in relation to others of a roughly similar nature. This is the reason for the selection of certain key positions to serve as points of

[25] W. F. Cook, "The Technique of Wage Negotiations and Adjustment," in *Compensation Plans for Executives and Workers*, American Management Association, Personnel Series, No. 30 (New York: 1937), p. 9.

reference in the grading process. Thus, to continue with the same illustration, the position of piccolo player would not be graded in direct relation to that of prize fighter, but to that of the key position of, let us say, trombonist. To be sure, this does not resolve the question of the monetary value of either a trombonist or a piccolo player in comparison with a prize fighter, and there is no very satisfactory basis upon which that question can be settled. It can be avoided, however, by careful wage studies of the key positions, so that their open-market values are known and can be used as pegs.

Having determined the key positions, and being in possession of the facts in respect to them, one can begin the actual grading process. What factors should determine the wage relationships of one position to another? Why should a principal employment interviewer start at $3200 and a junior insurance examiner at $3500? Strictly speaking, there is no outside market rate for either position. In relating them to key positions for which "going rates" have been determined, what factors govern whether they should be placed on the scale above or below those key positions?

A host of factors might, theoretically, enter into such a judgment, and there would certainly be some variations in those deemed significant for differing types of work, such as labor or clerical. In general, however, classes of positions are graded in terms of the same "allocation factors" which were referred to in the chapter on position classification, where we were discussing the evaluation of individual positions. These factors include: (1) skill and knowledge required in the work; (2) degree of freedom of action of incumbent of the class; (3) originality required; (4) complexity; (5) supervisory responsibility; (6) consequences of action; and (7) responsibility for such things as property, lives, or money, or for accuracy, quality, or effectiveness of results of the work. In relating classes to pay scales, there is also the question of the number of levels into which a given occupation—such as engineering draftsman—can be divided. If the classification has been pressed to the point of recognizing in separate classes all possible distinguishable zones or gradations of difficulty and responsibility, that many separate pay ranges will have to be established. If the object in the classification is to keep the number of levels at a minimum consistent with the natural pattern of major distinctions in the particular occupation, then considerably fewer grades for pay purposes will probably be required. The tendency in recent years is in the direction of the latter approach. This is one of the points at which the relationships between classification and pay are almost inextricable, even though quite separate in substance. Some technicians will still argue for numerous distinctions in level in an occupation simply because the distinctions can be rationalized on job evaluation grounds; that is, differences can, by great refinement in reasoning, be made. It seems more feasible, however, to require no more distinctions than are

absolutely necessary for the recognition of genuine differences in skill, ability, or knowledge required and of the usual hierarchical structure of positions in the occupation. This not only simplifies the subsequent process of determining which classes individual positions fall into, by reducing the number of break-off points or border lines; it also simplifies the establishment of pay ranges, by permitting more "room" or flexibility in pay between classes. Hence, the nature of the classification plan vitally affects the way in which the compensation structure can be set up.

Graphic methods may occasionally be employed to advantage also in the grading process. In one large private concern, for example, the positions in a representative department were listed in order of their importance in one column of a chart, after which those in other departments were similarly arranged in adjoining columns. By this means all jobs of approximately similar value appeared on the same level. The whole was then checked again with the department heads, and the appropriate salary rates were set up for each level.[26] Some such procedure is often useful in studying relationships among classes of positions, throwing light upon their relative value.

By way of summary at this point, a few general rules in respect to the grading process may be listed: (1) Do not try to compare incomparable positions; relate each position to others of a similar nature and to the key position for the group. (2) Follow similar principles in grading classes as in evaluating individual positions. (3) Consider the relationships among broad groups of occupations, such as professional, clerical. (4) Sell the grading process to the staff and elicit their coöperation. They should be fully informed of the factors entering into the grading.

Of course, a completely rationalized wage structure will remain an ideal rather than become an accomplished fact. Numerous other considerations may enter in to vary the relationships determined through the grading process. It is obvious that particular salary rates have to be set at a point sufficiently high to facilitate the recruitment of competent personnel. In certain instances, therefore, this necessity may modify the theoretically desirable rate. For example, skilled craftsmen in organized unions are likely to enforce standards that are out of line with the going wage for unorganized classes of workers whose training and skill are on a par with those of union men. Since the first requirement of any personnel program is that it result in the recruitment, selection, and maintenance of a qualified and efficient staff, the ease or difficulty of recruiting employees for certain positions may be a determining factor in setting wage scales.

It is also desirable, in fixing rates, to keep in mind their probable effect on turnover. Although poor pay conditions are not the only ones con-

[26] Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, Policyholders' Service Bureau, *Salary Standardization and Administration* (New York: 1934), p. 13.

tributing to high turnover, it has been shown that they are important in this respect.[27] It is good policy, therefore, to set the rates with this in mind, particularly for the higher-grade technical and administrative positions.

V. SALARY RANGES

In the public services it is usual for the agency drawing up the compensation plan to recommend to the legislative body an appropriate salary range for each class of positions. The adoption of these compensation schedules, as they are known collectively, constitutes the original standardization. In certain large services, however, and the Federal service may be taken as typical, the legislature has set up a number of broad salary grades, leaving it to an administrative agency to allocate the various classes to them. In the Federal Classification Act, covering less than half of the service, eighteen salary grades are set up under the General Schedule, each having a grade definition and a salary range. The general character of the compensation schedules is indicated by the following definition and range for General Schedule Grade 5:

Grade GS-5 includes all classes of positions the duties of which are (1) to perform, under general supervision, difficult and responsible work in office, business, or fiscal administration, or comparable subordinate technical work in a professional, scientific, or technical field, requiring in either case (A) considerable training and supervisory or other experience, (B) broad working knowledge of a special subject matter or of office, laboratory, engineering, scientific, or other procedure and practice, and (C) the exercise of independent judgment in a limited field; (2) to perform, under immediate supervision, and with little opportunity for the exercise of independent judgment, simple and elementary work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training equivalent to that represented by graduation from a college or university of recognized standing but requiring little or no experience; or (3) to perform other work of equal importance, difficulty, and responsibility, and requiring comparable qualifications. *Range:* $3670–$3805–$3940–$4075–$4210–$4345–$4480.[28]

The grouping of salaries into grades is a useful device in the process of setting up a compensation plan. Like the scaffolding on a new building, however, the grades can well be discarded when the plan is put into operation. The lower and upper limits of the grades are arbitrarily determined, and the device is an artificial one; as a matter of fact, one salary grade shades into the next much like the colors of the rainbow. The proper scale for a given class of positions may overlap two grades. Because of their

[27] See the study by Paul F. Brissenden, "Labor Turnover in the Federal Service," *Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, Personnel Classification Board, pp. 320–364, and the conclusions of the President's Committee on Administrative Management and the first Hoover Commission respecting the salaries of Federal administrators.

[28] Classification Act of 1949, P.L. 429, secs. 602(a) and 603(b), pay scale as amended by P.L. 94, 84th Cong., 1st sess., approved June 28, 1955; pay rates effective retroactively to March, 1955. For other aspects of the Federal system, see U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Pay Structure of the Federal Civil Service*, June 30, 1954 (Washington: 1955).

arbitrary nature, the use of grades sometimes forces classes into salary limits which may not be appropriate. Let us assume, for example, that under normal control conditions comptometer operators and senior typists should have the same wage scale; placed in the same grade, both classes would start at the same rate. If comptometer operators are scarce in a given situation, however, it would be desirable to provide a somewhat higher scale for them than for typists. This cannot be done when the plan of grades is rigidly adhered to. On the other hand, there is good reason to argue against overemphasis on market conditions as destroying equal pay for equal work among different but equivalent occupations.

Whatever method is followed, in the best practice typical individual schedules consist of (1) a minimum rate, (2) several intermediate rates, and (3) a maximum rate. The minimum rate is ordinarily the starting rate, although the rules for administering the compensation plan may provide exceptions. The minimum represents the "least that should be paid to an employee who is considered worthy of appointment to the position at all."[29] It is in the determination of minimum rates, when they are in the lower occupations, that consideration must be given to living costs and standards.

The maximum rate should be fixed as nearly as possible at a figure representing the most that any incumbent of a position in the class should receive, considering the relative importance of the positions involved.[30] In the determination of this maximum the probable rapidity of promotion may be considered a factor. In the case of blind-alley positions it may be good policy to increase the maximum rate beyond that which is set for classes having reasonable expectation of promotion. It has also become the policy in some jurisdictions to provide extra salary steps beyond a maximum rate for extra-long service, such as at five- or ten-year intervals beyond the service required to reach the normal maximum.

The spread between the minimum and maximum rates is established upon the theory that there is, normally, a gradual increase in the value and usefulness of an employee as he becomes more familiar with his work. Moreover, the adoption of a scale consisting of several rates, rather than of a single flat rate, permits the use of compensation as a direct incentive and reward for efficient service. As a general rule, the maximum rate should bear approximately the same relation to the minimum in each grade or at each level of work. A maximum about 25 percent higher than the minimum is common. This means a relatively equitable range, rather than an exactly equal spread, and is a method of relating the size of the salary increment to the level of the position.

[29] Griffenhagen and Telford, *op. cit.*, p. 23. This article contains a good discussion of the processes involved in the actual construction of scales of pay.

[30] One private company has stated: "The maximum represents the salary above which, in the opinion of the management, compensation would be uneconomical no matter how efficiently the work were performed."—Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

Although there is considerable variation in practice, salary scales comprising four or five rates or steps are in general favor.[31] The decision as to the number of steps for any particular class of positions may depend largely upon the probable length of time it will take an employee to reach the point of maximum usefulness in the work. Thus, more steps may be provided in certain classes of positions, involving complex duties, than in others. The probable rapidity of promotion and the general policy regarding recruitment are also contributing factors bearing on this decision. If it is the policy of the government to recruit high-grade personnel for the lower levels with the idea of promoting rapidly, fewer steps are necessary than if employees are recruited with the idea of maintaining them for some time in the positions for which they were originally selected.

There is some difference of opinion as to whether, in establishing scales of pay for a series of classes related in vertical order, the scales should overlap. Overlapping may mean no increase in salary for employees promoted from a grade in which they have served a number of years to one in which the entrance rate is no higher than one they have already achieved within the lower grade. This can be corrected, however, by permitting an arbitrary advance in rate with any grade-to-grade promotion. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to avoid overlapping scales anyway, if each salary range is to have sufficient spread to function as a real incentive. But such overlapping should be kept to a minimum.

In general, salary increases are believed to be appropriate within the salary scale not oftener than once a year. Some jurisdictions permit increases in lower-level jobs within a six months' period. The most satisfactory system is to grant increases on the anniversary of each employee's reaching the preceding rate.

The preferred practice is to set forth salary rates for permanent workers in annual rates easily divisible into monthly, bimonthly, or weekly payments. For the lowest classes, annual increments of $84 or $120 are most convenient in making up the pay roll and the budget. In the higher classes the increments may be as large as $600. Hourly rates are a convenience in compensating laborers and workers in the skilled trades, especially when prevailing union rates are called for.

VI. MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCES

The rates of pay set up in the compensation schedules should represent the total remuneration. It is accordingly necessary, in the case of those

[31] See the survey by J. Lyle Cunningham, "Compensation Plans for Public Employees," *Society for the Advancement of Management Journal*, July, 1939, pp. 94–99, and the further development by Ismar Baruch, "The Structure of a Pay Scale," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1946, pp. 141–148.

employees receiving various allowances—meals, lodging, and laundry, for example—to determine standard values for such allowances and to deduct them from the gross compensation. Salary standardization cannot be secured, nor equitable treatment assured, unless everything of monetary value received by the employee is included in the wage rate.

Moreover, the problem of inequitability will arise if each establishment is permitted to determine the value of such allowances for its own employees. The Personnel Classification Board in its 1928 survey of the Federal field service found that full maintenance (quarters, subsistence, laundry) for a graduate nurse was evaluated at widely varying amounts in various Federal agencies.[32] Although less disparate today, there is still no Federal-wide standard for determining deductions for maintenance.

The problems involved in the standardization of allowances for maintenance are technical and complex, and their careful examination is beyond the scope of this chapter. Speaking generally, the process involves deciding upon (1) what constitutes maintenance; (2) whether the plan of standardization adopted shall prescribe fixed rates for all types of allowances, considering, for example, only the size of house, the number of meals, etc., or shall be one under which the rates are varied according to quality; (3) the specific amounts to be deducted for various items of maintenance.[33] The general principle which should be followed throughout, in the opinion of the Comptroller General of the United States, is that the value of particular items of maintenance "is not necessarily to be limited to the cost of the allowance to the government, but the basis is to be the reasonable value to the employee during the particular period and in the particular locality where employed."[34] However, cost should certainly be an important factor in standardizing the value of maintenance.

VII. DIFFERENTIALS

Broadly speaking, salary differentials are of two sorts: (1) geographic differentials and (2) special differentials. The first implies a wage differential that is added to or subtracted from the basic wage rates of all employees in all classes in a given locality for the purpose of equalizing real earnings between employees in various localities. It arises only in those jurisdictions employing a considerable field service and is based upon the

[32] *Closing Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, p. 326.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 349. This report contains one of the best early discussions of some of the technical aspects of maintenance standardization, and the reader is referred to pp. 325–357 for a much fuller account than space allows here. See also Buffalo Municipal Research Bureau, *Employee Maintenance by Erie County, New York* (Buffalo: 1938); and John C. Crowley, *Institutional Employee Maintenance*, Public Administration Service Publication No. 99 (Chicago: 1947).

[34] *Closing Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, p. 351.

realization that equality or inequality of pay is really determined, not by the number of dollars received, but by what they will buy in a given locality.

A. GEOGRAPHIC DIFFERENTIALS

Although, in the case of a far-flung service like that of the Federal Government or even of the state of California, geographical differentials are sound in theory, their practical application is beset with difficulty. Some of the complications are as follows: (1) No *single* salary rate or guide for a given occupation prevails in a locality; (2) there is no practical way of determining the geographical boundaries for particular rate areas; (3) the door is open for continual bickering over wages and jockeying by employees for transfers to what appear to be more favorable localities; (4) the political implications are staggering, with every legislator under pressure to concern himself with whether rates for his constituency are fair in comparison with those for other localities; (5) there is good argument, in the case of the Federal service, that the government should serve as a stabilizing and nationalizing influence on pay levels rather than a follower.

B. SPECIAL DIFFERENTIALS

The question of special differentials is a somewhat different one. These relate to differences in working conditions of positions which are in other respects the same and are not necessarily related to differences in living costs as between various localities. Among the factors which may be considered as necessitating a special differential are the isolated character of a particular post, unusual hazard involved in a particular assignment, and particularly undesirable climatic conditions. Where these factors are present, it may be desirable, both from the standpoint of fair and equitable treatment to the employee and from that of recruitment necessities, to employ special differentials. For example, employees in the Panama Canal service are paid a substantially higher rate than that paid for similar work in other services.

1. Hazardous Work. The question of special pay differentials for hazardous work alone presents many perplexing problems. Few jurisdictions have made serious provision for extra pay in jobs in which the employee is exposed to unusual danger of loss of life, crippling injury, or disabling disease. Many government agencies have manufacturing, inspection, testing, laboratory, hospital, and other jobs which are inherently dangerous in one of these respects. The Federal Government has, in an uncoördinated way, provided for hazard pay differentials for certain postal jobs and some other field positions, largely through the separate action of individual departments under miscellaneous legislative authority, although an impor-

tant coördinated study of hazard pay by the Civil Service Commission is on the books.[35]

Some argue that hazard should be taken into account as a classification factor in evaluating the position. Others feel that degree of hazard is not as measurable as the duties of a job and that, therefore, recognition of hazard must be based on some arbitrary measure of its importance in the recruitment and retention of employees on the work in question.

There is a question regarding the desirability of trying to meet the hazard problem by extra pay. Many officials contend that hazard should be controlled by safety engineering, by careful selection of employees where special skills are required to avoid harm, by safety training, and by careful adjustment of working time or conditions, and that more adequate injury compensation and family benefits as the result of death should be looked upon as economic protection for the individual and his family. This view, however, does not take into account the uncontrollable hazard—as in test pilot assignments—where extra pay is simply designed to induce a person to accept and stay on a job which requires him to risk his neck. The Federal Civil Service Commission concludes, however, that extra pay for hazardous employments should be avoided as much as possible but that the prevailing practice in private industry for comparable jobs should be a controlling consideration.[36] There is little doubt that the long-range goal for public employers facing this issue should be to reduce and control the occupational hazards themselves.

2. Territorial and Foreign Posts. Elements of both the geographical cost-of-living differential and the special differential are reflected in the system of extra pay now established in the Federal service for territorial and foreign posts. Although executive orders in 1948[37] brought some consistency and order into special compensation provisions for territorial and foreign assignments, this is a matter requiring continuing study and problem solving. The postwar policy of paying up to 25 percent over base pay (for recognition of cost-of-living differences as well as of the need for a recruitment incentive in certain environments) was based primarily on the thought of transferring citizens on the American continent to such assignments. The companion problem, particularly in the territories, of determining pay policy for local people hired in Federal establishments is not so easily resolved. Whatever the combination of cost-of-living, prevailing wage, or post hardship principles that are brought to bear on the issue, an equitable policy will depend upon periodic surveys of the facts. Pos-

[35] U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Report on Additional Compensation for Hazardous Employment*, prepared in accordance with sec. 803 of the Classification Act of 1949 (October, 1950).

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[37] Executive Orders 10,000 and 10,011.

sibly an improvement in the 1948 policies will have been arrived at by the time of publication of this volume, in view of current surveys.

3. Overtime, Night, and Holiday Pay. Although not exactly belonging under the heading "Differentials," several other aspects of pay may for convenience be mentioned here. They are overtime, night, and holiday pay. More and more, jurisdictions are finding it necessary to provide overtime pay, usually approximating one and one-half times the basic pay, for at least the lower-level jobs. The Federal Government was a leader in establishing overtime pay in 1945 as well as in setting a 10 percent differential for work between 6 P.M. and 6 A.M. and in providing for double pay for work on holidays. Many Federal activities operate round the clock, such as hospitals, public buildings operation, certain military installations, and to some extent even mass clerical operations where space or machinery limitations require more than one shift. State and local governments often have similar activities, but not many have recognized the need for special pay in such situations.[38] The complexities in administering these special pay provisions are enormous but are probably justified by the added ease of recruiting and holding personnel for duty outside a normal work week.

If all such special considerations concerning pay are to be taken into account, the best procedure is for the legislature to authorize the personnel agency to establish differentials or other provisions after investigation and consultation with the budget agency and the appointing officers concerned. These should then be published as a part of the compensation plan.

VIII. INSTALLATION AND ADMINISTRATION

After salaries and wages have once been worked out and approved by the appropriate authorities, the first step becomes that of assigning salaries to the members of the staff. Certain administrative rules will also have to be adopted and approved. Finally, provision must be made for keeping the salary scales up to date. These items will be dealt with briefly in the following order: (1) effect of the installation of the plan upon the salaries and wages of present incumbents; (2) utilization of minimum, intermediate, and maximum rates; (3) adjustments due to changes in market conditions and cost of living. The scope of a single chapter offers no opportunity for the presentation of a set of model rules, or even for extensive consideration

[38] The trend in municipal governments has shown an increase in use of the following: "Time and one-half for time over eight hours per day and 40 hours per week, as well as premium pay for Sunday and holiday work. . . . Other payments in addition to cash salary, such as afternoon and night shift differentials; hazard pay; travel time compensation; payment for meals which occur during a period of overtime; and a minimum of two or four hours pay for reporting for regular duty even when conditions prevent regular work, and a similar arrangement as well as premium pay for call-backs."—Edmond F. Ricketts, "Trends and Forecasts in Personnel," *Public Management*, January, 1955, pp. 9 ff. See also Civil Service Assembly, *Overtime Compensation Policies*, April, 1953.

of each of these points. It is possible, however, to comment briefly upon them and to refer to the practices of several progressive jurisdictions.

A. EFFECT ON PRESENT INCUMBENTS

Whenever a compensation study is applied to the existing force, it is found that, although the present compensation for some positions is within the range provided for the class involved, that for others is either above or below the range. This fact immediately raises a question of policy, particularly in connection with employees whose present compensation is in excess of the range provided. If such salaries are reduced to the maximum prescribed for the class, the result is likely to be not only resentment on the part of those affected but a serious hardship to them as well. Living standards tend to adjust themselves to income, so that a reduction even in relatively high incomes often causes real hardship. On the other hand, if such out-of-line salaries are maintained, the uniformity of the compensation schedules is impaired and the principle of equal pay for equal work violated.

Public personnel administrators have grasped now one and now the other horn of this dilemma. There has been no uniformity of practice. After all the factors have been evaluated, the rule recommended by the technical committee of the Civil Service Assembly appears the most satisfactory. Under it employees receiving pay in excess of the maximum for the class are allowed to continue at the rate during their incumbency but without opportunity for salary advancement.[39] Although temporarily impairing wage uniformity, such a procedure results in the least dissatisfaction and hardship. It should be made clear, however, that the higher rate does not attach to the *position* and that transfers of such workers will be effected wherever practicable for the purpose of assigning these incumbents duties which warrant the payment of the given salaries.

The cases of those receiving less than the prescribed minimum and of those whose present compensation, while within the range, is not at one of the prescribed rates, offer few problems. Employees receiving less than the minimum for their class should be increased to the minimum rate as soon as the compensation plan is installed. Those whose pay is not at one of the prescribed rates should be advanced to the next higher one. By these means flarebacks are avoided and the hearty support of the staff is assured.

B. USE OF MINIMUM, MAXIMUM, AND INTERMEDIATE RATES

Although several questions are involved here, they can be treated but briefly. The rules should provide that *original* appointments be made at the minimum rate. It is sometimes argued that there should be no hard and fast rule upon this point, but that the question of the appropriate

[39] *Report of Technical Committee on Rules*, Part B, Rule 48; see also p. 33.

starting rate should be left to the discretion of the appointing officer. By this means, it is said, exceptions can be made for unusually well-qualified appointees. The best practice, however, admits no such exceptions. Occasionally there are exceptions which are more defensible. Serious difficulty in recruiting for a given class of positions may be met with temporary use of rates above the minimum, although this requires, for the sake of morale, adjusting the pay of existing personnel in the class also.[40] The more satisfactory method of meeting the condition is to have some administrative flexibility to change upward the whole pay range for the class and occupation, including a higher minimum rate. Another condition that prevents absolute adherence to minimum rates for entrance is in clashes between two compensation systems. This is illustrated in the Federal service where a white-collar supervisor under the Classification Act must occasionally be paid less than a blue-collar subordinate whose wage is set on a prevailing wage basis.

In the interests not only of uniformity in compensation, then, but also of proper selection and appointment procedure, it is desirable that original appointments ordinarily be made at the minimum rate. The rule should not apply to promoted or transferred employees, however, particularly where the various classes of positions have overlapping salary scales. In such cases, if a promoted employee were forced to start at the minimum of the next higher class, his promotion might necessitate a financial sacrifice.

The intermediate and maximum rates are prescribed upon the assumption that an employee's value to the service will normally increase as time goes on. The steps above the minimum serve, therefore, as a recognition of merit and should be utilized for this purpose.

Salary increases within the grade are commonly granted automatically.[41] The seniority principle, standing alone, has little to commend it from the standpoint of good administration. Ordinarily, to be sure, an employee's value to the service may be expected to increase as he becomes more familiar with his duties and more skilled in performing them. It is true also that the government's responsibility toward an employee should normally increase as his length of service increases. But the superiority of a salary range over a flat rate rests upon the fact that increases can be given as a reward for good service and as an incentive to further effort. No system of increases, unless accompanied by recognition of superior performance, is adequate to secure the utmost incentive value from compensation.[42]

[40] Such authority exists in the Federal service (68 *U.S. Stat.* 1112, September 1, 1954) and has been used for entrance positions in engineering and certain sciences.

[41] See Ricketts, *op. cit.*, pp. 9 ff.

[42] The Task Force of the second Hoover Commission urged the use of within-grade pay steps to recognize "achievement and experience" and as "merit increments." See Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: 1955), p. 87.

On the other hand, although advancement should certainly be based primarily upon performance, there are difficulties in a formal requirement that current measures of efficiency be the sole basis. Most perplexing is the inadequacy of most of the performance rating schemes in use. Although this is not an insuperable obstacle and evaluation methods are being constantly improved, few jurisdictions at present would be justified in making them the sole basis for salary increases. In the Tennessee Valley Authority the maximum rate of upper grades is reserved for recognition of unusually meritorious service or other special conditions. In the general Federal pay plan, flat dollar awards rather than salary increases are granted for demonstrated outstanding accomplishment.[43] This use of awards or pay increases as a positive measure to reward meritorious performance seems to be in the right direction.

Under present conditions, perhaps the best plan is to grant increases periodically, subject to certain standards of performance being met, below which no one could be advanced. Under such a plan each of the factors might be given some weight and standard practices developed, but the ultimate responsibility would rest directly upon the supervisory officer who evaluates performance. This is where it unquestionably belongs. Certainly, the widespread custom of automatic increases without relation to performance is not in keeping with efficient administration.

C. ADJUSTMENTS IN THE COMPENSATION PLAN

A review of the salaries and wages paid over a period of years by the majority of jurisdictions indicates that the scales have tended to become static. Adjustments when made have usually constituted a major operation, which has been decided upon only when conditions became intolerable. No agency has been responsible for investigating and reporting, as a matter of routine, the shifting conditions which have a direct bearing on wage payments. We have seen how little compensation in government employment has conformed to salary changes in private employment, particularly on the professional and executive levels.

This is a fruitful source of dissatisfaction and contributes greatly to the rate of turnover. It also affects the drawing power of government in its effort to recruit new employees and its holding power to retain experienced and competent employees. For these reasons, the personnel agency should be charged with the duty of carrying on routine studies of the labor market, the effects of changes in the price level, and related matters, as a basis for recommendations to the fiscal agency and the legislature. Studies should be made of turnover figures, the number and quality of candidates pre-

[43] 68 *U.S. Stat.* 1112, September 1, 1954. Earlier provisions allowed for more rapid salary advancement, first authorized for "especially meritorious services" and subsequently amended to cover "superior accomplishment."

senting themselves at competitive examinations, and the rates of pay for certain sample (key) positions in slected private firms in the local area.

Of great importance is a periodic checkup on fluctuations in the level of prices. In the long run, prices and wages must strike a sort of equilibrium. The wage structure, particularly in government, is always more "sticky" than the price structure, however. Serious maladjustments sometimes occur, therefore, as during the period of World War I, when public employees were grossly underpaid. Wages must always be set in terms of prevailing prices, and any considerable shift in price levels should be reflected in the rates. Revisions in public pay scales following World War II have been more responsive. There have been no less than six adjustments upward since 1945 in the Federal service, and material changes have taken place in most state and local governments.

Various experiments have been carried on looking to the automatic adjustment of pay rates to changes in the cost of living. The British civil service was remunerated under such a scheme from 1920 to 1935.[44] In outline, it provided basic salary rates for each grade which were, for the most part, those obtaining in 1914. Total pay was then increased or decreased in accordance with changes in living costs since the base year of 1914. During the first years of the operation of the plan, prices rose rapidly, and in March, 1921, the bonus was related to a cost-of-living figure of 165 percent above 1914. From that peak the bonus fell steadily, a fact which led to rather widespread staff dissatisfaction with the scheme. The plan was attacked, too, by the Royal Commission on the Civil Service (1929–1931) and, in the face of all these pressures, was abandoned. The objections of the royal commission are worth noting, since they tend to be advanced by all those opposed to cost-of-living wage plans. The more important were (1) that employees in private industry were not so remunerated and that real wages in the public service were accordingly out of line; (2) that there were numerous practical difficulties involved in the operation of the plan; (3) that the remuneration of all classes of civil servants could not properly be related to a single cost-of-living figure; (4) that remuneration in the service should reflect the long-term shifts in wage levels and economic conditions.[45] Most of these objections are rooted in a commodity theory of wages, and no one of them impresses us as fundamental. Despite the acknowledged inadequacy of the cost-of-living figures, they provided a better basis than no figures at all. We cannot agree, either, that the State should never lead in the matter of wage policy but should be wholly guided by prevailing standards in private industry. This is to strait-jacket public personnel administration.

[44] See *Report of the Cost-of-Living Committee of the Civil Service National Whitley Council* (London: 1920).

[45] Royal Commission on the Civil Service, 1929–1931, *Report* (London: 1931), pp. 96 f.

In the United States, a somewhat similar cost-of-living plan was probably first successfully operated by the city of St. Paul. The scheme was adopted for a portion of the St. Paul municipal service in 1920 and for the entire classified service in 1922. It provides for annual automatic adjustment of pay rates in accordance with the rise or fall of the cost of living for the base year 1916. The cost-of-living index employed is that of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. The basic salary rates were set as of 1916.

In administering the plan, increases or decreases are scaled from 0 percent in the case of the highest salaried positions to a percentage representing the full change in the cost of living for the ten standard lower rates. Increases went as high as 53 percent in 1927; from 1927 to 1936 there was a continual decline in the money wages of St. Paul employees; but from 1940 to date there has been a heavier adjustment upward. Experience with the plan has clearly demonstrated that employees will accept reductions in money wages if they feel that the compensation plan is a fair and equitable one. In February, 1933, when the St. Paul council had been considering the abandonment of the plan, a representative committee of employees submitted a letter to the council which said in part, "We feel . . . that the only equitable treatment is retention of the present cost-of-living salary ordinance."[46] This is an effective answer to those who have assumed that such a plan could not be maintained in the face of falling prices. The St. Paul plan has continued in operation to this day.

A somewhat similar plan was adopted by San Diego in 1933. For the most part, during the depression years of falling prices and wages, however, there was little expansion of the sliding-scale approach to public pay scales. During and following World War II, interest in this method of keeping salaries abreast with economic conditions revived. After May, 1943, state, municipal, and county governments were able to make salary adjustments for their employees without securing approval of the National War Labor Board, which had established rigid controls on basic pay scale changes in private industry as one of the cardinal aspects, along with price control, of wartime economic stabilization. Public pay levels, because of normal legislative controls, were not expected to and did not rise to an extent inconsistent with national wage stabilization policies.[47]

Pay adjustment plans of the automatic type were adopted in a number of jurisdictions during the 1940's. The state of Minnesota has a system

[46] J. B. Probst, "The St. Paul Plan of Adjusting Salaries to Cost of Living," *Public Management*, June, 1933, p. 166. See also Carl P. Herbert, "Saint Paul's Fair Wage System," *National Municipal Review*, December, 1932, pp. 589 ff.; St. Paul Civil Service Bureau, *18th Annual Report* (1931), pp. 6–12; and "Cost-of-Living Pay Adjustment Plans," *Public Management*, September, 1948, which includes item on St. Paul by H. Lyon, p. 262.

[47] See the comprehensive discussion in Ismar Baruch, "The Wartime Salary Problem," *Public Personnel Review*, April, 1944, pp. 77–89.

providing for graduated percentage increases, decreasing from lower to higher brackets. Madison, Wisconsin, adopted a plan under which cost-of-living adjustments, based on the consumers' price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, are made twice each year. Similar plans, differing only in detail, were set up in Jackson, Michigan; Portland, Oregon; Duluth, Minnesota; Brookline, Massachusetts; several California cities; five local units in the Milwaukee metropolitan area; and several smaller jurisdictions.[48] No changes in this trend have been reported since 1950. The trend in the late forties of increasing use of the sliding-scale wage policy in private business, however, has been reversed, largely owing to the relative stabilization of price levels in the middle fifties.[49]

An automatic wage-adjustment system obviously requires delegation of authority for modifying salary scales to the agency responsible for instituting changes. This does not appear to be a fundamental objection to an automatic plan. The delegation would not be one of a policy-determining power but would merely be an authorization to an administrative agency to act contingent upon the finding of certain facts. This type of delegation is familiar in many fields and certainly has few objectionable characteristics *per se*. Moreover, the question of the final provision of the necessary funds is always in the hands of the legislature. Through this means alone the legislative branch exercises and should exercise control over wages.

There are some real difficulties with the cost-of-living schemes. Price levels vary and wage levels will vary accordingly. But each affects the other, and under special circumstances, such as those prevailing in Washington, where most workers are government employees, this fact may be sufficient to complicate the working of any such plan. There is some evidence to suggest that in Washington general money wage increases are followed almost immediately by general price increases. This is, however, a special situation and would present no problem where public employees were a minority of all workers.

More serious is the inadequacy of price data and cost-of-living statistics in the United States, which has served to retard the whole movement. Even where such data are extensive, there are technical considerations which make it difficult to determine a living base wage. Future adjustments under such circumstances may merely perpetuate unsatisfactory conditions.

[48] For the most recent summary see "Cost of Living Pay Adjustment Plans," *Public Management*, September, 1948, pp. 260–265; Ovid Blix and Norman N. Gill, "Milwaukee Local Governments Join in Salary Adjustment Plan," *National Municipal Review*, October, 1943, pp. 482–486; and Earl L. Berg, "Minnesota's Cost-of-Living Pay Plan," *State Government*, May, 1949, pp. 140–142.

[49] Lily Mary David and Donald L. Helm, "Wage Escalation—Recent Developments," *Monthly Labor Review*, March, 1955, pp. 315–318. For earlier developments see National Industrial Conference Board, *Cost of Living Provisions in Union Contracts*, Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 113 (New York: 1951).

There is a tendency to regard base rates as sacrosanct—a rock upon which the British plan foundered—and thus to make more difficult the correction of original inequities. Moreover, unless factors other than the cost of living are considered, the desirable approximate equilibrium between public and private wages may be so seriously upset that the recruitment process is impeded.

Consumers' price indexes are not perfect measures of true living costs. For example, "The Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is a statistical measure of changes in prices of the goods and services bought by families of city wage earners and clerical workers. It measures only changes in prices; it tells nothing about changes in the kinds and amounts of goods and services families buy, or the total amount families spend for living, or the differences in living costs in different places. . . ."[50] Also, employees and families have different total incomes and different responsibilities, which create widely varying patterns of expenditure. Furthermore, because of purchase of more or different goods and services, a mere index of prices does not measure changes in living costs. Nevertheless, automatic pay adjustment according to price indexes provides a rough relationship between pay and costs that is superior to the typical situation in the American public service, where pay scales fail to keep pace at all with economic conditions.

One of the early Federal investigating commissions suggested that "the government worker should look to the legislature and not to any administrative agency to prevent his wages from falling due to changes of a broad character in the price level."[51] This proposal is both unsound and unworkable. Wage standardization and adjustment are primarily an administrative job, even though they become ultimately subject to legislative decisions. If standardization is to cut across departmental lines, logic dictates a central agency, adequately qualified and equipped to keep the standard scheme intact and up to date. With shifting conditions in the market and shifting price levels, this means continuous investigations and consequent changes in salary standards. The prescription of sound policies and the provision of proper machinery to care for such changes are in keeping with good management. There are feasible remedies for the static wage practices generally characteristic of the American public in the role of employer.

When management is indifferent to the need of continuous adjustments and workers are forced to defend their own interests, pressure groups organize and become active as lobbyists. Successful groups may easily throw the whole salary policy out of gear, as the police and firemen have done in many a locality. Salary administration should not be a matter of partisan

[50] *The Consumer Price Index, A Short Description of the Index as Revised, 1953,* Bureau of Labor Statistics, January, 1953, p. 1.

[51] *Closing Report of Wage and Personnel Survey,* p. 230.

politics, of group pressures, or of personal influence. Salary rates may not be subject to scientific determination, but decisions should be reached in the light of various pertinent facts and principles that have been approved in practice.

SUMMARY

Governments generally have given inadequate attention to the methods of determining a sound and equitable wage structure or to what might well be termed the philosophy of public wages. This is, of course, not everywhere true, and the notable ferment in the public personnel field in recent decades has had some effect on pay policy. By and large, however, the situation leaves much to be desired. Among the consequences of the absence of comprehensive wage policies are inequalities in salary schedules, difficulties in respect to recruitment and turnover as a result of the greater attraction of outside employment, failure to maintain relatively stable wage levels in terms of real earnings, decreased efficiency, and lowered morale. Even in the Federal service there is no coördination among pay rates for employees under the Classification Act, wage-board employees, postal employees, the military services, and numerous special groups, and, as yet, no central authority to gather the necessary basic wage data to report to either the President or Congress.

Among the basic factors involved in the determination of a public wage policy, the following are of major importance: on the economic side, that the government should pay rates that are roughly comparable with those paid by the best private employers; on the social side, that even the lowest rates should afford the workers the means for maintaining a minimum standard of living according to the requirements of health and decency. If certain key points are pegged on a salary schedule in accordance with these criteria, the whole schedule can be set up on a rational and systematic basis.

The movement for the standardization of salaries, marching hand in hand with that for classification, has made real headway in the larger jurisdictions. Wherever standardization has been attempted, some decision as to wage policy has been forced. Of major influence in the states have been the requirements as to merit systems attached to Federal grants-in-aid for social security and health functions. Public pay scales have especially improved since World War II under the pressure of a tremendous rise in the cost of living after wartime price controls were relaxed. Perhaps the majority of public authorities still fail to employ wages and wage scales as incentives. Automatic salary increases are still the rule, rather than the exception, and faithful mediocrity is as well rewarded as creative effort. However, great progress has been and is still being made.

Of primary importance is the need to charge some qualified agency with

the responsibility for currently reviewing salary and wage conditions and reporting its findings to the legislative body. The customary practice of ignoring this problem until a crisis arises, when long-drawn-out investigations are carried on, is short-sighted and costly from every standpoint. The predominating wish at such a time is to "settle the matter once and for all." As the preceding analysis must have shown, there are too many variables to permit of any such final settlement. The most basic improvement, then, would be the assignment of keeping salaries up to date and properly adjusted to the central personnel agency and providing it with sufficient funds to perform this function satisfactorily.

PART IV

Motivation and Productivity

The striking thing about this new science of human relations is not the vast areas of what is unknown—which many are fond of emphasizing—but the degree to which what is known is not used.

—Alexander H. Leighton, as stated to Eileen Ahern, "Preventive Psychiatry in Industry," *Management News* (American Management Association, New York), January 28, 1949, p. 3

Although we may not know clearly exactly what morale is, we do know some of the elements upon which it depends and without which it is unable to survive.

—Arthur L. Rautman, "Employee Morale," *Personnel Administration*, November, 1950, p. 4

11

Leadership and the Will to Work

Wherever you have democratic and sympathetic administration, wherever you have men working co-operatively for a common ideal, there will you have morale also—not like a guardian angel to protect either workers or management, but like a goddess of beauty to give point to the works of man.

—*Arthur L. Rautman*[1]

I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MORALE

Good executives have come to realize that the most important part of an organization is *the people in it;* that *how they work together, how they are led, and how they lead* are far more important than all the mechanical efficiencies imaginable. An increasing number of leaders are recognizing personnel administration in broad terms as a positive mission to improve performance by developing among the employees of an organization *a sense of "belonging"* and *a sense of unity of purpose* which combine to maintain what all of us can understand but rarely see, namely, *high morale.* This does not

[1] "Employee Morale," *Personnel Administration,* November, 1950, p. 7. Among significant documents in the field covered by this chapter are: *Employee Relations in the Public Service,* A Report Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly by the Committee on Employee Relations in the Public Service, Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman (Chicago: 1942); Ordway Tead, *The Art of Leadership* (New York: 1935); F. J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, *Management and the Worker* (Cambridge: 1939); Elton Mayo, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization* (Cambridge: 1945); John M. Pfiffner, *The Supervision of Personnel; Human Relations in the Management of Men* (New York: 1951); Morris S. Viteles, *Motivation and Morale in Industry* (New York: 1953); and Hugh Cabot and Joseph A. Kahl, *Human Relations,* "Concepts" (Vol. I) and "Cases" (Vol. II) in *Concrete Social Science* (Cambridge: 1953). Excellent popular treatments of the revolutionary impact of the social sciences on modern organization and human relations may be found in Stuart Chase's *The Proper Study of Mankind* (New York: 1948) and *Roads to Agreement* (New York: 1951).

These are but a few samples of the growing literature on this subject, which is more fully reflected in the Bibliography at the end of the book. Two outstanding bibliographies are Alfred De Grazia, *Human Relations in Public Administration,* An Annotated Bibliography (Public Administration Service, Chicago: 1949); and John M. Pfiffner, "A Human Relations Reading List," *Personnel,* September, 1949, pp. 133–145.

mean something separate from the various aspects of personnel administration discussed in other chapters. Certainly, in those organizations in which there is not some effort at job evaluation and "equal pay for equal work," it is pretty difficult to achieve very high morale. Certainly, where selections and promotions are made on some basis other than merit, respect for one's employer is not likely to be very high. Certainly, where performance is evaluated perfunctorily or unfairly, there is not very fertile soil for development of a genuine *esprit de corps.*

In a broad sense, therefore, the inculcation of morale, of that spirit, that state of mind, which expresses itself in loyalty, enthusiasm, coöperation, pride in the service, and devotion to duty, is the end of the whole personnel system. Every aspect of the personnel program, from recruitment to retirement, may be handled so that it is either an incentive or a depressant to individual and group morale. In a very real sense, this whole work is devoted to a consideration of ways of building and maintaining this most valuable asset of any organization.

Alexander Leighton defines the morale concept as follows: "*Morale is the capacity of a group of people to pull together persistently and consistently in pursuit of a common purpose.*" He goes on to say that morale, thus defined, is dependent on (1) the confidence that individual members of the group have in the purpose of the group; (2) the confidence that they have in the leadership; (3) the confidence that they have in each other; (4) the organizational efficiency of the group—both formally and through the "grapevine" or over a cup of coffee; and (5) the mental, emotional, and physical health of the individuals. After elaborating on these, he reminds us that sometimes it is impossible to keep all of these factors in equal balance, and that weakness in one does not necessarily mean low overall morale. "This is a very useful fact, especially in government work where adventitious factors may sweep in and upset the best laid plans. As a person with responsibility for the morale of an organization, you may be up against a law or the decision of a Congressional Committee that adversely affects one of the five factors." But, visualizing morale as a table supported by these five legs, he observes that removal of one leg still does not keep the table from standing. "If the missing leg cannot be replaced one can still keep the table top from collapse by giving attention to the other legs and not leaving them to the termites."[2]

In this chapter attention is turned to those features of the will to work that are sometimes grouped together as "employee relations" or "human

[2] Leighton, "Applied Science of Human Relations," *Personnel Administration*, July, 1947, pp. 4–6. Dr. Leighton is the author of *The Governing of Men* (Princeton: 1945). This study of the motivation of work groups, based on experiences in the relocation communities housing Japanese Americans during World War II, won the first Human Relations Award given by the Society for the Advancement of Management in 1946. He also has written *Human Relations in a Changing World* (New York: 1949).

relations." The position taken here is that one of the most significant factors affecting morale is a sense of importance enjoyed by the members of the working staff. If the conditions surrounding the work life of the individual contribute to the feeling that he "belongs," that he "counts," that his fellow workers and his superiors look upon him as having *worth*, not alone as a producer but also as a human being, his morale will be high. Self-respect depends largely upon the respect in which one is held by others. Those interested in the morale of the organization will give thought to the methods, procedures, and attitudes of management in regard to this feature. Are they so developed and designed that the individual members of the working staff are of consequence as individuals? This goes to the heart of employee relations. It covers all the thousands, if not millions, of human contacts that accumulate over the course of a single working day in any good-sized organization. Modern analyses of personnel matters have laid increasing emphasis on supervisor-employee relations and on executive leadership, since the bulk of the contacts between worker and management are conditioned by these factors.

Even the routine worker engaged in a humdrum job wants recognition as a person in his peculiar right. He does not relish being a number any more than he enjoys being ordered about in the peremptory tones usually associated with minor officers in the army. He wants to know the reason why, to feel that what he is doing is important, and even to have the privilege of having something of a "say" about what he is called upon to do and how he does it. The awareness of such stirrings and desires on the part of workers has done much toward making "industrial relations" one of the major activities of management in forward-looking private concerns.

II. THE ELEMENTS OF SATISFACTORY HUMAN RELATIONS

This statement is attributed to editor H. L. Mencken: "There is always an easy solution to every human problem—neat, plausible, and wrong." If this bit of cynicism is taken to mean that we should be wary of pat formulas and panaceas to solve human relationship problems, then it is very much worth bearing in mind. If, on the other hand, it is taken to disparage our having any guideposts in conducting human affairs, it is seriously overdrawn.

It is certainly not the purpose of this chapter to insist that all the answers to human problems have been found. But it must be acknowledged that modern research plus ethical considerations point to some basic principles that deserve careful attention.

The basic objectives of good human relations are not unrelated to principles that have been found desirable in our national life and in our social way of living. Even when we talk of such concepts as democracy and the Golden Rule, we are not far afield from the mainsprings of human behavior.

The findings of social psychologists today seem to confirm the thinking of some of the ancient Greek philosophers like Plato, the prophets and disciples of Biblical times, and the fathers of our country. Nevertheless, we owe a great deal to modern psychologists for systematizing and rationalizing the justification for the use of democratic techniques *inside a working organization* just as we have justified them on a larger scale in the organization of our society as a whole. Democracy does not come automatically with us as individuals. We may have drives within us that compel us to act contrary to the principles that we accept intellectually. Then there are those who naturally do the right thing without ever having analyzed the principles of human relations intellectually.[3]

A. BASIC EMOTIONAL NEEDS

Students of the subject have pointed out that the members of an organization must satisfy several fundamental psychological needs in order to be happy and productive. These are the needs for a *sense of security*, a *sense of success* (*achievement and recognition*), and a *sense of belongingness*. The broadest and most basic need is for security. In some ways, it actually comprehends the others.

By a sense of security we do not mean economic security, although that is a part of it. More than that, we mean security in knowing what is going on, security in the feeling that one's work is wanted, that he is part of the group, that his boss is going to react in some predictable way to certain actions and not by whim or caprice, and that he has a reasonable opportunity to get self-expression into his work. It means that he must be given as much freedom to "create" as is consistent with coördination of effort among many human beings, to utilize his mind and his skill as fully as possible. Developing a working situation in which employees have this sense of security should be a fundamental objective of every good supervisor.

Part of the meaning of security is found in the satisfactions derived from

[3] John M. Pfiffner observes: "The manager gets the most out of people by displaying his confidence and respect in them as human beings. His approach to supervision is characterized by consultation, participation, and two-way communication. Such behavior is indicative of strength rather than weakness. This is not a copybook maxim based primarily upon ethical considerations. It is beginning to emerge as a scientific truth from the pioneering researches now going on."—"Management Must Manage," *Public Management*, November, 1953, p. 245.

James C. Worthy, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce and later Assistant to the Chairman of Sears, Roebuck and Company, has said: "Technical improvements made possible by the application of scientific methods, the material advances provided by higher wage scales, shorter hours, generous employee benefits, better working conditions, and the like, are all important, but none of them reaches the heart of the problem—which is what lies in the hearts of the individual men and women who comprise the management of American industry."—"Management Attitude and Employee Morale," *The Management Review*, December, 1954, p. 790.

achievement and recognition. This sense of success refers to the feeling that one is making progress, that there is general acceptance of one's work, that one is achieveing what he set out to achieve, that one is realizing the potentialities of his skill and his ability. Such emotional satisfaction is affected not only by *what* one accomplishes but also by *how* those with whom one works *react* to what one accomplishes. People work not for bread alone but for the satisfaction of social acceptance. We all know the killing effect of working for an organization or an individual that seldom, if ever, indicates to us that we have done a good job on something.

We also know that standards set unreasonably high do not always make success experience possible. A social psychologist tells this story of his experience in a garment factory:

> The particular sewing line had the day's quota written on the blackboard in front of the long line of machines. The quota was written as 180 dozen garments a day. The women were sewing on the average of 100 dozen garments per day. Dr. French in talking to the supervisor discovered that the quota actually had been reduced to 140 dozen garments per day because of lack of machines and materials. He asked the supervisor why the quota hadn't been changed on the blackboard. "If you do that," said the supervisor, "they'd think you were lowering your standards and they'd really lie down on the job." Dr. French urged him to tell one girl what the real quota was and see the results. After doing so the supervisor came running back and said, "That really changed her! I'm going to tell all of them." The quota was announced as 140 dozen garments per day and production jumped to nearly 120 dozen garments per day.[4]

This example illustrates very clearly many of the misunderstandings that supervisors and managers have of the meaning of success.

At this point it is well not to overlook the importance as a motivational factor of the character and prestige of the work itself. This is, of course, more valid in professional work and in the higher reaches of an organization than in menial jobs. In a survey of fifty-five senior scientists in the Federal service *the work to be done* was listed more frequently than any other item as the major recruiting attraction and the principal holding power.[5] This resource cannot be tapped as dependably, of course, in occupations involving repetitive, manual tasks. But the public service, more than industry, is fortunate in having many routine jobs that entail interesting and sometimes fascinating duties. Also, there is always the satisfaction growing out of the importance of the work to the public welfare or safety. These considerations are too infrequently emphasized either in the recruitment or in the supervision of public employees.

[4] J. R. P. French, Jr., of Nejelski and Company, Management Counsels, of New York; quoted in Leland P. Bradford and Ronald Lippitt, "Employee Success in Work Groups," *Personnel Administration*, December, 1945, p. 6.

[5] Subcommittee on Scientific Personnel, Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development, *The Scientist in Government* (Washington: August, 1954), p. 4.

Much of the sense of achievement in a work force is lost through failure to recognize the pleasure to be found in the kind of work performed. This fact, of course, has implications for the organization of work: where mechanistic, material, or layout considerations may dictate one pattern, this may not take into account job satisfaction for the worker. It is for this reason more than any other that we see a trend away from that routinization of tasks in industry which had narrowed jobs down to absurd specializations, as on assembly lines.

Finally, workers are not likely to be contented and productive unless they feel that they have a personal place in the work group. An office, a plant, or a store is as much a social unit as it is a productive enterprise. Being "accepted" in that little "society" as a respected individual is often as vital to the employee as drawing his pay check. In fact, some studies have shown that this need for a sense of belongingness is even more important to many persons than the amount of pay they receive. Like the need for achievement and recognition, this need for belongingness is in essence a facet of the basic personal security of the individual. It is a form of recognition, not so much of achievement, but of personal worth and significance. With it, the individual is "one of the gang"; without it, he feels unwanted and is likely to be viewed as eccentric or at least as an "outsider."

Conditions of employment and supervision are rarely such that the needs for security, achievement, and belongingness are fully met. Circumstances vary in the degree to which they satisfy these needs, and there are infinite varieties of combinations. Also, individuals vary considerably in the degree to which their needs in these directions have to be satisfied in order to keep them working as useful members of a group. We can observe, however, without too much research, the effect of the extremes—where satisfaction of these basic emotional needs is either fairly complete or almost totally absent. In the one instance we find a happy, productive working force; in the other, conflict, frustration, and stomach ulcers. The alternative to giving serious attention to the fundamental psychological needs of human beings is generally destructive of all that we are seeking when we bring people to work together in a common enterprise.

B. DEMOCRATIC MANAGEMENT

What, then, does a sense of security, of achievement and recognition, of belongingness, have to do with democracy in administration? "Democratic management" is not the idle dream of impractical idealists. One may say, "After all, how can the head of an organization exercise his responsibility and authority if he must do everything by getting a majority vote of his staff on the matter?" This interpretation misses the point. The important aspect of democracy in management is the process of winning consent. It is perfectly true that one can get things done in a way by strict discipline

and absolute orders, but experimentation has shown that one can get a lot more done by enlisting the whole-hearted participation of a work force and working toward a common end. The key is that if that work force is convinced that it is working toward a desirable objective, is convinced that it can achieve that objective coöperatively, has some choice in methods taken to reach the goal, and is able to see and participate in the results that grow out of that objective, then we have democracy in management.

Democracy in management does not mean that the supervisor need ever take a ballot. It does mean that he must consult with his staff frequently. It does mean that he must give them a chance to express themselves, to think with him in arriving at a decision rather than just to receive decisions, to be free to apply their own intelligence rather than being told every detailed step in how they must perform a task. They need teaching and leading, but teaching and leading are far different arts from ordering and commanding.

The point is that this democratic approach has been found to be the most effective means of meeting the needs of employee groups for security and the related basic satisfactions. It certainly is consistent with allowing employees to find some motivation in the work itself.

C. EXPERIENCE WITH THESE PRINCIPLES

Quite naturally one may wonder to what extent some of these ideas on human relations have been proved. Actually there have been some controlled experiments. An educated person would no more think of concluding that he needed to eat a pound of liver a day to keep fit merely because he knew someone who seemed to thrive on it than he would rely solely on patent medicines for good health. Yet every day many otherwise intelligent people in their work relations and in their supervision apply and even propagate ideas on human relations and conduct that are strange indeed when checked against the findings of modern psychology.

Perhaps the first and most significant bit of research in this area was one which grew accidentally out of a study made in the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company in Chicago, which was begun before 1930.[6] That progressive company started out to explore the effect of good lighting on certain work groups. They discovered that, when lighting was increased step by step over a period of time, production increased correspondingly. Fortunately, they were thorough researchers and decided to check their findings by *reducing* the amount of light. To their astonishment, production continued to rise and did so until the lighting was no brighter than moonlight.

Psychologists and engineers from Harvard University and from the company staff were called in to probe more deeply. They found, after much

[6] The study is described in full in Roethlisberger and Dickson, *op. cit.* Also see the popular description in Stuart Chase, *Men at Work* (New York: 1941), Chap. 2.

painstaking effort, that the workers in the test groups had come to feel important—because they were being given all this attention! They had a feeling of not being "bossed." These researchers seemed more interested in the workers' welfare than in production. But, as a result, production continued to go up. Furthermore, where individuals had problems at home, they depended critically on a favorable social climate in their work situation to make up for it. In other words, the Hawthorne studies were revealing what the philosophers have been saying for centuries—that one's efforts are affected more by his *attitudes* than they are by physical surroundings. The problem in management is to find out about and influence, as favorably as possible, those attitudes. The Hawthorne studies, carried on over a period of sixteen years and costing a million dollars, were milestones in the development of personnel administration. Stuart Chase has said: "If managers of factories the country over were intimately aware of what the research men at Hawthorne discovered, American industry would be *revolutionized.*"[7]

Another illustration of research in this field is a much more obscure project that was conducted by a group of social psychologists at the University of Iowa some years ago. They operated on the principle that adult psychology was pretty much like child psychology, with the exception that children could be studied more easily because their reactions were more pointed and less repressed. They organized groups of twelve-year-old boys into separate clubs which were set up to make various articles of handicraft. Each club had an adult leader. Leaders in some of the clubs played the role of an autocrat who decided everything that was to be done without consultation with the boys. They had complete autocratic control. Others played the role of a laissez-faire leader who took no responsibility for leadership at all but just let the groups drift. Finally there were leaders of clubs who played a democratic role—that of stimulating thinking, suggesting alternative things to do, and helping the boys decide on their projects. Then the boys' groups were rotated under different leadership. Invariably, the research showed that handicraft production was substantially higher under democratic leadership than it was under laissez-faire and slightly higher than it was under autocratic. Also, the happiness of the boys was considerably greater, and there was far less conflict among the boys and less jealousy under the democratic leadership than under either of the others. And this was all true even with the same boys when leadership was changed.[8]

Since World War II, the Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan has been conducting studies in a number of private business

[7] Chase, *Men at Work*, p. 9.

[8] Ronald Lippitt and Ralph K. White, "The Social Climate of Children's Groups," in *Child Behavior and Development*, edited by Roger G. Barker, Jacob S. Kounin, and Herbert F. Wright (New York and London: 1943).

establishments. One relating to the Prudential Insurance Company of America made a careful study of the characteristics of different kinds of supervision as related to production.[9] It arrived at these brief summary conclusions: that *first-line supervisors* in the *high production* work groups differed from those in *low production* groups in that they (1) were under less close supervision from *their own* supervisors; (2) placed less direct emphasis upon production as the goal; (3) encouraged employee participation in the making of decisions; (4) were more employee-centered; (5) spent more of their time in *supervision* and less in straight production work; (6) had a greater feeling of confidence in their supervisory roles; (7) felt that they knew where *they* stood with the company. In other words, the studies show that the *direct* route to increased production is not necessarily the best one. Refinements in later studies have borne out these general findings, even though various subsidiary questions were being pursued.[10]

In passing, we may say that there are some fundamental principles of good supervision, but it is important to stress that there is no strict pattern for it and that there are no precise practices and skills which can be acquired by rote and which automatically make people good supervisors. *Instead, we must be certain of the emotional maturity of our leaders and provide a long process of education in human relations, so that supervisors can naturally and automatically arrive at the right method in a given situation rather than try to apply some set rules on a "canned" basis to any problem that may arise.* Every human problem is a little different. That is why we are stressing the "mission" of personnel administration rather than the "techniques."

Interest and testimony regarding this approach to the leadership of work groups is everywhere at hand. Two eminent students of industrial relations state:

> Good personnel administration helps individuals to utilize their capacities to the full and to attain not only maximum individual satisfaction from their work but also *satisfaction as part of a work group.* Though he is merged in the group, the individual is not necessarily submerged in it. . . .
>
> . . . If people are skillfully handled both as individuals and as group members, they will respond by giving their best work to the organization of which they are a part. This is another way of saying that democracy is stronger and more effective than authoritarianism and that, in business as well as in government, where men and women are free they will be happier and work more effectively than if they are regimented.[11]

[9] *Productivity, Supervision, and Employee Morale,* Human Relations Series 1, Report 1, University of Michigan, Survey Research Center (Ann Arbor: 1948).

[10] See, for example, Daniel Katz, Nathan Maccoby, Gerald Gurin, and Lucretia G. Floor, *Productivity, Supervision, and Morale Among Railroad Workers* (Ann Arbor: 1951), and various similar studies.

[11] Paul Pigors and Charles A. Myers, *Personnel Administration,* 2nd ed. (New York: 1951), p. 7.

James C. Worthy, out of both governmental and business experience, advises:

> The purpose of a human organization, whether business or otherwise, can be defined only in terms of the purposes of the people in it. Unlike the component parts of a machine, the people who comprise a human organization are something more than just parts of that organization. They are flesh-and-blood men and women, with sentiments, ambitions, and needs of their own ranging far beyond the confines of the organization. The extent to which these people serve the needs of the organization willingly and enthusiastically depends upon the extent to which the organization serves their needs as sentient, aspiring human beings.[12]

In a significant series of articles in *Harper's Magazine*, Peter F. Drucker called attention to findings that industrial strikes are really grounded in the absence of democratic methods of management rather than in the superficial disputes over hours and wages. He urged: "The first job management has to do is to acknowledge the fact that it does not know how the worker sees things from his angle of vision, that it does not understand how the worker acts and reacts, and that it is management's job to find out"; and he concludes: "But a real solution of this problem can come only if the worker is allowed—perhaps even forced—to participate responsibly in the management of the community life of the plant."[13]

Government executives have become increasingly aware of the importance of these principles within their own domains. Appleby, for example, captured the feeling in the following:

> The spirit of consideration for the citizen affected by governmental action must be fostered first in the administration of the department itself. Administration used to be thought of simply as giving orders and getting compliance. But it has already been shown that organizations cannot actually be so run. In recent years recognition has been growing that, by themselves, mechanical coordination and legal delegation can never call forth the full zeal of an organization or get the full advantage of the abilities of all its personnel. And that is the newer goal. Government departments which are themselves responsive and considerate and which operate with appreciation for human dignity and human diversity within their own staffs are the only ones that can hope to be able to have their personnel take a similar attitude with respect to the public with which they deal.[14]

[12] James C. Worthy, "Changing Concepts of the Personnel Function," *Personnel*, November, 1948, p. 170. In addition, see the following articles in *Personnel:* Leland P. Bradford and Ronald Lippitt, "Building a Democratic Work Group," November, 1945; and Bradford, "Building Employee Security," January, 1946.

[13] Peter F. Drucker, "The Way to Industrial Peace: II. Citizenship in the Plant," *Harper's Magazine*, December, 1946, pp. 512, 519. The other two articles in the series are "I. Why Men Strike," November, 1946, and "III. Can We Get Around the Roadblocks?" January, 1947.

[14] Reprinted from *Big Democracy* by Paul H. Appleby by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Copyright 1945 by Paul H. Appleby, p. 127. The principle applies, of course, to the field of educational administration also. An engaging presentation of the democratic approach

The subject even reached the status of eloquent presentation in a public document when one member of the first Hoover Commission, James K. Pollock, saw fit to supplement the main report of the commission with the following views:

> Certainly the objectives of intelligent personnel management are to obtain competent employees, and having them, to provide the climate which will be most conducive to superior performance, proper attitudes and harmonious adjustments. This is a problem of human relations, requiring an understanding of human motivation. It is a problem of satisfying the needs of individuals within the context of agency needs.
>
> Personnel management must do this by directing its attention to problems of orientation, placement, working conditions, on-the-job training, and counseling. The employee must be made to feel that he belongs in the organization, that he is creatively, not passively participating, and that he is contributing to its total effort. All these are factors now too much neglected, but nevertheless vital to high morale in working-group situations.[15]

The possibility of more serious attention to the human element in management of the public service is, to say the least, encouraging.

III. PROGRAMS TO FOSTER GOOD HUMAN RELATIONS

As stated earlier, all phases of personnel management should contribute to satisfactory human relations and morale and therefore the will to work. Here we are merely sketching certain areas of activity and attitudes of management which are especially important to high morale but have not been discussed explicitly elsewhere in this book.

A. SELECTION OF SUPERVISORS FOR LEADERSHIP

Of major importance in any organization are the day-by-day and hour-by-hour relationships between executives, foremen, and supervisors, and the individual members of the force. The personnel department or chief executive may decide upon policies of one sort or another, may even issue orders and require reports, but many other supervisors run the works so far as personnel management is concerned. Personnel administration is not an activity of a few specialists. It is an activity of everyone who has to get along with other people and particularly everyone who has to lead other people. On top of that, supervisors, especially those at the executive levels, need to be well-adjusted individuals themselves.

In spite of this obvious truth, it is still routine in government, as in business, to select supervisors on the basis of their subject-matter ability rather

---

in university administration is found in Eldon L. Johnson, "Dear Dean Misanthrope," *Journal of Higher Education*, May, 1949, pp. 258–264.

[15] "Additional Views of Commissioner Pollock," in *Personnel Management* (Washington: 1949), pp. 50–51.

than their leadership ability. It is not enough these days to be trained in a profession. We have reason to be dissatisfied with the training that the technicians and professional people are getting, in most places, in human relations. All supervisors need to be personnel experts of sorts; it is obvious that the field cannot be isolated for the attention of a few. Vocational and professional schools cannot presume to turn out a finished product unless the graduate is acquainted with the study that man has made of human relations and with the heritage that we have in our whole democratic society. There is a tremendous bond of relationship between the principles which we revere in our political and social organization and those which govern our behavior in administrative organizations. We are simply being consistent with ourselves when we extend democracy and the Golden Rule to our workaday lives as well as to our political ideals and to our moral values.

The public service has not entirely neglected modern supervisory selection methods. Many executives have the knack of observing human relations skills in others. In filling supervisory posts they steer away from persons who display anxieties when they are up against the obligation to make decisions; they watch out for individuals who find it necessary to punish others for mistakes or inadequacies; they avoid men and women who get easily aroused. In short, they have found that the worst mistakes in selecting supervisors can be avoided by a shrewd evaluation of the character and personality of candidates on nonsupervisory jobs. The significance of these simple guides is not to be overlooked. They do not, however, minimize the usefulness of more formal and objective selection devices.

Some notable studies have been carried on by the U.S. Civil Service Commission in tests for administrative ability.[16] Likewise, there has been significant experimentation with tests of supervisory skills, as one selection criterion, in the Department of the Navy, the Bureau of Old Age and

[16] See, for example, the discussion in Milton M. Mandell, "Testing for Administrative and Supervisory Positions," *Public Personnel Review*, October, 1948, pp. 190–193, and "Selection of Blue-Collar and White-Collar Supervisors," *Personnel*, March, 1948, pp. 321–328. For technical discussions by the same author see "The Validity of Written Tests for the Selection of Administrative Personnel," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Autumn, 1946, pp. 293–313, and "The Selection of Foremen," *ibid.*, Autumn, 1947, pp. 385–397. The latter article describes a program in the Navy Department field installations.

Some of the best analyses of the elements of supervision and of how to find and develop supervisory talent are found in the splendid articles by John M. Pfiffner which have appeared in *Personnel:* "An Outline of the Supervisor's Job," November, 1946; "A Pattern for Improved Supervisory Leadership," January, 1948; and "Selection and Development of Supervisors," January, 1949. See also *The Supervisor's Management Guide*, American Management Association (New York: 1949). A summary of the subject is found in a report entitled "What's New in Supervisory Selection and Development," *Personnel Administration*, July, 1949.

Executives are commonly required to handle a variety of stress situations as much as, or more than, technical knowledge. Of special value to the study of assessment techniques under stress situations is the report by the O.S.S. Assessment Staff, *Assessment of Men: Selection of Personnel for the Office of Strategic Services* (New York: 1948).

Survivors Insurance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Post Office Department, and other Federal establishments. But the prevailing pattern still calls for primary reliance on tests or measures of technical competence rather than human relations skills.

There is no magic formula by which the specialists in any profession can guarantee that they will be good managers. The greatest possibility lies in supplementing their own information and in urging the inclusion, in the schools and colleges for their profession as well as for others, of enough training in the social and psychological and administrative sciences so that a person who achieves some reasonable success in the field will be equipped to deal with his *human* problems as well as with his *technical* problems.

The public service, like industry, must also resort to in-service training to supplement the preparation of technicians for supervisory duty. This is discussed in greater detail in the chapter "Staff Development and Training." Suffice it to say here that the selection and training of supervisors become tasks of basic importance under enlightened management. What is wanted is supervisors who will not alone get the work out but also do it in such a way that the subordinates find some personal satisfaction in the doing of a job. This calls for understanding, coöperation, and even a kind of comradeship. The worker is never merely a worker. He is a sentient and highly sensitive social being, responsive to all sorts of real and perhaps at times some imaginary influences.[17] The alert supervisor brought up under a modern personnel system will have appreciation of leadership in both an economic and a social situation. He will not appeal to the authority of his position but rather to the authority that grows out of his experience, his superior knowledge and understanding—above all, his understanding of human beings endowed with the normal aspiration to count in all situations.

A survey of modern research studies by one writer resulted in the following conclusions as to qualities which make for successful leadership:

1. The leader is somewhat more intelligent than the average of his followers. However, he is not so superior that he cannot be readily understood by those who work with him.

2. The leader is a well-rounded individual from the standpoint of interests and aptitudes. He tends toward interests, aptitudes, and knowledge with respect to a wide variety of fields.

3. The leader has an unusual facility with language. He speaks and writes simply, persuasively and understandably.

4. The leader is mentally and emotionally mature. He has come of age mentally and emotionally as well as physically.

5. The leader has a powerful inner drive or motivation which impels him to strive for accomplishment.

[17] "For the employee in industry, the whole working environment must be looked upon as being permeated with social significance."—Roethlisberger and Dickson, *op. cit.*, p. 374; see also Chap. 25.

6. The leader is fully aware of the importance of cooperative effort in getting things done, and therefore understands and practices very effectively the so-called social skills.

7. The leader relies on his administrative skills to a much greater extent than he does on any of the technical skills which may be associated directly with his work.[18]

A most important level in management is that at the top. Not only must we avoid pet schemes and formulas to achieve good supervision by short cut; we must also recognize that first-line supervisors and middle management cannot do a very good job without the best of supervision from the top management, right up to the chief executive of the organization. Supervisors themselves are workers and will reflect to their subordinates substantially the kind of treatment and attitude which they get from their own superiors. Therefore, the attributes of a good supervisor, which we have been discussing, must be possessed in a very high degree indeed by top executives. They should be the most sought-after aspect of a man's ability when a top administrative position is to be filled.[19] This is a field in which the public service has considerable room for improvement.

B. CONSCIOUSNESS OF COMMUNICATION

Although communication can hardly be isolated as a "program," attention must be called to the problems of communication in any enterprise. Communication in one form or another exists regardless of what is done about it. Here we need simply to be reminded of the necessity for management and employees to be conscious of its existence and of its quality, smoothness, and accuracy, and to be deliberate about making improvements.

Modern writers have stressed the importance of "informal organization" and of the "grapevine" as a means of transfer of information and news among the staff.[20] Too often such is the major channel of communication because management does not open up the overt channels or because it

[18] Cecil E. Goode, "Significant Research on Leadership," *Personnel*, March, 1951, p. 349. See also the lengthy series of pamphlets by the American Management Association on supervision and communication, such as the three in the *AMA Human Relations Reading Kit* (New York: 1952).

[19] See O. Glenn Stahl, "What a Bureaucrat Thinks About Executives," *Journal of Social Issues*, December, 1945. Outstanding works written from the standpoint of private industry include Glen U. Cleeton and Charles W. Mason, *Executive Ability, Its Discovery and Development* (Yellow Springs, Ohio: 1946); Bernard Haldane, "A Pattern for Executive Placement," *Harvard Business Review*, Autumn, 1947; William E. Henry, *Identifying the Potentially Successful Executive*, American Management Association Personnel Series, No. 127 (New York: 1949); Rexford Hersey, *Individualized Executive Selection, Training, and Follow-up*, American Management Association Personnel Series, No. 89 (New York: 1945); Benjamin M. Selekman, "Wanted: Mature Managers," *Harvard Business Review*, Winter, 1946 (this article also appears as Chap. 7 in *Labor Relations and Human Relations* [New York: 1947]); and John W. Stokes, "Selecting Executive Successors," *Industry*, December, 1948. See also Chaps. 7, 8, and 16 in Tead, *op. cit.*

[20] See, for example, Herbert Simon, *Administrative Behavior* (New York: 1950). For a good brief discussion see Pfiffner, *The Supervision of Personnel*, Chap. 8.

fails to take employees into its confidence. And the informal channels, as a result, frequently convey misinformation rather than facts. Any group of people associated to get work done automatically constitutes a kind of social organism that devises its own ways of keeping alive through exchange of intelligence as to "what is going on." The answer to poor communication lies not in suppression of these natural, informal channels (which probably is impossible anyway) but in keeping a two-way flow of information free of obstructions.

Research in communication within industrial organizations has led to articulation of a few principles which may be summarized as follows:

1. Communication—oral and written—is the lifeblood of an enterprise. It is the means by which human beings work together.

2. Communication is a two-way process. Employees should know the goals of the organization, why management is proceeding the way it is, what changes are in the works. Management should know what employees are thinking and feeling, what ideas they have to get the job done.

3. Communication involves *receiving* and *understanding* as well as *telling*. Words, ideas, or proposals do not always mean the same thing to the receiver that they mean to the transmitter. A breakdown in understanding can occur because the communicator does not put himself in the other fellow's shoes. A supervisor may not proceed carefully in making his instruction, or an employee may not properly prepare a supervisor for a new idea that he springs.

4. Normally, the more freedom and encouragement given to self-expression and the more care taken to provide people with the reasons for action, the less communication difficulty there will be.

5. Good communication is an essential concomitant of delegation of authority and reliance on the good sense and good intentions of the staff. Along with participation, it is the "stuff" of the decision-making process.

It is hardly necessary to point out the consistency of the above generalizations with recognition of the dignity and importance of the individual and with nourishment of the basic desires of a work force for security, achievement, and identification. In the following sections of this chapter we will examine several programs and problem areas which really are facets of communication in this broad sense. Communication is found, for example, in the stimulation of employee ideas for work improvement and in the formal analysis of employee feelings through attitude surveys. Concurrent with various methods for stimulating employee expression and getting at employee opinion is management's obligation to see that employees are so thoroughly informed about the current problems and aims of the organization that they truly become an interested partner in the enterprise.[21]

[21] For good general reading in problems of communication see Paul Pigors, *Effective Communication in Industry* (New York: 1949); Simon, *op. cit.*; Charles E. Redfield, *Communication*

C. EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION IN WORK IMPROVEMENT

In any fair-sized working force it has been found advisable to adopt some systematic method whereby the workers are encouraged to express their ideas and may gain recognition. A number of concerns have long had recourse to suggestion systems for this purpose. Their experience goes to prove that a reservoir of ideas may be tapped by this method, ideas that are often of real value for improving both work processes and working conditions.[22] Such contributions, when adopted and given due recognition, will obviously add to the workers' sense of partnership and personal worth.

Since the development of formal suggestion systems in the United States there has been rather widespread disillusionment with the way they have worked out in private industry, although many of the earlier plans are still functioning successfully. Initially, suggestion plans were characterized by suggestion boxes placed at convenient places in the office or plant buildings and by emphasis on anonymity or on circumventing the supervisory line. Later, management committees were set up to pass on the feasibility of suggestions, both in industry and in government. These approaches may account for the lack of success of many suggestion systems. In more recent years increasing attention has been paid to getting suggestions processed through regular supervisory channels so that full participation of all concerned is insured. Also, a number of organizations during and since World War II have established production or suggestion committees, composed of representatives of both management and employee unions, which in various ways participate in the stimulation, consideration, and adoption of ideas on work improvement.

The Departments of the Army and the Navy have for many years sponsored extensive suggestion systems—with full-time staffs devoting their energies to the stimulation and processing of suggestions. One of the Federal agencies which pioneered in the conditioning of the supervisory line to encourage and accept good suggestions was the Social Security Board (now Administration) of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under the leadership of Milton Hall, it developed a plan whereby employees were first of all given systematic training in techniques of job methods analysis and improvement, so as to increase their skill and interest in making suggestions. In group meetings, employees were encouraged by their supervisors (after supervisors themselves had been indoctrinated) to submit proposals for consideration by the group. Any suggestion agreed upon

in Management (Chicago: 1953); Cabot and Kahl, *op. cit.;* and Harold L. Dickinson, "Semantics: Its Application to Personnel Administration," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1951, pp. 8–14.

[22] "What impressed management most, however, were the stores of latent energy and productive cooperation which clearly could be obtained from the working force under the right conditions."—Roethlisberger and Dickson, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

was presented in writing to the next higher supervisor or the line official who could act on the matter. He was required either to adopt it or to pass it on with his comments to the next supervisor. This process continued up the line until it got to the executive head of the organization. Thus, not only were employees encouraged to work *with* their supervisors, instead of *around* them, but also ideas were developed jointly on a teamwork basis. The beneficial effects of the plan were compounded. In one of the first units, for example, where certain improvements were expected to increase productivity by 15 percent, output actually increased by twice this percentage. Coming as it did during the early phase of World War II, this plan was a lifesaver for a nonwar agency that had to get more work done with fewer employees.[23]

Another notable contribution to employee participation in work improvement has been made by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Over a twelve-year period (1943–1954), out of 6723 suggestions made by trades and other blue-collar workers, 76 percent were accepted. In 1954 there were thirteen suggestions for each hundred employees, a higher ratio than in any other Federal agency. The essential feature of the TVA plan is the active use of union representation in "coöperative conferences and committees," of which there are eighty-five (counting those for white-collar employees) in the various locations where the Authority's operations are carried on. These committees, which are similar to joint labor-management committees in industry, provide the machinery for coöperative discussion of both individual and group suggestions. The committees are used for regular joint discussion on all work problems, of which specific suggestions form a part. Frequently employees broach their ideas first in their own union meetings. This often results in altering and improving the suggestions because of the critical review of colleagues with similar technical backgrounds; further, it stimulates constructive thought among employees and a coöperative approach to work problems. Thus, group suggestions become as important as individual ideas. By way of recognition, credit goes usually to the particular committee itself for outstanding improvements, although individual recognition is also given where practicable. Suggestion write-ups are frequently published in jointly sponsored publications, *Teamwork*, for trades employees, and *Wire*, for office workers. Letters of commendation to individuals are also used. TVA contends that the most satisfying recognition to individual employees is the recognition they receive from those to whom they are responsible.[24]

[23] The plan is discussed by Milton Hall and William P. Mallard in "Making Employer-Employee Cooperation Practicable," *Personnel*, January, 1946, pp. 237–247; and by Oscar M. Powell in "Adjusting Administration to Wartime," *Social Security Bulletin*, November, 1943, p. 409. For a popular presentation see Stuart Chase, *Men at Work*, pp. 77–88.

[24] From material on the subject supplied by Dr. Harry L. Case, Director of Personnel, TVA, Knoxville, Tennessee, including *Teamwork* and *Wire* and reports of the Central Joint Cooper-

These experiences with employee participation indicate a considerable change from the original suggestion-box or independent management-committee types of approach to this problem.[25] It will be noted, however, that even the most forward-looking enterprises still do not leave the matter to chance or to the incidental collaboration of supervisor and employee. Formal devices are used to create an awareness of the need for work improvement and machinery is established to permit joint evaluation of new ideas.

Of course, the final decision as to the adoption of a particular suggestion must rest with the department head or even, in some cases, with the legislature. The task of review committees and the supervisory line is to weed out the worthless suggestions, evaluate those remaining, make appropriate recommendations regarding the credit which the employee is to receive, and report on the apparent applicability of the suggestions. A further function of a committee is to stimulate the free use of the privilege and obligation to make suggestions. Repetition is said to be the basis of good advertising. So it must be the basis of a successful program which seeks to provide through suggestions an outlet for the ideas of the force and a means for the progressive improvement of the conduct of the enterprise. The Department of the Navy has been outstanding in this phase of its program, through a continuous stream of posters and other media.

In conclusion, a few general comments may be made upon the operation of suggestion systems. They are, obviously enough, of value only if they induce employee coöperation and participation. It is necessary, then, to make it plain to the workers, first, that suggestions are seriously desired and, second, that they will be accorded careful attention and appropriate recognition. Moreover, if full value is to be obtained, every suggester should receive some sort of personal attention, whether his suggestion is good or not. The mere fact of its submission is evidence of a desire to coöperate and supplies a reason for discussion or acknowledgment by either the supervisor or a joint committee. If the suggestion is impractical, that should be explained to the employee; if it is valuable, a personal word of commendation and encouragement should pay dividends in renewed enthusiasm. Personnel administration is a matter of proper human relations, and the operation of the suggestion system offers unique opportunities for developing such relations. It is, however, only one such avenue and should be viewed in perspective with other aspects of employee participation.

---

ative Committee of TVA and the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council. See also Harry L. Case, *Personnel Policy in a Public Agency* (New York: 1955), pp. 62–66.

[25] The democratic work group objective is well put by Clinton S. Golden and Harold J. Ruttenberg: "Union-management cooperation to reduce costs, eliminate wastes, increase productive efficiency, and improve quality represents a practical program that provides workers with effective direct participation in the creative phases of management."—*The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy* (New York: 1942), p. xxvi.

Discussion of awards used in connection with suggestions or other employee achievement will be found in the chapter "Evaluation and Incentives." Also closely related is the examination of methods of employee consultation in the chapter "Employee Organization and Representation."

D. EMPLOYEE COUNSELING

One of the conclusions of the research men at the Hawthorne works of the Western Electric Company, as indicated earlier in this chapter, was that production increased when workers found that someone was interested in them as *persons*. A great deal of this experiment was carried on by repeated interviews of a thorough and confidential character with each worker in the test groups. It is not surprising, therefore, that one of the modern personnel concepts that emerged from this great landmark in human relations research was what is commonly called (for want of a better term) "employee counseling."

Actually the word "counseling" is an unfortunate one, for it merely connotes positive advice. What it is intended to convey in this case is both *a means of giving psychological support to a personality and a method of getting employees to understand the cause of any dissatisfaction they may have and to do something about it themselves wherever that is practicable.*[26] This includes creating a climate in which they *can* do something about it themselves. The technique is, by skillful interviewing and artful listening, bordering on psychoanalysis, to draw out of an individual what is really his innermost feeling toward his work situation and help him analyze for himself why he feels as he does. This is done ordinarily by a listener who is not in the supervisory line and has no authority to affect the employee's success in the organization. Interviews are entirely confidential between interviewer and interviewee. The counseling interview is described by psychologists as "nondirective." It also may include some positive, "building-up" approaches if an employee's attitude suggests that they are desirable.

For counseling purposes, many industries and large establishments in the Federal service have employed specialists who spend full time in this listening role with employees.[27] This movement was catapulted into promi-

[26] Counseling in this sense was first discussed by the Hawthorne researchers, Roethlisberger and Dickson, *op. cit.*, pp. 590–604, as their concluding plea for a long-range program to improve morale in a work group.

[27] See Nathaniel Cantor, *Employee Counseling* (New York: 1945); Margaret E. Barron, "The Emerging Role of Public Employee Counseling," *Public Personnel Review*, January, 1945, pp. 9–16; and Paul S. Burnham and Stuart H. Palmer, *Counseling in Personnel Work*, A Bibliography: 1945–1949 (Public Administration Service, Chicago: 1951). One of the best brief analyses of the counseling function is Astrid Kraus, "Some Recent Trends in Employee Counseling," *Personnel Administration*, May, 1947, pp. 29–31.

For additional discussion see also Margaret E. Barron, "Employee Counseling in a Federal Agency," in *Human Factors in Management*, edited by Schuyler Dean Hoslett (Parkville,

nence almost overnight by World War II. The dislocation and migration of workers, breaking up of families, acute housing shortages, interrupted educations, increased spending power, nervous strains, relaxation of inhibitions on such matters as drinking and sexual behavior, and other conditions brought about by wartime psychology—all these made the time ripe for introduction of counseling into work groups. Mixed with the counseling on personal problems, ranging from maternity or marital problems to alcoholism and persecution complexes, were management activities designed to supplement this phase of counseling, covering such welfare services as housing aids, loan funds, recreational programs, health consultation, personal budget planning, child care for working mothers, and vocational and educational guidance. Needless to say, the greatest users of these services and of personal counseling were the younger men and women newly thrown into war plants and government offices. The sources of their problems were as often off the job as they were on the job. The counselors were in most cases recruited from the fields of social work, psychology, and education. Too many, unfortunately, were selected on the basis of pleasing personalities or "motherly" attributes, with little appreciation of the underlying basis or nature of the counseling function. Since one of the duties of a counselor is to know when an individual needs to be referred to a psychiatrist, and how to do it, the job calls for the utmost skill and fullest understanding of mental and emotional ills. This need, coupled with the need for knowledge of community resources and for interviewing skills, makes it essential that such positions be filled only by professionally trained persons.

For the most part counseling has developed and ripened into an important phase of personnel management. More and more the idea of an individual spending full time on interviewing alone for quais-psychoanalytic purposes has been broadened into that of an employee relations specialist who uses nondirective as well as advisory counseling as one of his tools, along with other programs to build good human relations, or helps supervisors to use counseling techniques with their own subordinates. The effect on production of the individual worker's emotions and of the social climate about him in his work situation is just as important in peacetime as in war. Nor are the problems confined by any means to the younger employees. The need for emotional outlets for frustrated older workers is so common as hardly to require mention.

Like other approaches to problems of human relations, counseling is not a cure-all. Roethlisberger and Dickson themselves recognized this: "It may be well to say that for the investigators and management at Hawthorne, personnel counseling is still an experiment and is not regarded as a panacea

Mo.: 1946). Although there has been a later edition (1951) of a volume of the same title, it contains different research reports, and several items from the earlier version are cited in this chapter because of their relevancy to the discussion here.

for all employee relations problems."[28] Many executives still scoff at the counseling function because they do not understand that it can work through and with the supervisory line rather than around it.

E. MENTAL HEALTH

The discussion of counseling led us close to but not directly into general problems of mental health. The concept that psychiatrists are useful only in cases of mental illnesses is giving way to recognition of their value in the *maintenance* of mental health.

In a survey of ten well-managed companies in New York State it was found that, among employees who fail to make good on the job, four out of five have the knowledge and skill to do the work but fail because of "unsatisfactory attitudes, interests, and work habits."[29] Emotional troubles, says the secretary of the Menninger Foundation, account for 85 per cent of "stomach trouble" and "a very large percent of heart difficulties."[30] That these conclusions are borne out generally is attested to by almost every executive who has stopped to think about the real nature of his personnel problem cases or of his instances of dismissal. Incompetence is more often induced by emotional disorders than by intellectual failures.

A number of progressive firms have employed psychiatrists or clinical psychologists on a full-time basis for many years to keep watch over the mental health, the emotional maturity of their employees. Special attention is given to supervisors and executives who probably have more than their fair share of the stresses and strains of organizational living. The psychiatrist is available to handle cases referred by the employee counselor or personnel specialist, he can examine those being considered for supervisory or other "stress" posts, and he can advise top management on removal of causes for emotional breakdowns. Such professional help is rarely available in public agencies for civilian employees.

The ramifications of the counseling and psychiatric approaches have led to a number of interesting experiments. Among them is the technique of getting employees to play a "role" in a mock interview as a part of group discussion and observation of supervisor-employee relations. A group leader, for example, describes a hypothetical conflict between a supervisor and an employee, and calls for volunteers to act out the situation, possibly with one primed to assume a certain persistent attitude. One or both participants thereupon try their wits at "handling" the other person. While some stress the value of this role-playing as "practice" that will in-

[28] Roethlisberger and Dickson, *op. cit.*, p. 604.

[29] Survey conducted by Dr. Earl Brooks, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University (press release, August 23, 1953).

[30] Dr. William C. Menninger, from a speech to supermarket executives in October, 1953, as reported by Alred G. Larke, "Industrial Psychiatry: Aid to Human Relations?" *Dun's Review and Modern Industry*, February, 1954, pp. 130–135.

fluence the participant's own behavior in real situations, others find its chief value in dramatizing the problem to the rest of the group and evoking critical analysis of what should or should not have been done by the actors to achieve the desired result.[31]

A few industrial establishments and government agencies have recently tried out a sort of group psychoanalysis, which involves some of the same methods used in counseling. They have recognized that any amount of "learning" of the right supervisory methods will not usually change poor supervisors into good ones. Like that of his subordinates, a supervisor's behavior is governed by his own drives and his degree of security and feeling of success in the organization. He can correct his own mistakes only when he can recognize why he is reacting as he does. With these considerations in mind, a few organizations have employed psychiatrists[32] to conduct small group discussions among top executives and supervisors in an effort to diagnose and treat human relations problems. In one of these experiments there was no fixed subject for discussion in the group meetings. Except for the restriction to "in-office" subjects, each individual talked about whatever experience or problem he was moved to bring before the group. The psychiatrist, as leader, stimulated each to lay bare his own reactions to the situation he described. Then members of the group were encouraged to talk out with the participant questions that were designed to draw out their innermost feelings on the matter—why they thought it good or bad, why they resented this or favored that, how the situation might have been altered, and the like. The discussions were kept strictly confidential. Participants were, of course, better prepared to accept this approach when they met with colleagues—their "peers," so to speak—than they were if their superiors or subordinates were present. Results in these groups have included instances, related by the executives themselves, of better handling of such problems as absenteeism of subordinates, excessive overtime on their own part, and increased comfort in making delegations of authority to subordinates that have improved operations.[33]

These examples of preventive work in mental health are described here because they illustrate the many interesting and challenging approaches to problems of human relations that are being made today in both private

[31] See the discussions in Margaret E. Barron, "Role Practice in Interview Training," *Sociatry*, June, 1947, pp. 198–209; and J. R. P. French, Jr., "Role-Playing as a Method of Training Foremen," in *Human Factors in Management* (1946). A host of articles on this subject has appeared in recent years in the various psychology journals.

[32] Few professional psychiatrists are actually interested in these group approaches and in human relations among normal people in general. Frequently a clinical or social psychologist is as well equipped and usually more interested in this kind of assignment.

[33] Although this work is still of a limited and tentative character, much credit is due Dr. Milton Hall and Dr. Henry Laughlin, who have pioneered this approach in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. See Henry P. Laughlin and Milton Hall, "Psychiatry for Executives," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, January, 1951.

and public enterprises. Such forward-looking projects are, of course, still conspicuous by their rarity. Human relations in administrative organizations is a vast field, and only the surface is so far being scratched. But the findings of various disciplines—psychology, social work, education, anthropology, sociology, psychiatry, and political science—are being brought more and more to focus on this subject and with increasing practical usefulness.

F. ATTITUDE SURVEYS

Closely related to the foregoing discussion but deserving special mention is the technique of employee attitude surveys. Like counseling, the formal questionnaire or interview survey of employee attitudes was greatly stimulated by the researches at the Hawthorne plant. In accord with both the method of inquiry and the results of that series of studies, attitude surveys are a device to find out what employees are thinking about, what is motivating them, what is bothering them, what they get the most satisfaction out of in their jobs. The attitude survey is a diagnostic tool of the personnel man to lay the groundwork for improving human relations, and thereby production, in a working organization. It has been used extensively in large industrial and governmental enterprises and in the armed forces. During World War II the Army set up a special group of psychologists to concentrate on surveying and interpreting to the top staff the attitudes of the rank and file toward practically everything—gunfire, meals, quarters, discipline, uniforms, recreation, medical care, supplies, equipment, etc.[34] An extensive program of surveys was also conducted among civilian employees of the Army. A number of other Federal agencies have also conducted surveys from time to time.

The technical aspects of an attitude survey are found in the actual construction of questionnaires and the conduct of interviews. These must be so handled that the questions will get accurate and specific responses and will supply data that can be readily consolidated and interpreted for such conclusions as may be drawn from the survey. This calls for considerable skill and professional knowledge. Likewise, in organizations of more than a few thousand persons, there are questions of distribution and sampling, since covering everybody may be too costly and no more useful than a good cross section of opinion. Among other considerations, the techniques of the public opinion poll are relevant to the analysis of employee attitudes.[35]

[34] The story of these studies is told in Samuel Stouffer, *The American Soldier* (Princeton: 1949), Vol. I, "Adjustment During Army Life," and Vol. II, "Combat and Its Aftermath." The results are summarized by Stouffer in "A Study of Attitudes," *Scientific American*, May, 1949, pp. 11–16.

[35] A complete and technical treatment of the subject is found in: United States Air Force, *Improving Management Through Employee Attitude Surveys*, Civilian Personnel Manual No. 17,

Many experts advocate an attitude survey as a periodic affair—not as a substitute for other programs, such as employee participation in work improvement, counseling, or supervisory training, but as a supplemental check on how everything is going. More often than not, organizations that have used attitude surveys have failed to give sufficient continuity to the idea by following through with succeeding surveys. Perhaps in many cases the findings are so shockingly bad that a repeat performance is unconsciously shied away from. In other cases, however, follow-up surveys have been used with profit, often showing how conditions that were corrected following the preceding survey have noticeably improved employee attitudes toward their jobs.

There are no theoretical limits to the subject-matter scope of a survey except that it has to do with the individual and the organization involved. Surveys may be on specific areas of question, such as physical working conditions, or on the whole range of the employment relationships, covering pay, supervision, advancement, health, safety, quality of workmanship and product, equipment, hours, vacations, and literally everything that might conceivably affect the employee's attitude toward his job and the organization. An example of the scope of questions in an attitude survey in the Federal service is shown by the following excerpts from a questionnaire, which was supplemented by sample interviews:

FOR ATTENDANTS AT —— HOSPITAL

DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME TO THIS BLANK

1. Do you like this kind of work? Yes ( ) No ( )
   Comments:
2. Which shift do you prefer? Day ( ) Evening ( ) Night ( )
3. Do you plan to make the job of attendant your life work? Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )
   Comments:
4. If your answer to the last question is "no" or "uncertain," what other kind of work do you prefer?
5. Do you find this hospital to be a friendly place in which to work? Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain ( )
   Comments:
6. Considering job conditions, what do you think is a fair wage for your job? $_____ a year.

AFM 40–1, December, 1954. For briefer discussions of methods see Lewis M. Nixon, "Techniques of Surveying Employee Attitudes," *Public Personnel Review*, January, 1949, pp. 23–28; Oakley J. Gordon, "A Factor Analysis of Human Needs and Industrial Morale," *Personnel Psychology*, Spring, 1955, pp. 1–18 (based on study at Hill Air Force Base in Utah); and Catherine S. Lott, "Let's Have an Attitude Survey," *Personnel Administration*, March, 1952, pp. 5–11. Among the best presentations in somewhat greater detail are Arthur Kornhauser, "Psychological Studies of Employee Attitudes," in *Human Factors in Management* (1946); and Morris S. Viteles, *Motivation and Morale in Industry* (New York: 1953), pp. 221–253.

Needless to say, a survey is worth no more than the effort expended to do something about what it reveals. Practices or conditions that seem to be sound and well received deserve further strengthening or emphasis. Those that are sources of dissatisfaction require correction or abandonment. As a matter of fact, even before a survey begins, management and supervisors should be conditioned to accept the results as objectively as they can and to commit themselves to doing something about them.

One of the surprising results of many attitude surveys is how significant for employee morale minor irritations become. In numerous instances the difficulty is not with pay or hours of work or even "the boss" but with petty annoyances or oversights that suggest that management is not concerned about human welfare in the organization. In a Federal mental hospital a few years ago one of the chronic sources of irritation among attendants was that they could not be compensated for a torn shirt or broken glasses or losses in other personal effects suffered at the hands of a disturbed patient. For decades an unimaginative executive officer was content to hide behind the fact that there was no law to permit such reimbursement. When an attitude survey initiated by a higher level in the organization demonstrated that this factor was one of the prominent sources of employee resentment and ill feeling, the top management succeeded in getting Congressional approval with no difficulty whatever. In fact, Congress actually made the provision more liberal than a timorous hospital middle management at first proposed.

Although a chapter could be written on this subject alone, space confines us to this introduction to a very practical tool for diagnosis of personnel ills. Where it is used continuously and seriously for evaluating the effectiveness of administrative practices, and where positive action is taken over a period of years to meet the needs shown, employee attitudes can be improved to the benefit of the organization, the public, and the employees themselves.

G. ADJUSTMENT OF GRIEVANCES

What has been said above applies with equal force to procedures for adjustment of grievances. Whether well or ill founded, grievances undermine morale. Let a man harbor the idea that he is being abused on any ground whatsoever, and his attention to and interest in his work are bound to decline. By the same token his satisfaction in it will decrease.

It is well to recognize at the outset that unsatisfactory conditions are endemic in any undertaking, no matter how well it is run and no matter how up to date the work environment and management policies may be. Where any considerable group of human beings are intimately thrown together, maladjustments are bound to arise. With human frailty what it is, misunderstanding, incompatibility, unfriendly rivalry, jealousy, and nu-

merous other human shortcomings make for the friction that destroys the *esprit de corps* of any staff. Improper placements, wages, or salaries, tedious or laborious assignments of work, faulty tools, delays in securing materials or tools, draughts, glare, dirt, and what not make for dissatisfaction and all that comes in its train. Many of these conditions which normally arise with changes in personnel and work processes and the inevitable deterioration of physical properties may be discovered and remedied by an alert management, but many will not be discovered, nor will the consequent discontent be realized, unless some plan is adopted for bringing them into the open where they can be dealt with promptly and adequately. This is the purpose of a system for handling grievances, although it bears a close relation to and, in part, may be incorporated with the mechanics of the suggestion system. Obviously, no hard and fast line can be drawn between the two, since remedies for grievances may easily take the form of constructive suggestions. For the latter as well as for the former, the important thing is to keep the channel open between the rank and file and those in responsible positions.

Speaking generally, there are four channels through which public employees may hope to secure "redress of grievances": (1) through group pressure on the legislature; (2) through appeal to the operating executives; (3) through an appeal to the personnel agency; and (4) through the machinery of representative committees or unions. Not all of these will be discussed at length at this point. The method of appeal to the legislature, considered more fully in Chapter 12, on the civil service unions, is likely to be employed wherever a major policy is involved, as, for example, in connection with wage and leave policies. Wherever one or more individual pressure groups gain the support of a majority of the legislative body, measures may be passed in their favor which make for highly inequitable conditions for the balance of the force. This has happened on more than one occasion in the case of firemen and policemen. In most countries of the world past experience with legislative bodies has led civil servants to look in this direction only as a last resort.

The method of appeal to immediate supervisors also has decided limitations. Although grievances can often be adjusted by this means, and the good administrator makes a conscious effort to maintain sympathetic contacts with his subordinates, there are numerous cases in which additional machinery is necessary. Many grievances, for example, may be felt against the operating officer himself, in which case they would usually not be taken to him but allowed to remain and rankle. Moreover, all the arguments in favor of handling suggestions through some formalized plan apply equally to the handling of complaints. An important task of the administrator will always be the removal of petty irritations and the adjustment of complaints, but something more is needed.

Referring again to the Hawthorne plant investigations, one of the most valuable contributions of that extensive study was the interviewing program carried on by a limited number of specially trained interviewers. Those interviewed were assured that their comments would be treated as anonymous. In 1929, 40,000 comments were listed, of which 28,000 were classified as complaints. These had to do with practically every feature of the work environment and work life in the plant. The benefits derived from this investigation were: (1) the correction of unfavorable conditions of work; (2) material for training supervisors and interviewers; (3) psychological benefits accruing to the person interviewed; and (4) material for research.[36] This investigation goes to show how little informed the management is, even in a well-managed plant, of what is on the worker's mind. It may reasonably be assumed that most of these matters would never have come to the attention of those in charge through the existing machinery or through the established relations between supervisory and work forces.

In many private establishments the task of handling grievances has been assumed by the personnel office. In the majority of American public jurisdictions, the characteristic separation of the central personnel agency from the rest of the administration precludes any extensive development of its participation. For the most part, civil service commissions are empowered to entertain complaints only when improper political influences are alleged and only in respect to serious matters, such as removal. This has been dealt with in another connection. Personnel offices in the operating agencies, however, do have a part to play. Federal agencies, for example, have formal statements regarding employee relations with provisions for the handling of grievances and appeals. This practice has also become more common in state and local units.

On the whole, the prevailing tendency is to take up the grievance first with the supervisor and, in case of unsatisfactory decision, with higher officials in order of rank, even finally with the head of the organization. Most agencies provide at some points in the process an opportunity for the individual to present his case before an impartial hearing committee that is usually authorized to *advise* the head or assistant head of the organization on an equitable disposition of the matter. A common method for selection of such a committee is for the aggrieved employee to select one member, for management to select a second, and for these two to agree upon the third member, who may serve as chairman.

In Federal departments grievance appeals are usually used by employees to protest dismissals or other actions of major significance to their career. Many feel that prosecution of an appeal to the point of a hearing before a committee creates more conflict and bad feeling than it corrects. *The im-*

[36] Roethlisberger and Dickson, *op. cit.*, p. 228; for a list of the items on which comments were made in a series of 10,300 interviews see pp. 232 ff.

portance of this machinery, however, lies not so much in its frequent use as in the fact that it is made available by management, "just in case." In fact, in many large agencies with thousands of employees this machinery is used, on the average, only one or two times a year.

One side issue that deserves mention here is that some members of the legislative body make it difficult to operate such machinery smoothly and impartially by taking up blindly the cause of some disgruntled employee and interfering with the normal course of the matter within the department. Not all grievances are a reflection on management. It should be understood that grievance procedures are also the resort of the incompetent and the misfits, who are the very ones most likely to appeal concurrently to the type of legislator who is ready to make political capital out of the matter.

Nevertheless, there is general acceptance of the desirability of a policy in the public jurisdictions of this country which definitely invites both complaints and suggestions from the rank and file and permits them to exercise some influence in remedying conditions. It is not enough for the executive to let it be known that his door is always open. The Hawthorne investigation showed, among other things, that there were those who had nursed grievances for years, some of which, interestingly enough, were based on "emotional and irrational reactions." But the most unexpected result was the fact that the employees appreciated in the interviewing process that they were recognized as individuals who had valuable comments to make and had the opportunity of "participating jointly with the company in its endeavor to improve working conditions and supervision."[37]

SUMMARY

If, as Edward A. Filene once remarked, "the principle of absolutism in business cannot stand in a society that has established the principle of democracy in politics," how much truer this should be in the public service.[38] This is not to suggest for a moment that lines of authority should not be clearly drawn or that the general principle of hierarchical administrative organization should be violated. Final authority must rest somewhere. But, in the state of the modern world, it is not only desirable social policy to allow employees a voice in determination of conditions of service but also good personnel administration. Only by instilling an attitude of cooperation and a feeling of mutual participation in a great service enterprise can the public administrator hope to energize the potentialities of his staff.

Thus, morale is being recognized increasingly as the most important single aspect of administration and production. It is more important than

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 227.

[38] Edward A. Filene, commenting on a report of a Special Committee of the National Economic League on Readjustment in Industrial Relations, *The Consensus*, July, 1923, p. 14.

mechanical techniques, than procedures, than time and motion studies. Further, it is influenced more by the attention and recognition received by the individual worker than it is by physical working conditions, by direct appeals for increased production, or even by pay.

How high morale may be achieved in a given situation depends largely on circumstances. There are no panaceas. But some general approaches to the subject, based on substantial and recorded experience, have been outlined in this chapter. In one situation, selection and training of supervisors may need to be stressed. In another, it may be employee participation in work improvement, or counseling, or attitude surveys, or grievance procedures, that require attention. In most instances, it is something of all of these, as well as other factors, that calls for continuous study and support by all levels of management. The core of the problem is in devising those working arrangements and relationships which contribute most to the employee's sense of security, achievement, and belongingness—the elements of job satisfaction. Efficiency and productivity normally flow therefrom automatically.

Clearly a part of these considerations is the subject of employee representation in various forms for the governing of administrative enterprises. Because this is intimately bound up with the development and role of unionism in the civil service, it is dealt with in the succeeding chapter, "Employee Organization and Representation."

No better statement of the responsibility of management, public or private, in human relations has been made than the following:

> Adequate personnel administration in any particular industrial plant should fulfill two conditions:
> 1. Management should introduce in its organization an explicit skill of diagnosing human situations. . . .
> 2. By means of this skill management should commit itself to the *continuous* process or studying human situations—both individual and group—and should run its human affairs in terms of what it is continually learning about its own organization.[39]

It is strange that so little attention has been paid to the problem of leadership in governmental establishments which, taken all together, are the instrument of democracy. The question of discovering and training leaders within management has been more prominently identified with private industry. This is not to say that management in industry is better, but only that initiation of this approach has come from a progressive segment of business. An imposing bibliography on this subject has been accumulating in past decades, but the contributions from the public field are relatively few.

[39] Roethlisberger and Dickson, *op. cit.*, p. 604.

Can it be that public executives have depended more on their authority than on leadership qualities, and that legislators have been too unacquainted with problems of running large organizations to be much concerned? It is unlikely that the badgering and abuse often taken by public executives and the countless restrictions placed on their management contribute very much to the kind of security and stimulation which they require to be good leaders. Unfortunately, also, too little emphasis is placed on qualities of leadership in their initial selection.

The hopeful signs in the situation are that the subject is receiving increasing attention, that more and more trained administrators are entering the public service, and that the quality of supervision in government is clearly improving. With the continued development of technology, the growing complexity and scope of governmental activity, and the critical reliance on administrative agencies as the means for effecting public policy, we shall probably see in coming years further recognition that the considerations set forth in this chapter are an indispensable requirement in the forward march of democracy.

12

Employee Organization and Representation

> Unionism springs from the basic aspirations of wage earners who become convinced that they can get more satisfaction by membership in a union than by "going it alone." This feeling is so widespread that even "good" firms are unionized. Instead of regarding this as an insult or as an evidence of their failure, managements should take the initiative in developing constructive relationships.
>
> —*Paul Pigors and Charles A. Myers*[1]

> It has been the experience of Government employees everywhere that the amelioration of their material status must have organized self-pressure as its initial impetus.
>
> —*Walter R. Sharp*[2]

Among public servants in the United States a consciousness of common needs and interests began to emerge shortly after the close of the Civil War, although the unionization of the civil service did not really get under way until the 1880's. Nor is it strange that a hundred years should have elapsed before American public servants reached the point of organization. In every country the unionization of the civil service has waited upon the development of the general labor movement, which, in the United States, was retarded by the unrestricted opportunities for individual enterprise, long characteristic of this country. Moreover, conditions in the public services themselves, prior to the adoption of the Civil Service Act in 1883 and similar state laws, were not conducive to the development of solidarity among civil servants. Uncertain tenure, rotation in office, open adherence to spoils politics, all resulted in a rapidly fluctuating body of public employees whose common bond was not the service of the State so much as allegiance to a political party.

[1] *Personnel Administration*, 2nd ed. (New York: 1951), p. 38.
[2] *The French Civil Service* (New York: 1931), p. 493.

Starting in the 1880's, however, with teachers, policemen, and postal employees, the unionization movement has spread rapidly among public employees in the United States. At one time it was alleged that 40 percent of them were organized.[3] However, Sterling Spero estimated in 1948 that only about one-sixth of public employees belonged to unions.[4]

In view of the discussion in the preceding chapter emphasizing good leadership and individual motivation, one may well ask why unions are necessary or even tolerated. What do voluntary organizations of workers provide that management cannot provide through intelligent direction and a good personnel program?

To be sure, employees join unions in some instances because they feel that some form of solidarity is necessary to protect their interests against an unenlightened management. Such necessity is not unknown even in the public service. But as the philosophy and practice of personnel management has progressed in recent decades we must look more to other reasons to explain the continued and growing strength of unionism in governmental employment. If we are to be analytical about it, we will find that the following purposes served by unions, particularly in the public service, go far to explain why they hold and increase their membership:

1. The union makes it possible for employees to express their point of view to the legislative branch and to management as a whole. We must acknowledge that there are many matters in the fundamental employment relationship—pay, for example—which are commonly beyond the scope of authority of the executive side of government and certainly outside the jurisdiction of individual supervisors. Even if the legislative branch is not involved, many personnel policy matters cannot be settled within the typical employee-supervisor relationship. A personnel issue that cuts across the board in a public agency or in a whole governmental jurisdiction calls for collective representation of employees. One of the most effective ways of securing such representation on a valid basis has been through voluntary association of employees into organized groups, whether they be labeled unions or otherwise.

2. A corollary to this collective purpose of unionism on overall policy matters is the convenience to management that a union provides when management honestly wants to secure the real opinions of employees as a group, rather than to rely wholly on the faulty distillation of opinion that slowly filters through the supervisory line.

3. A union is something belonging to the employee. What it seeks and what it does is a part of him. It provides a feeling of identification with the

[3] See Walter R. Sharp, "Public Employment," in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York: 1934), Vol. XII, p. 635. It is very difficult to estimate the proportion of organized civil servants in the United States because of spotty and inadequate data.

[4] *Government as Employer* (New York: 1948), p. 71.

securing of certain personnel objectives that is not present when the solution to personnel policies—even when they are highly acceptable—is handed to workers by management. Employees want to do something for themselves, no matter how enlightened an organization's personnel administration.

4. A voluntary employee organization provides an outlet for natural social aspirations of employees which the work in office or shop may not make possible. This is particularly the case for workers at routine, repetitive tasks. Whether it be garbage collection or operation of a duplicating machine, guarding a museum or reading water meters, making out tax bills or typing reports, the work may be such that all of one's job satisfaction cannot be derived from performance of the duties themselves, as may be more likely in professional and executive positions. Union membership gives the employee a chance at a kind of association, and even avenues of recognition and advancement, not present on the job. If job satisfaction can be increased in this way, it is to management's advantage to permit and encourage voluntary unionism even though management may also be doing all it can to make the work satisfying and attractive.

The above considerations make for more reconciliation than may appear on the surface between management's responsibility for the welfare and motivation of employees and the acceptance of unionism as a continuing feature of our society. The growth and continuation of union organizations does not make good personnel management any less important, nor does enlightened personnel practice eliminate a useful role for unions. The two can properly be viewed as complementary and supplementary to each other.[5]

In the first part of this chapter a brief historical sketch of the public union movement is presented, followed by an analysis of the present situation. The latter part is then devoted to a consideration of some of the issues raised by unionization and of the part the unions can play in the personnel program.

I. THE BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE UNIONISM

With the exception of the National Teachers' Association, established in 1857, almost the only public employee organizations in existence prior

[5] One of the best discussions on this subject is found in Pigors and Myers, *op. cit.*, Chap. 3. See also Burleigh B. Gardner and David G. Moore, *Human Relations in Industry* (Chicago: 1950), Chap. 8.

For a research study demonstrating that we can expect unionism in general to grow steadily in the long run, to suffer little or no loss in bad times, and to expand sharply in the event of war or depression, see Irving Bernstein, "The Growth of American Unions," *American Economic Review*, June, 1954, pp. 303–318.

to 1880 were benevolent societies, found principally among the police.[6] In the next twenty years, however, numerous organizations of both a professional and a union type sprang up. With the former, such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police (1893), the International Association of Fire Chiefs (1873), the Association of American Food and Drug Officials (1897), and the like, this chapter is not concerned. Suffice it to say that the formation of professional associations has proceeded at least as rapidly as that of unions and that many of these organizations are playing a prominent role in the improvement of standards and practices of administration.[7]

A. FEDERAL SERVICES

Organizations of public employees along trade-union lines appeared first, as might be expected, among the skilled and semiskilled workers in various government industries. Thus, the unionization of government printers, machinists, carpenters, and other craftsmen lagged but little behind the general labor movement. In the main, members of such unions enjoy about the same hours of work and wage scales as prevail among their fellow craftsmen in the same locality. They also pursue about the same tactics, even resorting to the strike occasionally.

The first strictly public service unions emerged in the postal service, primarily as a protest against the all but intolerable working conditions at the time but also because of its size and far-flung staff, its industrial character as compared with many other services, and the relative standardization of its operations.[8] These factors, combined with the marked strengthening of the labor movement in the 1880's, represented in the Knights of Labor, led to the formation of the National Association of Letter Carriers in 1889. In spite of extreme measures taken by the department against organizers and leaders, local units, backed by the Knights of Labor,

[6] See Leonard D. White, *Trends in Public Administration* (New York: 1933), pp. 283 ff. The National Teachers' Association was preceded by the American Institute of Instruction, first organized in 1830. See also *Employee Relations in the Public Service*, Report of the Committee of the Civil Service Assembly on Employee Relations in the Public Service, Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman (Chicago: 1942).

[7] In 1954 the Public Administration Clearing House identified some 513 national organizations interested in public administration in the United States and Canada, most of which included public officials in their membership. See *Public Administration Organizations* (Chicago: 1954), p. ix.

[8] The best accounts of the unionization of the postal and other services are to be found in Sterling D. Spero, *The Labor Movement in a Government Industry* (New York: 1924) and his above-cited *Government as Employer*, to both of which we are much indebted. These works are prounion. Also see Lewis Mayers, *The Federal Service* (New York: 1922), p. 546. For a compact résumé of the organization movement among Federal, state, and municipal workers see Spero's excellent monograph, "Employer and Employee in the Public Service," in *Problems of the American Public Service*, Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel (New York: 1935), pp. 171–231.

forced through an eight-hour law for letter carriers in 1888 and joined forces to organize the National Association the following year. By 1900 the Association's ranks included the overwhelming majority of city letter carriers. Today, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, it is one of the strongest civil service unions.

About the same time that the letter carriers were organizing, a similar movement was under way among the post office clerks. These also desired the institution of the eight-hour day, the elimination of overtime, which was uncompensated, the regularization of promotions, and so forth. Once more local organizations appeared, and once more various postmasters attempted to crush them. The upshot was the formation of the National Association of Post Office Clerks in 1890, which, following a merger with a rival group, became the United National Association of Post Office Clerks in 1899. The organization of the postal clerks has been a stormy process, in part because of the wide range of occupations and interests represented in the group. In 1906 the National Federation of Post Office Clerks was formed and affiliated with the AFL. Two rival organizations have existed since then, although UNAPOC, now the opponent of trade-union affiliation, has been losing ground in recent years.

During the first years of the century the unionization of the postal employees proceeded apace. Other groups noted the gains made by the clerks and carriers through organized effort and, contrasting their own status with that of the organized groups, decided to form unions. In 1903 the National Rural Letter Carriers Association was formed, from which there was a split in 1920, when the National Federation of Rural Letter Carriers was formed and affiliated with the AFL.

The organization of the railway mail clerks also began about the same time. In 1891 the National Association of Railway Postal Clerks emerged. Starting as a social and benevolent association, it changed its name to the Railway Mail Association in 1904 (now the National Postal Transport Association) and was soon forced to assume a more militant role by the failure of the government to improve intolerable working conditions. Although space does not permit an extensive account of the struggles of any of these groups, one or two illustrations of conditions in the railway mail service are pertinent. The mail was being carried in archaic and unsanitary wooden cars, some of which were in such a dilapidated condition that the clerks could see the sky through their roofs. One of the most serious results was a terrifically high accident rate. In the single year of 1909, 742 railway mail clerks were killed or injured.[9] Open toilets and generally unsanitary conditions in the cars also constituted a serious health menace. During the summer of 1909, when dissatisfaction with service conditions was rampant, a clerk gave publicity to the discovery of a dead rat in the water tank of

[9] Spero, *The Labor Movement in a Government Industry*, p. 128.

his car. The response of the department was to remove the clerk.[10] Conditions were further aggravated by the use of the "stretch-out" as a part of the economy drive of the Taft administration, and militant methods alone were left to the employees.

The postal service, with the exception of the supervisory employees, was by this time quite thoroughly organized, although the Railway Mail Association drew the color line, and Negroes were not welcomed in one or two of the other unions. A Negro union, the National Alliance of Postal Employees, was accordingly organized in 1913, along industrial rather than craft lines. It has not, however, attained any considerable strength. The supervisory staff of the postal service began to organize in 1904 with the formation of the National League of District Postmasters (third- and fourth-class post offices). The National Association of Postal Supervisors appeared in 1908, and in 1922 the National Council of Supervisory Officials of the Railway Mail Service and the National Association of Postmasters were formed. Since they represent management, neither of these latter groups is a typical union organization.

The unionization of Federal employees outside of the postal service and the established crafts lagged far behind and is a phenomenon of the period since World War I. In fact, the first important organization among such employees arose primarily as a result of the failure of government salaries to keep pace with the increasing living costs of 1916–1917. The general dissatisfaction occasioned by this situation was reflected in the formation of the National Federation of Federal Employees in 1917, and in its succeeding growth in membership and prestige. Although the National Federation had placed considerable emphasis on labor solidarity and had been affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, a jurisdictional dispute with some of the old-line craft leaders in the 1931 convention of the AFL led to its withdrawal and its establishment as an independent organization. The conflict was an overt manifestation of the struggle then rocking the AFL between advocates of industrial and of craft unionism.

The withdrawal of the National Federation was the signal for the emergence of dualism in the general employee field. In 1932, the AFL organized the American Federation of Government Employees. The new organization excluded persons eligible to membership in craft unions unless they were already members of such unions. But it was essentially an industrial union. Its original membership was drawn chiefly from dissident elements in the National Federation who believed in affiliation with the general labor movement. Its early years were stormy. At its inception it included a considerable left-wing element which favored such mass-action tactics as picketing. Despite the success of militant tactics, the officers of the AFGE disavowed responsibility for their use, and in the 1934 convention its con-

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

stitution was amended to forbid strikes and picketing. There was minority opposition to this move, and a split finally culminated in the formation of still a third union in 1937—the United Federal Workers of America, affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations.[11]

Both the American Federation of Government Employees and the United Federal Workers of America grew rapidly during the 1930's, benefiting in part from the wave of organizational activity sweeping the country. At the 1936 convention of the AFL, jurisdiction over non-Federal employees was surrendered to the newly formed American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees. The United Federal Workers in 1946 joined with the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America (CIO) to form the United Public Workers of America (CIO). In 1948, after a split generated by allegations that the UPWA leadership was communist-dominated, the organization was expelled from the CIO. Currently, the CIO sponsors the Government and Civic Employees' Organizing Committee for public workers, with a Federal unit known as the Government Workers Union. Presumably the UPWA is no longer in existence.

In addition to the postal unions and the three general organizations of Federal employees, several departmental organizations exist. Thus, employees of the customs service organized the National Customs Service Association in 1925, an organization with a membership of over 6000. In the Immigration and Naturalization Service, a number of groups have organized along craft lines for immigration inspectors, clerks, guards, and laborers. Employees in the navy yards, the arsenals, the Government Printing Office, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and similar industrial establishments are nearly 100 percent organized. For the most part they are craftsmen who belong to the well-established trade unions affiliated with the AFL, or technicians associated with the CIO Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians.

In an unpublished report of the U.S. Civil Service Commission in December, 1954, union membership in the Federal service was estimated as 39 percent of the total employee population, or approximately 905,000 members, divided as follows:

455,000 in thirteen postal unions. Nearly half of these members are in the two AFL unions: Post Office Clerks and Letter Carriers. This total membership embraced 91 percent of the employees of the Post Office Department, easily the most highly organized of major Federal agencies.

230,000 in fourteen general unions representing employees in various occupations and usually cutting across agency lines. All but a few thousand of these are in five

[11] The reasons for this split, as well as other historical data, are analyzed in an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Eldon Johnson, "Unionism in the Federal Service," University of Wisconsin, 1938. See also his article "General Unions in the Federal Service," *Journal of Politics*, February, 1940, pp. 23–56.

unions, by far the two largest being the National Federation of Federal Employees (independent) and the American Federation of Government Employees (AFL).

220,000 in at least thirty-four craft unions representing almost entirely employees engaged in the various skilled-trades jobs which make up about one-third of the Federal service.

If we exclude the postal unions and the postal service, the proportion of the Federal service which is unionized is about 25 percent, which approximates the 25.8 percent[12] represented by union membership in the total civilian labor force (private and public employment) in the United States. Historically, the proportion of Federal employees who were organized increased from about 20 percent at the close of World War I to 28–30 percent in the late 1920's and climbed to over 40 percent in the middle 1930's before settling to its present level of 39 percent.

Some reference should be made here to a unique and important program for the systematic and enlightened treatment of management-employee relations through the aid of representatives of organized unions—the policy adopted by the Tennessee Valley Authority. This policy is built on the principle of collective bargaining; it assures the employees that they may organize as they see fit and choose their own representatives without restraint of any sort. They are assured that policies, rules, and regulations will be submitted to the representatives before adoption. Even wages for the skilled-labor group who are to receive the "prevailing wage" are annually agreed upon in conference and then recommended to the Authority. The rights of workers and management are clearly set forth, and governing principles and the machinery for maintaining these rights are determined with full approval of all concerned. All the evidence indicates that the Authority has pioneered in the direction of industrial citizenship and democracy.[13]

[12] From several publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including its *Fact Book on Manpower* (September, 1954).

[13] For a statement of the personnel policy see *The Employee Relationship Policy* (Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville: 1945). See also Gordon R. Clapp, "Problems of Union Relations in Public Agencies," *Papers and Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association*, 1943, p. 184, which is a presentation of the basic theoretical and practical problems in union relations in public agencies, with the TVA as an example of one agency's solution to these problems. Discussion both pro and con is included. The most recent authoritative work which elaborates on the union policy is Harry L. Case (TVA's current personnel director), *Personnel Policy in a Public Agency—The TVA Experience* (New York: 1955). See also Robert S. Avery, *Experiment in Management—Personnel Decentralization in the Tennessee Valley Authority* (Knoxville: 1954).

Other published sources include C. Herman Pritchett, *The Tennessee Valley Authority: A Study in Public Administration* (Chapel Hill: 1943), Chap. 9, "Personnel Administration"; TVA Personnel Department, *Interpreting the Experience of Eight Years*, Management Services Report No. 1 (Knoxville: 1942); Judson King, *The TVA Labor Relations Policy at Work: Successful Cooperation Between Public Power and Organized Labor in the Public Interest*, rev. ed. (Washington: 1940); Harry L. Case, "Wage Negotiations in the Tennessee Valley Au-

The TVA deals with a Trades and Labor Council whose basic membership consists of twelve craft unions. White-collar employee organizations are integrated through what is known as the Salary Policy Employee Panel (as distinguished from trades and labor employees paid on a prevailing wage basis). The representation plan is further discussed later in this chapter, under "Employee Representation."

It is surely to the credit of the TVA management that a team comprised of such mixed elements pulls together toward a common goal. A review of the available material, taken together with comments of those who have had first-hand experience with the policy of the Authority, justifies the conclusion that here we have a far-sighted conception of what is involved in a democratically controlled personnel policy, as well as an intelligent execution of the policy.

To summarize at this point, unionization in the Federal service is primarily a phenomenon of the period since 1890 and has been closely associated in its development with the general labor movement. Taking its first salients in the postal service, it has swept over many of the lower grades in the general civil service. Among the general employees, however, the emergence first of multiple unionism has caused some confusion and has undermined the solidarity which might otherwise have been expected, although in some Federal agencies full coöperation among several unions has been established. Amalgamation of AFL and CIO at the top has so far had little effect on Federal unionism.

B. STATE AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES

The organization of state and local employees got under way much more slowly than that of Federal workers, owing no doubt to the greater hold of the spoils system on the states and cities and to a wider dispersion of personnel. The established craft groups were early allied with the appropriate craft unions, and benevolent societies existed in great numbers in 1890 among the teachers, the police, and the firemen. Outside the recognized crafts, however, organization along union lines has taken place largely since 1910.

The earliest national unions of state and local employees were of the craft variety. The first of these appeared among the teachers, who have generally exhibited greater solidarity than many other groups. The American Federation of Teachers was organized in 1916 and affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Espousing the trade-union point of view,

---

thority," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1947, pp. 132–138; Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council, *A Step Forward in Labor-Management Relations* (July, 1952); James D. Schneider, "Collective Bargaining in the Field of Job Classification—The Joint Classification Committee at TVA," *Personnel*, July, 1953, pp. 49–53; and Robert S. Avery, "The TVA and Labor Relations: A Review," *Journal of Politics*, August, 1954, pp. 413–440.

it has grown steadily. It is the principal trade-union organization for this important group of employees.[14] The International Association of Fire Fighters, formed in 1918, also emphasized labor solidarity and affiliated with the AFL. It has been one of the most successful unions in the municipal field. More recently, national unions of the industrial type have appeared in the state-local field. As previously indicated, in 1936 the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees was chartered by the AFL. Its jurisdiction extended to all non-Federal employees except those eligible for, but not yet affiliated with, established craft unions. In 1937 the CIO entered the field with its State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, now the Government and Civic Employees' Organizing Committee. The dual unionism that is conspicuous in the industrial field, and which we have noted as impairing the solidarity of the general workers in the Federal service, has thus been carried straight down the line.

Comparative data on these national organizations of state and local employees are summarized in Table 6.

TABLE 6. National Organizations of State and Local Employees, 1954

Organization	Year Organized	Number of Locals	Membership	Affiliation	Type of Employee Covered
American Federation of Teachers	1916	400	50,000	AFL	Teachers
Int'l Ass'n of Fire Fighters	1918	720	60,000	AFL	Fire fighters
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees	1936	1,200	90,000	AFL	All local employees except those eligible to craft unions who have not joined such unions
Government and Civic Employees' Organizing Committee[a]	1950	130	40,000[b] to 50,000	CIO	All employees of Federal, state, and local governments

[a] This Organizing Committee was established in 1950 after the United Public Workers of America (organized in 1946) had been expelled from the CIO. This organization includes a small number of federal as well as state and local government employees.

[b] It is CIO policy to allow organizing committees to state only approximations of their membership.

SOURCES: *Public Administration Organizations* (1954) and Government and Civic Employees' Organizing Committee staff.

Leaving the national organizations in the state-local field, one is immediately confronted with a mass of conflicting detail which all but defies

[14] Teachers are also organized in the National Education Association, which has some several hundred thousand members. However, the NEA is more nearly a professional association than a union and tends to be dominated by the administrative group.

analysis. State-wide organizations of general jurisdiction exist in a number of states. For the most part, these are less active than either the national or the purely local unions. Powerful organizations of general jurisdiction exist in a number of the larger communities. Also, innumerable organizations of a craft or vertical type are to be found in local jurisdictions. Some idea of the extent of unionization in municipalities is reflected in Table 7.

TABLE 7. Organizations of Local Employees in Cities Over 10,000

Population Group	Number of Cities Reporting	Cities with No Employee Organizations	Cities with Employees in One or More Organizations	Number Cities Having Employees in Affiliated Organizations[a]			Number of Cities with Unaffiliated Organizations
				AFSCME	GCEOC	IAFF	
Cities over 500,000	18	0	18	16	14	18	12
250,000 to 500,000	23	1	22	15	8	20	10
100,000 to 250,000	65	0	65	46	13	54	26
50,000 to 100,000	113	5	108	63	14	94	47
25,000 to 50,000	231	37	194	109	22	148	75
10,000 to 25,000	535	250	285	97	17	156	118
All cities over 10,000	985	293	692	346	88	490	288

[a] The total number of cities with employees in the several affiliated organizations exceeds the total number of cities having one or more organizations because there are many cities having employees in two or more organizations. AFSCME stands for American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFL); GCEOC, Government and Civic Employees' Organizing Committee (CIO); and IAFF, International Association of Fire Fighters (AFL).

SOURCE: *Municipal Year Book, 1955*, p. 162. This table summarizes data on organizations strictly for public employees in cities having over 10,000 population. In some cities skilled-trade workers belonged to separate craft unions whose membership is related to the trade rather than to the public nature of the employment. These affiliations are not included in this report.

A survey of municipal management trends in 1954 predicted "a steadily increasing proportion" of city employees in unions. See Edmond F. Ricketts, "Trends and Forecasts in Personnel," *Public Management*, January, 1955, p. 9.

Upon the basis of this rapid survey a number of points may be noted respecting the unionization of state and local employees. The first is the rapid acceleration of the movement in recent years. Even so well established a union as the International Association of Fire Fighters has enjoyed its greatest expansion since 1934. Secondly, the period of the thirties witnessed the appearance of industrial unionism on a national scale in the state-local field. Thirdly, the four-way division noted among the organized general employees in the Federal service was partially paralleled in the state and local services, with AFL, CIO, and unaffiliated national unions competing for favor. Finally, organized employees outside of the crafts affiliated with the general labor movement were more numerous than those in independent unions or associations.

II. THE OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES OF CIVIL SERVICE UNIONS

The objects for which unions of public employees are formed are usually stated in their constitutions. Despite the multiplicity of organizations, examination of a number of such documents reveals a considerable uniformity of purpose. The usual objectives appear to be four in number: (1) to promote a feeling of solidarity and comradeship among the workers; (2) to protect and extend the merit system; (3) to protect and improve the working conditions, status, and material welfare of the employees; (4) to improve the quality of public administration. There are, of course, variations in emphasis from one to another union, but on the whole these four classes will cover the objectives cited. Thus, the constitution of the National Federation of Federal Employees proclaims its aim as "to advance the social and economic welfare and education of the employees of the United States and to aid in the perfection of systems that will make for greater efficiency in the various services of the United States."[15]

The purposes of the California State Employees' Association are broadly described, embracing such aims as coöperation among state employees, fuller knowledge of the state's work, high standards of conduct, effective management, and preservation of the merit system as well as employee welfare and interests.[16]

A more typically trade-union note is struck by the National Federation of Post Office Clerks. Its aims are stated as follows:

. . . to unite the postal employees in one brotherhood for their social and economic advancement and to aid in the perfection of the postal service. It has been demonstrated by past experience that the trade union movement as exemplified in the American Federation of Labor is the best and most practical method of advancing the interests of all wage earners; therefore we desire to be and to remain in full affiliation with that body.

It shall be the purpose of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks to advance the interests of the postal employees and the postal service, and to aid all workers in distress.[17]

[15] Art. II, sec. I.

[16] Art. I of constitution, as amended in 1952: "The California State Employees' Association is hereby constituted and established in order to foster acquaintanceship, cooperation, efficiency and harmony among State employees and to develop a fuller knowledge among them of the State's organization, functions and activities; to encourage and preserve a true merit system in State government; to promote the welfare of State employees in all ways compatible with the public interest, including the support of legislation deemed beneficial and resistance to legislation deemed detrimental to their interests; to encourage the maintenance of highest standards of employee conduct in governmental affairs; to advocate and defend a just and efficacious administration of laws; to aid in the improvement of government and in the development of the State's resources and the advancement of the State's economy; to inspire and maintain in the hearts of its members a constant dedication to the principles of constitutional democracy as exemplified in our American form of government; and in all ways to render the most effective service to the people of the United States of America and of the State of California."

[17] Constitution, Art. II, sec. I.

The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFL) expresses its conviction of the right to organize and to be part of the labor movement:

> Actuated by the firm conviction that it is a God-given and inalienable right of workers to form into organizations to promote the common good, to improve the social and economic welfare of all employees of state, province, territory, county and municipal governments without regard to sex, color, race, or creed, to promote efficiency in government service, and to give clear evidence of the recognition of our unity with organized labor, we adopt this constitution.
>
> Further we sincerely believe that it is the purpose of our organization to insure that its membership be guaranteed the recognition of them as human beings, creatures of God, in their dealings with those who are charged with the administration of the business of government service.[18]

It must be apparent from these citations that American public service unions are essentially conservative bodies. There is here none of the syndicalist doctrine that is usual in similar documents in France, or even among some of the postal organizations in England; no demand for worker control or for the extension of socialization; no demand for a voice in management, as in Germany. So far as their professed aims are concerned, these organizations are bulwarks of the established order.

A similar impression results from an examination of concrete programs. Most of the Federal unions, for example, are working for wage improvements, a thirty-five-hour week, in-service training, an improved promotion system, a liberalized retirement system, extension of the merit system, and improvement of classification and efficiency rating.[19] They may differ in respect to details or to emphasis, but they are in substantial agreement upon the principal items in this program. Obviously, there is nothing dangerous or revolutionary in it.

The activities engaged in as a means of accomplishing these purposes are various, ranging from the sponsorship of an annual employees' picnic to the maintenance of a high-pressure lobbying machine. In general, they fall into the following classes: (1) social and recreational activities; (2) service and benevolent activities; (3) educational and propagandistic activities; (4) representation of employees before administrative officers; (5) representation of employees before the legislature.

The range of activities comprised under each of these headings is broad.

[18] Preamble of constitution, as amended in 1946.

[19] See the excellent article by Eldon L. Johnson, *op. cit.*, pp. 36–42. For a discussion of the objectives of the national unions in the state-local field see Rollin Posey, "Union Agreements in Municipal Employment," *Public Management*, February, 1948, which tells of the advantages gained by unions through union agreements in municipal government; Gordon Clapp, *op. cit.* (see especially the comments by Arnold S. Zander, President, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, in the discussion); and Joseph Mire, "Collective Bargaining in the Public Service," *Papers and Proceedings of 58th Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association*, 1946, p. 347.

Most organizations engage in some social and recreational pursuits, sponsoring outings, dances, bowling leagues, baseball games, and so on. Some engage in rather extensive service and benevolent activities, maintaining credit unions, sickness and death benefit associations, coöperative buying programs, and the like. Most of the unions favor in-service training, and several have set up educational programs and institutes of their own.

The propagandistic activities of the unions are various. All the larger ones publish periodicals, some of which are very effective. The more important union organs include the *Federal Employee*, issued by the National Federation of Federal Employees; the *Government Standard*, published by the American Federation of Government Employees; the *Union Postal Clerk*, issued by the National Federation of Post Office Clerks; the *Postal Supervisor*, published by the National Association of Postal Supervisors; the *Public Employee*, organ of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; the *American Teacher*, organ of the American Federation of Teachers; and the *International Firefighter*, published by the International Association of Fire Fighters, to mention a few among many.

Although these publications are of different character, they usually contain material of four general sorts: (1) news regarding governmental developments of interest to the particular group of employees—proposed legislation, new legislation, administrative orders, and so forth; (2) informative articles concerning work methods, improved procedures, and the like; (3) editorial material presenting the position of the organization and designed to foster a united front among the members; (4) social news, concerning the activities of members, affiliated organizations, and so forth. There can be no question but that such publications exercise a powerful influence and are effective instruments of unification.

All the larger organizations carry on propagandistic activities through the lay press as well. Effort is made to keep the viewpoint of the employee before the public, and the unions have done a great deal to counteract the popular stereotypes concerning civil servants. Whenever particular measures are desired or feared, the propaganda activities of the large national associations are similar to those of any well-organized pressure group. Petitions are circulated, news releases issued, handbills, posters, and leaflets prepared, mass meetings organized, and radio programs sponsored. There is, of course, great variation in the intensity of the publicity effort made by various organizations and in respect to different issues.

The function of representing employees before administrative officers, although not formalized to the extent represented by the Whitley Council scheme in England, is of constantly increasing importance. One of the most significant trends in the past decade has been the elaboration of relationships between administrative officers and representatives of the organized employees. To be sure, there are definite limits to the possibilities

of collective bargaining in the public service, as President Roosevelt pointed out in a famous letter to Mr. Luther C. Steward of the NFFE on August 16, 1937. This is of so much importance as a statement of official policy that it is quoted at some length:

> All government employees should realize that the process of collective bargaining, as usually understood, cannot be transplanted into the public service. It has its distinct and insurmountable limitations when applied to public personnel management. The very nature and purposes of government make it impossible for administrative officials to represent fully or to bind the employer in mutual discussions with government employee organizations. The employer is the whole people, who speak by means of laws enacted by their representatives in Congress. Accordingly, administrative officials and employees alike are governed and guided, and in many instances restricted, by laws which establish policies, procedures, or rules in personnel matters.

Spero comments as follows on this quotation:

> This statement has been seized upon by employing officials, who were reluctant to negotiate with employee organizations, to prove that it was actually improper for them to do so. President Roosevelt, as subsequent events have demonstrated, never intended to convey such an impression. In August, 1940, three years after he wrote his letter, the Tennessee Valley Authority signed a series of agreements with 15 AFL unions representing its construction and operating employees and with the TVA Trades and Labor Council composed of all these unions. A month later, President Roosevelt, at the dedication of Chickamauga Dam, praised this "splendid new agreement between organized labor and the TVA," declaring "Collective bargaining and efficiency have proceeded hand in hand."[20]

It should also be pointed out that Congress may, if it sees fit, allow a considerable range for collective bargaining even of the orthodox type. Indeed, such a development would seem a logical accompaniment of the expansion of the area of administrative discretion. Congress should lay down certain broad, general rules governing the conditions of service of public employees, but the details should be worked out coöperatively by administrators and employees.

In the less formalized ways, union-management relations are expanding in the public service. This is particularly the case in Federal agencies. But as yet the extent of coöperation between unions and management is not great. As Eldon Johnson has indicated, "the most common type of cooperative machinery consists of irregular meetings between union representatives and directors of personnel or heads of agencies."[21] Nevertheless, more formalized procedures have been evolved in a number of agencies, notably the Tennessee Valley Authority, Department of Agriculture, De-

[20] Spero, *Government as Employer*, p. 346.
[21] "General Unions in the Federal Service," p. 52.

partment of Labor, Bonneville Power Administration, the three Defense departments, and National Labor Relations Board.

Most personnel problems can be handled "within the family" by a wide-awake administration. When legislative action is called for, there should be agreement between management and workers, and the management itself should act as the spearhead in the approach to the lawmakers and appropriating body. The brunt of the attack should be borne by the administrative staff. But as matters now stand generally, one of the most important functions performed by civil service unions is to represent their members before the legislature and to secure favorable legislation. Public employees in their organized aspect are differentiated from other workers primarily by their dependence upon legislation. Since compensation and all the conditions of service are, in the final analysis, controlled by law, the unions can hope materially to improve conditions only as they succeed in securing favorable legislative action. The highest development of union techniques has, therefore, come in connection with lobbying methods and "pressure politics."[22]

But even in the matter of securing remedial legislation, civil service unions are at a special disadvantage for a number of reasons. There is, first of all, popular distrust and antipathy toward the jobholder and the bureaucracy in general, factors upon which legislators are inclined to capitalize. Secondly, the political disabilities of civil servants make it difficult or impossible for them to advocate openly the punishment of political foes and the rewarding of friends. In the third place, many of the members of Federal organizations do not even possess the vote. To overcome these and other obstacles requires not only a high degree of organization but the ability to rally the voters "back home." It is in this respect that affiliation with the general labor movement assumes particular importance.

III. EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATION

It has been pointed out in the previous chapter that the workers are interested in having recognition as individuals. But many of their rights and privileges are granted to them as members of groups. For the protection of such rights and privileges, some form of employee representation is called for. One or more individuals serving as representatives of their group will secure a better hearing from management and speak to it with more assurance and authority than would the same individuals divested of their representative character. What is more, if the management wishes to consult with its workers before modifying existing rules and regulations and procedures which affect the working force, it must have recourse to the principle of representation—that is, where large numbers are involved.

Employee participation, as it was referred to in Chapter 11, has its most

[22] For a good account of their methods see V. O. Key, Jr., *Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups* (New York: 1947), pp. 48–84.

fruitful application when it is conceived as an inherent characteristic of supervision and of the daily work process—a method of decision making. It has to do with the subject matter of each work unit—procedures, standards, and methods—on which supervision arrives at decisions through continuous probing of staff ideas by means of staff meetings, group action, suggestion systems, employee bulletins, and many other approaches. Employee participation in this broad sense is not primarily concerned with across-the-board considerations like conditions of employment and personnel policy. It is when we get into these overall subjects that the appropriateness of employee representation through voluntary organized groups —in other words, unions—becomes especially apparent, because individual work units and in many cases even whole departments do not have the sphere of competence to deal with general personnel policy.

Consultation between management and workers on employment problems is dictated, not alone in the interest of handling these problems satisfactorily and securing the coöperation that is indispensable for the successful conduct of large-scale enterprises, but also because of the growing appreciation of the argument that political democracy and industrial autocracy cannot be reconciled. The adoption of the labor provisions in the National Industrial Recovery Act codes and the bill of rights for labor in the act establishing the National Labor Relations Board were basic decisions looking toward the foundation of industrial democracy. It goes without saying that public employers are more and more experiencing the contagious influence of this movement.

Customarily employee representation takes place through one of two forms: (1) the inside or company organization, or union, whose membership is limited to those employed within a single organization; (2) the trade or industrial union, whose membership is recruited from a number of organizations or even a whole industry and whose leadership is usually vested in full-time officials supported by union funds. Both types of union are involved in representation plans. Still other plans are based on election of representatives by employees as a whole.

The so-called company union had a considerable vogue in private enterprise in the twenties and early thirties,[23] but it is not looked on with favor by labor groups and is now pretty well outmoded. In the public service the development of representation plans has been slower, but the Whitley councils in Great Britain and the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been particularly significant.

In the public service the matter of employee representation is complicated principally by two factors:

1. *The problem of determining the proper sphere of competence of any committee or body representative of employees.* The executive branch of any

[23] See Ernest R. Burton, *Employee Representation* (Baltimore: 1926), pp. 27 ff.; and Ordway Tead and Henry C. Metcalf, *Labor Relations Under the Recovery Act* (New York: 1933), p. 32.

governmental entity does not have the same authority to deal with all personnel policies as does a private business establishment. The legislative body can never abandon its ultimate authority to manage the public service even though great blocks of authority may be delegated by legislation to executive leadership. Employee unions or other employee representatives, therefore, must deal with both the legislative and the executive branches. The sphere of competence of any representational body created by an executive agency is necessarily confined to the authority for personnel determinations by that agency.

2. *Fragmentation of employee organization in the public service.* Particularly in the Federal civil service, large blocks of employees are not organized at all. Even in places where employees are fairly well organized, such as in the Post Office Department, there are often a number of separate unions, each covering specialized personnel. In many areas of Federal, state, and local services there are unions with overlapping and competing jurisdictions.

The typical machinery established for management-employee consultation has been that of the joint committee or council, usually with equal representation of management and employees. Because of the power of particular unions, the positive interest of some managements, or the compulsion of certain state and Federal laws (such as those in the railway labor and utility field), representational machinery in private industrial establishments has generally taken on a more authoritative character than that in governmental areas—in some cases involving the use of arbitration boards with final authority in settlement of disputes. Joint bodies in the public field are almost invariably limited to an advisory role. Even here they can be of significant influence.

The formal involvement of unions in the representational system appears to be more common in private employment than in the public service. Most of the joint councils that now exist in the Federal civil service include representation from employees by various election plans. Each unit or division, for example, will elect one or more employees to sit on a council with management of the bureau or department. These groups, for the most part, concern themselves with coöperative approaches to work improvement and rarely serve as a true example of collective negotiation on personnel policy. They do, nevertheless, serve a very constructive purpose.

As one looks over the public scene, however, he must be impressed with the dearth of experience in employee representation under public authorities. In comparatively few cases have either administrators or employees taken the initiative in this matter.[24] Some of these are worth noting in greater detail.

[24] For a further treatment of this subject see Floyd W. Reeves and Paul T. David, *Personnel Administration in the Federal Government* (Washington: 1937), p. 56.

A. WHITLEY COUNCILS IN THE BRITISH CIVIL SERVICE

The industrial unrest which marked the years immediately preceding and following World War I led, in England, to the establishment of the Committee on Relations Between Employers and Employed, headed by J. H. Whitley. Charged with the task of discovering means of promoting industrial peace, the committee worked out an elaborate plan of joint industrial councils. Its report, rendered in 1917, received the approval of the government, which urged private employers to try the scheme. In 1919, in the face of strong pressure from the civil service organizations, the principles of "Whitleyism" were accepted for the civil service.

The civil service Whitley councils set up under the 1919 agreement are "essentially joint conciliation boards, with unusually broad terms of reference and without an independent chairman.[25] They are of three general orders in the national government: (1) a National Whitley Council; (2) departmental Whitley councils; (3) district and office works committees. Similar councils exist in British local governments which are linked together in a National Joint Council. A common characteristic of all these bodies is equal representation of the government as employer ("official side") and the civil servants ("staff side"). As one authority has indicated: "These councils have become a well established and characteristic feature of the British civil service, providing the machinery through which virtually all phases of public personnel policy are discussed and the clash of contending interests ameliorated."[26]

The procedure of the National Whitley Council, a body of fifty-four members appointed half by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and half by the recognized staff unions, requires that decisions be arrived at, not by a majority vote of the whole group, but by agreement between the two sides. Before becoming effective, such decisions must be signed by the chairman and the vice-chairman, representing the two sides, respectively, and the agreement submitted to the Cabinet. Under the procedure followed, "silence gives consent," and the agreement becomes immediately operative unless the Cabinet acts. It should be noted, however, that the full authority of Parliament and the Cabinet is preserved by this means.

There are some seventy departmental Whitley councils organized on a

[25] Leonard D. White, *Whitley Councils in the British Civil Service* (Chicago: 1933), p. 10. This is the most useful early source on this subject. Among more recent items, the following reflect how Whitleyism has progressed since World War II: H. M. Treasury, *Staff Relations in the Civil Service* (H. M. Stationery Office, London: 1949); Robert S. W. Pollard, "Reflections of a District Whitley Council Secretary," *Public Administration* (London), Spring, 1951, pp. 76–83; Leo D. Cagan, "Recent Transformations in Civil Service Whitleyism," *Public Personnel Review*, January, 1951, pp. 25–30; and Carl J. Schneider, "The Revival of Whitleyism in British Local Government," *Public Administration Review*, Spring, 1953, pp. 97–105. Schneider describes the principles of Whitleyism "as the endeavor of employers and employees through representative councils to understand each other's problems, establish mutual confidence, and raise the efficiency of the enterprise in which they are commonly engaged" (p. 97).

[26] Carl J. Schneider, *loc. cit.*

similar basis. Their representatives are confined to the establishment, and their jurisdiction is limited to problems affecting a single organizational unit. The departmental councils differ from the national body, moreover, in that their competence extends not alone to matters of departmental interest but also to the consideration of individual cases of discipline and promotion.

Finally, there have been established a number of works committees for the labor services in the government dockyards, arsenals, and the like. They are constituted somewhat similarly to those described above, but the official side usually includes representatives of the Ministry of Labor and of the Treasury, in addition to those of the establishment concerned. The district and office committees are completely independent of the National Whitley Council.

In the early years of its existence, the National Council made a number of significant achievements, including adoption of a plan for reclassifying the whole service, acceptance of a cost-of-living bonus system, the creation of promotional boards in the departments, and the facilitation of transfers. No one can deny the tangible accomplishments of the National Council in the first few years. Later, however, the center of importance shifted to the departmental councils concerned with the day-to-day problems of administration. Nevertheless, there seems to be a consensus among British and American authorities that Whitleyism has been a success in the British public service. This is further attested to by the increase of activity along these lines in British local governments during the late forties. Collective bargaining has been achieved in the public service without vitiating the sovereign authority of the State.

B. EMPLOYEE COÖPERATION IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

Although elaborate machinery for joint dealings such as the Whitley Council system has rarely been established in the public services of the United States, the years since World War I have witnessed renewed interest in the problems involved, and various public authorities have embarked upon programs looking to better staff-management coöperation. No attempt will be made to catalogue these or to examine any of them exhaustively. At one time there was an elaborate and promising system of "service councils" in the Post Office Department, which chalked up some definite coöperative achievements during the twenties and early thirties but later were discontinued. The main successful experience in this country along these lines has been that of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The TVA when it launched its Employee Relationship Policy in 1935 consulted "a large number of employees, individually and through their duly authorized representatives." It is interesting to note that this policy embraces "rules and regulations governing labor standards, rates of pay,

classification, hours of work, and employment conditions."[27] The Tennessee Valley Authority clearly has substantially greater freedom of action on these and other matters than the typical government establishment. Nevertheless, it is to be congratulated on the manner in which it has used this discretion.

As stated earlier, the TVA plan, working with both its blue-collar and its white-collar employees, rests on the integration of (1) fifteen craft unions of the skilled trades, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, into an overall unit representing the unions in general, known as the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council, and (2) five organizations of professional and clerical employees into a bargaining group termed the Salary Policy Panel. TVA makes full use of its authority to negotiate on matters of pay, hours, and working conditions through periodic conferences with the Trades and Labor Council and with the Salary Policy Panel. Success in this respect is attributed by TVA management largely to the system of exclusive representation, whereby employee representation can be secured only through the bargaining units referred to, which in turn means only through participating in voluntary unions or associations.

Related to the basic collective representation and bargaining system is the plan for employee participation in work improvement described in the preceding chapter. Through a system of coöperative committees and conferences, in which there is joint representation, notable success has been achieved in developing ideas for the simplification of work processes and elimination of obstructions to efficient operation.

TVA provides the most significant, if not the only, instance of genuine collective bargaining in the public service in the United States, paralleling very closely the character and range of union-management negotiations required of private business under the National Labor Relations Act. Somewhat comparable procedures have been followed in the Bonneville Power Administration and in several municipalities.

C. THE CASE FOR EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATION PLANS

In spite of difficulties of organization and authority, the case for employee representation in the development of personnel policy is widely accepted. It is worth while to summarize here the particular advantages to management in getting such representation:

1. Although good supervision and the development of sound human relations principles can be enormously significant in the maintenance of morale and a highly productive work force, there is usually little or no

[27] *The Employee Relationship Policy* (Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville: 1945), p. 2. This basic policy was later superseded by formal agreements with unions. The most important recent work on TVA is Harry L. Case, *Personnel Policy in a Public Agency—The TVA Experience*, already cited. See especially Chap. 4.

opportunity in individual work units to gauge employee opinion or to test employee interest in service-wide policy matters over which any one work unit or executive has relatively little influence.

2. Soliciting employee opinion on prospective personnel policy avoids pitfalls that may not always be perceived by management, concerned as it usually is with the bird's-eye view.

3. Consultation with employees usually creates better understanding of the mutual objectives of management and employees as a group. Often reforms sought by management which might have been unacceptable to employees if the ideas had been "sprung on them" after they became full blown have actually enlisted the support of employee representatives when the latter were brought in on the ground floor of initial planning.

4. Management can frequently benefit by the positive ideas and proposals which are initiated by employee groups.

5. Mutual consultation promotes rapport and understanding and reduces the potentiality of conflict.

Whether or not the bulk of public employees are members of unions and thereby provide on their own initiative the machinery for consultation and collective bargaining within the limits of the public service, some internal representation plan for workers seems called for. The fact of the matter is that today in local, state, and Federal government the majority of public employees have neither union membership nor any means whereby they may express themselves or be consulted as groups with regard to matters that vitally affect their well-being. *Ad hoc* special purpose committees, whether of a temporary or a permanent character, hardly meet the requirements. What is needed is a well-conceived plan for bringing together responsible representatives of the work force in a group which will meet regularly and will systematically consider general policies in the personnel sphere. In the development of such a plan the administration will doubtless have to take the initiative and at the outset supply the leadership.

It is significant that the first Hoover Commission recommended that "The President should require the heads of departments and agencies to provide for employee participation in the formulation and improvement of Federal personnel policies and practices." It called attention to "one possible method" as that of establishing within each agency "a council composed of both supervisor and employee representatives."[28]

IV. THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CIVIL SERVICE UNIONISM

The unions of Federal employees unquestionably deserve much credit for many improvements in working conditions and for some fundamental improvements in personnel practice. Among the latter, the most important accomplishments were the passage of the Classification Act of 1923 and

[28] *Personnel Management* (Washington: 1949), p. 32.

of the Welch Act of 1928. The latter extended the departmental compensation schedules to the field service and provided for a wage and personnel survey by the Personnel Classification Board. The unions were also active in the campaign leading to a repeal of the personnel provisions in the Economy Act of 1932, and in support of the Ramspeck-O'Mahoney Postmaster Act of 1938, the Reorganization Act of 1939, the Retirement Act revisions, the Pay Acts of the 1940's and 1950's, and similar legislation. Their presence has served as a check on inroads upon the merit system and has facilitated the establishment of machinery for employee-management coöperation. They have consistently emphasized the human factor in administration and have thus helped to create an environment favorable to the development of modern personnel methods. In short, they have for the most part led the way toward the development of that democratic, coöperative administrative organization which the democratic State must, in the long run, achieve.

Somewhat similar generalizations can be made regarding the achievements of unions in the state and municipal jurisdictions. Almost everywhere they have been to the fore in the fight to sustain and extend the merit system and have, in numerous instances, been responsible for classification plans, salary standardization schemes, and the like. Some of the older unions have been responsible also for the improvement of work methods and the development of new techniques.

An important contribution of unionism, often overlooked, is the influence it has on management-employee consultation. This is best brought out in the foregoing discussion on employee representation. Management's task is immensely simplified if it can deal with one union or a committee representing several unions which can be relied on to speak for the mass of employees in an organization. The experience of the Tennessee Valley Authority in this respect is noteworthy. No better basis for employee representation than strong employee organization has as yet been discovered.

On the other hand, there have been disturbing aspects in the policies of employee organizations. They tend to overemphasize the security aspect of employment and to be overzealous in the defense of their members in all circumstances. They are inclined to favor rigidity in administrative procedures and to shy at the exercise of administrative discretion. Finally, their very existence raises fundamental problems, to some of which attention is now directed.

V. SOME PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN CIVIL SERVICE UNIONISM

Despite the progress of unionism in American governmental units, there is still considerable diversity of opinion as to the place of such organizations in the civil service. Adam Smith once remarked that whenever he

saw two bakers in conversation he suspected a conspiracy against the public. This attitude was carried over into classical economics, with its emphasis upon free competition, and thence into the thinking of large sections of the public. This fear of organization has been especially strong in America, retarding the development of trade unionism in general and of civil service unionism in particular.

A. THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE

The position of the civil servant has been peculiarly difficult, for, even in democracies, the State "still wears a royal crown set with the jewel of sovereignty." As a result, it is sometimes argued that group action by public servants should not be permitted. Indeed, for a number of years prior to 1912 such action by Federal employees was prohibited under the so-called "gag" orders. The first of these, issued by Theodore Roosevelt in 1902, forbade all employees of the United States, individually or through associations, "to solicit an increase of pay or to influence or attempt to influence in their own interest any other legislation whatever, either before Congress or its committees, or in any way save through the heads of the departments."[29] This order, in a somewhat strengthened form, was reissued in 1906[30] and further elaborated by President Taft in 1909.[31] Under the 1909 order Federal employees were forbidden to respond to any request for information by Congress, except through the department head.

The effect of these orders was temporarily to cripple the postal unions. Dissatisfaction was rife, not only among the civil servants themselves but among members of Congress. As a result of the demoralized condition of the railway mail service, the elder Senator Robert M. La Follette became interested and conducted an investigation of conditions. The upshot of this was the Lloyd–La Follette Act of 1912,[32] termed by Spero "the most important piece of legislation ever enacted affecting the rights of Federal workers."[33] Among the provisions of the act, the following excerpt is pertinent:

> . . . membership in any society, association, club, or other form of organization of postal employees not affiliated with any outside organization imposing an obligation or duty upon them to engage in any strike, or proposing to assist them in any strike, against the United States, having for its objects, among other things, improvements in the condition of labor of its members, including hours of labor and compensation therefor and leave of absence, by any person or groups of persons in said postal service, or the presenting by any such person or group of persons of any grievance or grievances to the Congress or any member thereof shall not constitute

[29] Executive Order, January 31, 1902.
[30] Executive Order, January 25, 1906.
[31] Executive Order, November 26, 1909.
[32] 37. *Stat.* 555.
[33] Spero, *The Labor Movement in a Government Industry*, p. 173.

or be cause for reduction in rank or compensation or removal of such person or groups of persons from said service.[34]

Thus was the right of the postal employees and, by interpretation, of all Federal employees to associate and to deal with Congress established. In most other jurisdictions, as well, the right of association has been recognized.

The question still remains, however, whether there is anything peculiar to public employment which imposes an obligation of special loyalty upon the civil servant and makes it improper for him to employ the methods generally accepted for other workers. From the standpoint of legal theory, there is such a differentiating characteristic, arising out of the fact of sovereignty. As Sidney and Beatrice Webb once pointed out, when workers "form associations of national extent, raise an independent revenue, elect permanent representative committees, and proceed to bargain and agitate as corporate bodies—they are forming, within the state, a spontaneous democracy of their own."[35]

On the whole, the liberal democratic State tolerates, and even encourages, the existence of such "spontaneous democracies" so long as they do not interfere with its own corporate functioning.[36] But any interference with the processes of government not only is a derogation of sovereignty but may be perilously close to a revolutionary act. This places particular limitations upon the activity of public service unions, since the actions of the servants of the State directly affect the processes of government. Considerations of this general sort have led to the placement of special restrictions upon civil service unions almost everywhere.

Nevertheless, the right to organize has now been long established. President Roosevelt in his famous letter of 1937, cited earlier in this chapter, stated: "Organizations of government employees have a logical place in governmental affairs." The Civil Service Assembly Committee on Employee Relations in the Public Service declared: "Employee Relations will increase as a dynamic and constructive force in government administration as long as it feels the impact of collective programs of employees and the mounting standards of performance in the public service."[37] Eldon Johnson observes of employee unions: "It is no longer a question of whether or not they shall be dealt with; it is simply a question of whether they shall be dealt with intelligently and cooperatively or grudgingly tolerated as a necessary evil."[38]

[34] Sec. 6.

[35] Webb and Webb, *Industrial Democracy* (London: 1926), p. 808. This brilliant analysis was published originally in 1897.

[36] Not so the fascist or communist State, however; there such organizations are absorbed into the State.

[37] *Op. cit.*, p. 230.

[38] Johnson, "Unionism in the Federal Service."

In some states and cities, however, the picture is not so clear. Some have legal provisions which allow employees to organize, others have no law or policy one way or the other, and still others specifically forbid public employees to organize. The governor of Virginia as recently as 1946 recommended that the state legislature declare unionization of state employees contrary to public policy.[39] Such a law was adopted in Texas. Michigan, on the other hand, has interpreted its general labor mediation act, which recognizes the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively, as applying to public as well as private workers. A 1951 survey showed that, of 1228 cities of over 10,000 population that reported, only 30 forbid their employees to join unions, whereas 78 go to the opposite extreme of giving recognition to unions through a written agreement.[40]

B. THE QUESTION OF AFFILIATION

The question of allowing organizations of civil servants to affiliate with outside labor organizations is one which has been differently settled in different countries. In Germany, before the advent of Hitler, civil servants possessed a constitutional right of association and were free to affiliate as they saw fit.[41] In France, although attempts were made before the war to pass laws restricting the right of *fonctionnaires* to affiliate, they were unsuccessful. Affiliation with other than civil service associations is prevented, however, by administrative action.[42] In England, prior to the General Strike of 1926, the question of affiliation was not raised, and many of the strongest civil service unions were members of the British Trades Union Congress. After the strike, in which the public employees took no direct part, the Trade Union Act of 1927 was passed amid high feeling. That act prohibited the affiliation of any civil service organization with an outside labor organization.[43] It has, of course, subsequently been repealed, and many of the unions have, since 1946, affiliated with the Trades Union Congress.

In the United States, as we have seen, the right of affiliation is implicitly extended to Federal employees by the Lloyd–La Follette Act, while in most other American jurisdictions it is not denied.[44] In spite of this fact, however, there is a considerable body of opinion which holds that such

[39] See Joseph Mire, *op. cit.*, p. 347.

[40] *Municipal Year Book, 1951*, pp. 137–139. For more recent data on the extent of unionism in city governments, see Table 7 in this chapter.

[41] Weimar Constitution, Arts. 130 and 150. This did not extend to affiliation with avowedly revolutionary groups, however.

[42] For an excellent account of prewar unionism in the French civil service see Sharp, *The French Civil Service*, Chap. 15.

[43] Clause 5.

[44] There are some exceptions, particularly in connection with police and firemen. The best discussion of the subject is in Spero, *Government as Employer*, Chap. 20.

affiliation is improper and should be prohibited. Although a wide variety of arguments is advanced in this connection, the more important may be reduced to two general considerations.

The first is that, since public employees are the servants of the whole community, they cannot properly identify themselves with organized labor, which is but a part of the community. Leaving out of account the question of sympathetic strikes, which is to be dealt with later, the problem seems to resolve itself into this: How far is the State justified in depriving a large class of its citizens of the democratic right of free association? If they are deprived of this right, will the State secure a desirable class of recruits and retain the services of such a class? So long as organized labor does not enter politics under an independent emblem, the question does not become acute. But even then a truly democratic treatment of the problem would appear to be to grant permission to affiliate. Democratic civil servants can serve and have faithfully served a Republican administration, and the converse is equally true. In England, civil servants in the Labor party have performed their duties impartially under various party controls. As already indicated, impartiality is a primary requisite of satisfactory public service, and any deviation from this standard is sufficient cause for summary discharge.

The second argument is a more practical one: namely, that affiliation with the general labor movement places too much political power in the hands of the public employees, which they are likely to use for their own ends and contrary to the public interest. At the outset, it should be said that such a situation has not developed as yet in the United States, although some groups of employees have been relatively successful in securing special legislative favors. It would, of course, be a serious situation if the civil servants secured sufficient power to dictate to the legislatures and then exercised that power irresponsibly. At the present writing, however, this seems a remote possibility, although many other special interests in America are engaged in this very thing.

There is always danger that the picture of the civil servant as a citizen and a human being will be obscured by the concept of him as a "legally created *homunculus*."[45] Necessarily more largely a creature of the law than his fellow worker in private employ, it is easy to make him a kind of legal abstraction or an automaton. He is already deprived of some of the political rights of the ordinary citizen, and the State should move slowly in adding to his disabilities. His morale is compounded of many elements, but a contributing factor is certainly the consideration that he has the right of reasonable and effective self-direction and self-expression.

[45] The phrase was coined by Friedrich and Cole. See *Responsible Bureaucracy* (Cambridge: 1932) (pp. 60 ff.) for a discussion of unionism in the Swiss civil service.

In the United States at the present time the arguments favorable to freedom of affiliation seem of considerably greater weight than those opposed.[46]

C. RECOGNITION OF THE REPRESENTATIVE AGENT

"In the determination of basic working conditions through mutual agreement, dealing with a single bargaining agency representing the majority of the workers is both a democratic and practical procedure."[47] If we accept the idea of collective bargaining at all, this statement by Spero makes sense. It is more convenient for management to deal with one group than with many and to feel certain that it is dealing with a group truly representative of the employees. In turn, among the employees themselves, a single or an integrated organization promotes greater unity of feeling and purpose. Singleness means simplicity, and simplicity means that it is easier for management and employees to get together to understand each other, and to come to agreement. Frictions, rivalry, and misunderstandings are often avoided when one union is the sole bargaining agency for employees.

In the public service the Tennessee Valley Authority provides the outstanding example of an effort to achieve this objective by its recognition (1) of the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council, an association of individual craft unions, as the sole bargaining agency for its blue-collar workers and (2) of the Salary Policy Panel as the only bargaining unit for clerical and professional employees. A few state and local government units have gone as far. Reeves and David, in their recommendations for the President's Committee on Administrative Management, favored recognition of the majority bargaining agent.[48] The National Civil Service League's Committee on Public Employer-Employee Relations has stated: "The head of a public agency must at all times be free to accept petitions or requests for conferences from any source, but he should reserve any 'agreements' for conferences with the group representing the majority."[49] In this connection, former TVA Chairman Clapp pointed out that employees in an organization, like citizens in a democracy who fail to vote or use political machinery, cannot expect to be well represented unless

[46] The National Civil Service League feels that public bodies must reserve the right to restrict affiliation in particular cases but says: "A general, indiscriminate attempt to dominate the form of organization desired by employees is out of step with the times."—*Employee Organizations and the Government Service*, prepared by the Committee on Public Employer-Employee Relations, National Civil Service League, New York, p. 18.

[47] Spero, *Government as Employer*, p. 378.

[48] Reeves and David, *op. cit.* Other helpful discussions are found in Spero, *Government as Employer*, Chap. 16; *Employee Relations in the Public Service*, pp. 91–99; Mire, *op. cit.*; and Posey, *op. cit.*

[49] *Op. cit.*, p. 16. It is interesting that the German works councils in public and private jurisdictions, first set up under the Weimar Republic and reinstituted under the recent Allied government, avoid the majority representation issue by direct election of employee representatives, who, in fact, are usually members of various unions.

they align themselves with the union that is recognized as the responsible agent for employees in that organization.[50]

This concept of majority representation has not been carried as far as the "closed shop" in the public service. A closed shop implies exclusive representation through one union with the additional conditions that (1) all employees of the organization belong to this union and (2) all new employees are hired from the ranks of this union. Spero observes: "Where the selection of personnel is made on a competitive basis under some form of merit system, the closed shop in the strict sense of the term is impossible."[51] There are, however, a few examples among smaller municipalities of the "union shop," under which employees are required to join the union after a given period, usually within thirty days following appointment. A more common condition among cities is the "bargaining-for-members-only" shop. In this case, an employee who declines to join the union cannot be represented by the union in bargaining with the municipal government.

The major difficulty in determining the proper representative agent or agents in public service unionism lies in the dispersion of union organization or the lack of it. What has been said about majority representation above applies almost exclusively to blue-collar or industrial-type situations in public agencies. Where there are competing unions, or where only a small minority of employees are organized, as in most state and local governments and in the bulk of the Federal service, it is idle to talk of majority representation.[52] The public service as a whole, therefore, still is in a difficult position in trying to deal with its employees on an organized, systematic basis. Most public agencies deal with several competing unions on matters of personnel policy. In many cases all of the unions collectively do not represent a majority of employees. This is a major obstacle to development of formal employee representation and participation plans. Farsighted management has on a few occasions encouraged employee organization and coöperation between possible competing unions so as to simplify and facilitate negotiations and agreement on personnel issues between management and employees as a group.

D. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND AGREEMENTS

Government agencies for many years have been coming to understandings with organizations of their employees on matters within their admin-

[50] See quotation in *Employee Relations in the Public Service*, p. 93.

[51] *Government as Employer*, p. 378.

[52] Spero observes: "Experience in handling the problem of employee representation in government shops and construction work cannot readily be transferred to white collar agencies, where employees lack the trade union experience of industrial workers and where organizations seldom include more than a small minority. . . . It is the problem of finding a responsible and representative group with which to deal which has thus far made the problem of the bargaining unit so much more difficult in the white collar than in the industrial services."—*Ibid.*, pp. 401, 404.

istrative competence. Not many, however, have viewed these discussions as collective bargaining or their results as collective agreements. In the Federal service alone written agreements with unions have been entered into by the Post Office (which had the first formal ones), the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Alaska Railroad, the former Inland Waterways Corporation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, the Maritime Commission, the former Federal Works Agency, and several of the depression-born housing agencies. In a hundred or more cities in the United States municipal officials regularly negotiate with unions of their employees. Results of these conversations range from unwritten understandings or changes in personnel policy to letters of understanding and confirmation or even formal contracts. Agreements sometimes take the form of a resolution or an ordinance by the governing body. The scope of such agreements is varied. Among them are to be found the usual subjects of employer-employee agreement: wage rates, work weeks, vacations, grievance procedures, working conditions, and even seniority in layoffs and reinstatements, group insurance, disability pay, and disciplinary rules.[53]

In spite of this accepted status in many jurisdictions, collective bargaining and union agreements are still viewed with a fishy eye in many places. The legal attack usually confuses the questionable legality of some item in an agreement, such as the compulsory checkoff of union dues, exclusive representation, or arbitration, with the process of bargaining or agreement itself.[54] In municipally operated transit lines, water systems, and similar enterprises the problem has been particularly acute. Too many jurisdictions still require the workers to run to the legislative body every time they want a grievance regarding the work situation settled. "To remedy this deficiency two steps are being seriously considered at public management and public union conferences. The first is to empower by law every appropriate public manager to negotiate and sign contracts with unions

[53] This discussion is based on data in Spero, *Government as Employer;* Mire, *op. cit.;* Posey, *op. cit.;* and Herbert Harris, "Collective Bargaining in Government Service," *Labor and Nation,* February-March, 1946, p. 48.

[54] "Although unions in private industry have always regarded collective bargaining as the life blood of a free labor movement, unions in the public service have only recently begun to show interest in the process. The reason for this is that extensive unionization in the public service developed in the postal and general administrative branches where basic conditions of work have always been fixed by law and in the War and Navy Departments where military control made free negotiation difficult. The relatively recent interest of public employees in collective bargaining has been stimulated by a number of developments occurring at the same time. The first was the influence of the Wagner Act guaranteeing and implementing the right of collective bargaining in private industry. The second was the great upsurge of the labor movement which coincided with the coming to power of the New Deal. The third was the growth of unions in the local government services where it was frequently possible to negotiate even with legislative bodies like city commissions and councils. The fourth was the development of autonomous agencies for the operation of public enterprises."—Spero, *Government as Employer,* p. 341.

within limits to be established by the legislature. The second is to create within every Civil Service Commission an industrial relations unit. Its members would advise and act for the executive directly in charge in much the same manner as the industrial relations director of a private corporation."[55]

Opponents of collective bargaining feared and prophesied such horrible consequences of the practice as diminution of respect for law, dictation by a minority group, domination by selfish interests, even "the shaking of the very foundations of the State." None of these dire results has materialized. For the most part there have resulted an increased sense of responsibility on the part of unions and employees for the employment relationship, a reaffirmation of the representative character of government, and a belief in the fairness and justice of the public service. As Spero has remarked: "If half the energy spent in trying to prove that states, municipalities or federal agencies cannot bargain collectively with their employees were devoted to finding ways to meet the understandable desire of the employees to exercise as large and direct a role as possible in the fixing of their working conditions, sound administration would be more effectively advanced."[56]

E. ARBITRATION

Many have argued that a government cannot compromise its sovereign position by submitting a dispute with its employees to arbitration. Yet as early as the 1890's the joint handling of grievances was used in the New York City Street Cleaning Department. Collective bargaining has stimulated the adoption of grievance procedures, usually with arbitration features, in local governments particularly. They usually provide for tripartite and *ad hoc* arbitration boards to settle both individual grievances and disputes regarding interpretation of an agreement.

In the Federal Government, arbitration is a significant feature of the union agreements entered into by TVA and the Bonneville Power Administration. In TVA, grievances of employees not settled by the Director of Personnel are referred for final determination to an outside arbiter selected from a panel agreed upon by TVA and the union councils. The TVA Act provides that arbitration of disputes as to prevailing wages be undertaken by the Secretary of Labor, whose decision is binding. In the various Federal agencies that establish advisory hearing committees for individual grievances, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, a procedure akin to arbitration, without the compulsory feature, is involved. Further, the establishment by the Ramspeck Act of boards of review for efficiency rating

[55] Harris, *loc. cit.*
[56] *Government as Employer*, p. 348.

appeals follows an even closer parallel.[57] Here the power of decision on an employee's rating that is disputed is vested in a board made up of one representative of the management of the agency involved, a member elected by employees, and a chairman from an outside agency, the Civil Service Commission.

Most authorities recognize that in the last analysis decision by arbitration cannot supplant the public power itself. The National Civil Service League's committee regards submission to arbitration as "a valuable advisory judgment to the administrator at a vital stage in grievance procedure," but observes that "binding arbitrations on questions of legislative character cannot be used, for they have their place only within those areas of policy and practice which are clearly within administrative discretion."[58] However, Spero reminds us that "emphasis on the legal aspects of final and binding arbitration in the public service misses the point. The general acceptance of advisory opinions indicates that the significance of arbitration lies not in the compulsory character of the awards but in their mutual acceptance."[59]

F. THE QUESTION OF THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

The most controversial and misunderstood aspect of the relationships of employee organizations in the public service is the question of the right to strike. The strike question at one time appeared to be of little moment in this country, and the strike was not legally prohibited in many jurisdictions. However, in almost every American city there have long been administrative regulations or a hostile attitude on the part of the executive, both against strikes and against affiliation with outside organizations, with respect to the police and frequently with respect to firemen and teachers.[60] Nevertheless, according to Ziskind, the courts, prior to statutory prohibition, have never passed on the right of government workers to engage in a strike.[61]

The Federal Government has long had other ways of preventing or suppressing strikes than by outright prohibition. The sections of the Criminal Code relating to obstruction of the mails and to conspiracy against the government may be invoked to cover any organized walkout.[62] Indeed, when twenty-five postal employees at Fairmount, West Virginia, resigned

[57] 54 *U.S. Stat.* 1215 (1940). Continued by the Performance Rating Act of 1950, P.L. 873, 81st Cong.

[58] *Op. cit.*, pp. 28–29.

[59] *Government as Employer*, p. 421.

[60] Spero, "Employer and Employee in the Public Service," in *Problems of the American Public Service*, p. 180.

[61] David Ziskind, *One Thousand Strikes of Government Employees* (New York: 1940), p. 233. Ziskind devotes an enlightening chapter (16) to the presentation and refutation of a series of arguments on this issue.

[62] 35 *Stat.* 1088, 1127.

en bloc in protest against the dismissal of two of their colleagues (1915), the government successfully prosecuted them for obstructing the mails.[63]

In this country, moreover, the constitutions of nearly all the civil service unions deny the use of the strike. Thus, that of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks "recognizes" the fact that legislation and not the strike is the last resort in the adjustment of grievances,[64] while that of the National Federation of Federal Employees proclaims that "under no circumstances shall this Federation engage in or support strikes against the United States government."[65] Similarly, the constitution of the American Federation of Government Employees declares: "We oppose and will not support strikes against the United States government, picketing and other measures which have the effect of embarrassing it." In the constitution of the International Association of Fire Fighters, this statement is found: "We shall not strike or take active part in any sympathetic strikes as our position is peculiar to most organized workers, as we are formed to protect the lives and property of communities in case of fire or other serious hazards."[66] Before this amendment was adopted, a number of the local unions of the international did go out on strike, occasionally with the support of the central organization.[67] In this earlier period strikes were "deemed inadvisable," as the constitution phrased it.

In spite of these guarantees, legislation to prevent strikes against the Federal Government did become effective in 1946 by means of clauses attached to appropriation acts requiring that funds not be used to pay salaries of employees who refused to sign an affidavit that they did not belong to an organization "asserting the right to strike against the United States."[68] These clauses undoubtedly grew out of the belief that the constitution of the then new United Public Workers of America departed from the traditional no-strike policies of other civil service unions. The prohibition appeared in substantive legislation the following year in the Taft-Hartley Act, the general labor law which passed over President Truman's veto.[69] It was further pinned down by the Eighty-fourth Congress in 1955.[70] No-strike laws for state and local employees also were deemed

[63] For an account of the Fairmount "strike" see Spero, *The Labor Movement in a Government Industry*, pp. 274 ff.

[64] Art. II, sec. 3.

[65] Art. II, sec. 2.

[66] Art. III, sec. 2 (1930).

[67] The last important strike of organized firemen was in Salt Lake City in June, 1925.

[68] P.L. 419, 79th Cong., July 3, 1946.

[69] "It shall be unlawful for any individual employed by the United States or any agency thereof including wholly owned Government corporations to participate in any strike. Any individual, employed by the United States or by any such agency, who strikes, shall be discharged immediately from his employment, and shall forfeit his civil service status, if any, and shall not be eligible for reemployment for 3 years by the United States or any such agency."—P.L. 201, 80th Cong., 1947.

[70] P.L. 330, 84th Cong., August 9, 1955.

necessary during 1946 and 1947 by the states of Virginia, Texas, Washington, Nebraska, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Ohio. Some of these preceded and several are similar to the Federal provision.

Although both the AFL and the CIO have consistently reiterated approval of the no-strike policy for civil service unions, the federation leaders do not endorse the proposition that public employee strikes are always indefensible. "They regard the adoption of no-strike clauses as a policy of expediency rather than recognition of the moral force of the claims of government as an employer."[71] Hence, spokesmen of both federations unequivocally opposed the above legislative prohibitions by the Federal Government and several states.

Strikes of public employees have nevertheless occurred, despite widespread recognition of the peculiar position of civil servants when it comes to the use of this weapon. As a result of extensive and painstaking investigations into the records and with the aid of newspapers and correspondence, Ziskind in 1940 was able to list and classify 1116 strikes of public employees. Over half of these are charged to the account of WPA and so-called "depression" workers, i.e., not regular employees. Apart from sixty-six strikes among police and firemen, and twenty among schoolteachers, the balance is chargeable to skilled and unskilled workers. The record goes back to 1835.[72] In 1947, there were forty-three municipal workers' strikes, accounting for a loss of 0.034 percent of the working time. The International City Managers Association points out that industry lost forty-four times more working time than municipal government in that year.[73] A teachers' strike in Minneapolis attracted national attention in 1948, but the reaction was more one of sympathy than one of disapproval.

The public employee strike is nearly always a measure of desperation; if conditions are sufficiently bad, it will be resorted to, whether or not its use is legally recognized. Thus, at one time or another strikes of public employees have occurred in most European countries, despite statutory provisions against such action. In this country, isolated strikes have taken place, including the famous Boston police strike which helped to make a President, but there has been nothing approaching a national walkout. There are no reports of sympathetic strikes; at the time of the general strike in Seattle some firemen and schoolteachers were ready to participate,

[71] Spero, *Government as Employer*, p. 476; see also the discussion in Chap. 2, "The Legal Right to Organize and Strike."

[72] *Op. cit.*, p. 3. Ziskind noted that strikers were accustomed to give ample notice of their intentions and that they consistently avoided acts of violence. The duration of the strikes also throws some light on the temper and attitudes of both strikers and their superiors. According to this source, 74 percent of the strikes reviewed were terminated within one week, 20 percent within one day, and 10 percent lasted less than a day (p. 189).

[73] Public Administration Clearing House, *News Bulletin* (Chicago), April 28, 1948.

but, interestingly enough, the committee in charge advised them not to do so.[74]

American public employees can certainly be said to have displayed great restraint, if not actual submissiveness, in use of the strike weapon. Such docility was put to a real test during the depression of the 1930's, when salary reductions, payless furloughs, and scrip payment or no payment at all were common. Despite hardships of this sort, government workers, for the most part, stuck to their jobs. During World War II the no-strike doctrine was actually implemented more than ever before. With the President's power to seize and operate strike-bound plants, the hocus-pocus of temporary seizure was used to transmute the striking employees of a company into "government employees," who were thereupon ordered to work. However, in most cases the government granted the workers' demands and eventually induced the company to continue them upon taking back its property,[75] which suggests that the strikes may have been justified.

In view of the foregoing history, it is strange that the recent trend has been to prohibit public strikes by statute. Perhaps it is accounted for by a carry-over from the usual reactionary mood after a war. It is certainly not explained by an increased disposition of public employees to strike, for there is no evidence to support such a contention. Neither does statutory prohibition seem supportable in logic or political philosophy.

The foundation of the argument in favor of antistrike laws is the sovereign character of government and the urgency and necessity of its administrative operations. But Leonard D. White reminds us:

> The inconvenience caused by a public service strike . . . is not necessarily so great as that which would be involved in a stoppage in some privately managed undertakings. A strike on the nation's railroads, once imposed for forty-eight hours in 1946 and again threatened in 1948, would bring instant disaster to the whole country; in 1947 a strike of coal miners caused creeping paralysis of American production; a strike of milk handlers would be as grave as a strike of almost any group of municipal employees. The relative inconvenience of a strike of street maintenance men, or of public welfare case workers, or of seamen on a government-owned barge line is clearly less.[76]

Spero adds:

> Today, any number of groups of private employees, harbor boatmen, electrical repairmen, railwaymen, telephone operators, transport workers, truckmen, gasoline filling station employees, can not only disrupt the life of great cities but can actually interfere with the functioning of government itself. The fact is that, in these complex

[74] Ziskind, *op. cit.*, p. 196. We have excluded from our discussion organized relief workers. They are not civil servants in the usual sense.

[75] Spero, *Government as Employer*, p. 26.

[76] White, "Strikes in the Public Service," *Public Personnel Review*, January, 1949, p. 5.

times, government depends upon the cooperation of the society of which it is a part as much as that society depends upon government.[77]

He goes on to say:

When the state denies its own employees the right to strike merely because they are its employees, it defines ordinary labor disputes as attacks on public authority and makes the use of drastic remedies and even armed force the only method for handling what otherwise might be simple employment relations. Furthermore, *when a community is faced with a strike, the problem is not punishment of the strikers but the restoration of service. Too severe penalties tend to defeat this purpose and encourage the strikers to remain out until they can bargain away the government's legal right to punish them.* This is hardly the way to maintain the prestige of government.[78]

Many legislators evidently regard the inviolability of government's sovereign authority as more important than the fulfillment of any particular public function, no matter how vital that function may be to the welfare or even the safety of a community and no matter if the punishment of strikers offers more hazard than leaving the matter unlegislated. On this White observes:

The true criterion of distinction should be based on the nature and gravity of the consequences involved in a strike, whether by persons employed by government, by a government corporation, by a public trustee, by a mixed enterprise, by a private corporation affected with a public interest, or by a privately owned and operated industry or enterprise. The rule may be stated in some such terms as these: *A strike that would bring direct, immediate, certain, and serious danger to a primary interest of the community should be prohibited by law, with adequate sanctions, but also with adequate means to secure full public consideration and solution of the issues involved.* In other cases the law should remain silent. The criterion of distinction is therefore the consequence of a strike upon the public interest, not the status of the employer.[79]

This eminent authority's conclusion on the antistrike issue is so significant that we must quote it in full:

The principal elements of a constructive public policy to prevent strikes by eliminating their causes can be briefly identified. They include:

1. Maintenance of equitable conditions of employment comparable to those prevailing in progressive private industry.

2. Full disclosure by management of the terms and conditions, and obligations, of employment in the public service.

3. Recognition of the right of employees to organize and to meet with the appropriate public authorities for collective representation and negotiation on conditions of employment, broadly construed.

[77] *Government as Employer*, p. 8.
[78] *Ibid.*, p. 15. The italics are mine.
[79] "Strikes in the Public Service," p. 6.

4. Provision of adequate machinery, in which both employees and management have confidence, to deal with employee grievances, whether individual or collective.

Proper recognition of these propositions will require new or enlarged administrative agencies in most jurisdictions. A central personnel agency to formulate and guide the application of personnel policy and to furnish positive leadership is required. This leadership, in turn, depends upon effective support by chief executives—mayors, managers, governors, commissioners, secretaries, and presidents.[80]

As recently as 1955 an American Bar Association Committee on Labor Relations of Government Employees declared that the strike prohibition "has proved ill-advised and unworkable." It found the solution of personnel problems, as did White, in assumption of responsibility by management and the legislative body for developing and maintaining enlightened practices and for collective negotiation on policy issues. The committee argued: "The consequences of individual or collective action in declining to perform services must depend on the nature and justification of the action, its cause and other surrounding circumstances, and the merits of the controversy involved in each case."[81]

The right to strike in the public service is clearly an unsettled issue. Some maintain that the issue is academic, that regardless of legislation on the matter if a strike actually threatened the public welfare the ultimate police power of the sovereign would of necessity be invoked to prevent a serious stoppage. In this event, one could conclude that no harm is done by recognizing this in advance through antistrike legislation. On the other hand, such legislation makes no distinctions as to essentiality of government services and leaves out of consideration the equally essential activities housed in private enterprise. But to base antistrike laws on functional distinctions would encounter almost insuperable obstacles of definition and classification.

It is probable that strikes can be prevented without denying the *right* to strike. In fact, they may even be prevented more effectively than by denial of the *right.* Arguments over rights, as distinguished from facts or effects, usually evoke emotionally charged debate. Union leaders, particularly those interested in state and local government, and even officials in a number of municipalities, advise against a flat restriction on the right itself. If groups of public employees are sufficiently irresponsible to endanger public health or safety by striking, then they are open to suspicion of being callous enough to endanger the public even while on duty—a condition that most of us find it difficult to imagine.

In view of the above, striking on the part of public workers does not seem

[80] *Ibid.*, pp. 8–9.

[81] Published in full in "Right to Organize Inherent," *The Union Postal Clerk*, October, 1955, p. 8.

to be a hazard to the public welfare as a practical matter, nor does legal prohibition of this right appear to be justified on a theoretical basis.

But in the event the freedom of action of public employees is to be restricted, the State should also accept restrictions upon itself as employer. It must be willing to accept employee organization and representation, to heed the requests of workers, when reasonable, and to adjust grievances promptly and amicably. Only then can the outlawing of the strike as a weapon be in any way justified, for the threat of a strike is a symptom of a seriously defective personnel system. To deny to any group of employees the right to strike against intolerable conditions is to reduce them to a form of slavery. If strikes in the civil service are contrary to public policy, then, clearly, unsatisfactory working conditions in the public services are against public welfare.

VI. SUMMARY: UNIONISM AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Civil service unionism is today firmly entrenched in the United States, and the question is not so much whether further restrictions are to be placed upon associational activities as whether a constructive place is to be found for such organizations in the personnel program. Some public administrators have been inclined to regard employee organizations with suspicion, if not with outright hostility. But in personnel relations, as elsewhere, suspicion begets suspicion. Coöperation can never be achieved until each side comes to regard the activities of the other with tolerance and understanding and to recognize the common aspects of their joint undertaking.

The unions have already been a constructive force in American public administration, though their full potentialities have not been realized in this respect. What is perhaps most needed is a change in attitude on the part of administrative officers, a willingness to accept the employees as partners in the enterprise. When such a general attitude is achieved, it will be discovered that the employee organizations, in the form either of unions or of labor-management committees, provide a much-needed machinery for staff-management coöperation. Mention has been made of the ways in which the unions have tied into the Whitley Council system of England and into the employee relationship plan of TVA. The logical development is in the direction of regularizing the unions, making them truly representative, and developing them as effective instruments for negotiation and adjustment between the administrators and their subordinates.

The progressive administrator will find employee organizations of value not only as instruments for the collective presentation and settlement of grievances, but also as channels of communication with the staff, as important factors in building morale, and as instruments for energizing the creative potentialities of the employees. An association of workers is all

but mandatory in large-scale organizations. Executives cannot deal intelligently with a mass of individuals, nor can a mass of individuals deal intelligently with the executives. Furthermore, such association is a necessary preliminary to the democratization of the administrative process. This is desirable not only because of the inconsistency of autocratic administration in a democratic State but also as a means of releasing the creative energy always available for tapping in large groups of individuals. Although we have far to go in this direction, progress is being made, and the experience of the Tennessee Valley Authority has especially demonstrated that the democratic method in administration is a fruitful one.

One of the writers on whom we have drawn heavily gives us a fitting close:

> The public services are expanding and the number of workers in the employ of the government is constantly increasing. The American public service, quite as much as the service of any other country, needs such criticism of its management and such a check upon its authority as only independent employee organizations, supported by a free labor movement, can give. Yet it still remains the duty of government to see to it that the public service operate for the benefit of the whole public. It is out of the inevitable conflicts inherent in this situation that problems of employer-employee relations arise in the government service. Fundamentally these problems are a phase of the perennial conflict between authority and liberty in a free society. The issue admits of no final solution but only of working arrangements which leave intact the basic claims of each party. If government presses its sovereign authority to its logical end, it may destroy freedom. If the employees of government fully exercise their collective pressure in their own behalf, they may undermine the public security upon which freedom rests. The life of a free society depends upon the maintenance of freedom and authority in delicate balance. The preservation of this balance depends in turn upon mutual restraint on the part of both government and its employees founded upon the recognition of the fact that in real life there is neither complete liberty nor absolute sovereignty.[82]

[82] Spero, *Government as Employer*, pp. 486–487.

13

Evaluation and Incentives

> Still to our gains our chief respect is had;
> Reward it is that makes us good or bad.
>
> —*Robert Herrick*[1]

One of the basic problems in any large or far-flung organization is the determination and recording of the performance value of staff members. Such a determination is fundamental not only as a guide to the administration of salary advancement, promotion, demotion, and transfer, but also as a means of checking the efficacy of original selection methods. So important is this, indeed, that the literature dealing with it has assumed formidable proportions. Yet despite this attention it remains an almost intractable problem, a challenge of the first order and one which has produced frequent disillusionment in the past.

The principal difficulty in approaching the appraisal of employee performance has been the failure to view it as part of the complex of conditions that motivate the worker. If an employee's behavior, productivity, and effectiveness are to be evaluated—and this is ultimately inescapable—it must be done in a manner that (1) seeks to maintain or improve his performance, not retard it; (2) gives support to supervisory responsibility for ultimate effectiveness of the work to be done; and (3) assures reasonable equity in human relationships. For this reason the matter of incentives through special recognition devices such as awards is associated in the same chapter with the discussion of performance evaluation.

Because the primary goal is good performance, it is appropriate first to say a few introductory words about the subject of incentives.

I. INCENTIVES AND AWARDS

Those conditions of work and supervision which motivate the employee were discussed at some length in Chapter 11 on "Leadership and the Will

[1] *Hesperides* (1648).

to Work." Psychologists and other students of the problem have concluded, among other findings, that (1) positive incentives are preferable to those that are merely directed at blocking the doing of wrong; negative or punishment incentives do not clarify the right way for something to be done, and it is impossible to contrive enough negative devices to block all the wrong paths anyway; (2) incentives must be related to the goals of the organization, so that employees get satisfaction from the fact that their work is part of a larger objective; and (3) recognition of the achievement of a group is a satisfactory way to appeal to the so-called "self motives," since the good of the group and the latter are often consistent.[2]

Based on this line of reasoning, the idea of awards (a positive incentive)—especially in conjunction with the employee suggestion plans discussed in Chapter 11—has taken hold widely in industry and some branches of government. Awards have taken the form of cash or honorary citations, presented to individuals or to groups.

In public jurisdictions in the United States, with the exception of the Federal service, formal award systems are still uncommon. As early as 1918, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Navy to pay cash awards for suggestions, and the "Beneficial Suggestion Plan" of the Navy Department was inaugurated in 1919. Special award plans for other Federal departments were authorized from time to time. In 1946 Congress authorized each department to spend as much as $25,000 per year on cash awards to employees for "meritorious suggestions which will result in improvement or economy in the operations" and which have been adopted for use, with a ceiling of $1000 for individual awards.[3] These restrictions were greatly liberalized in 1954 by the Incentive Awards Act.[4] Many Federal agencies are making use of this authority at the present time with varying success. New York State and a few other governmental jurisdictions also have award systems.

The idea of cash awards has been so long accepted that only in recent years has a serious challenge to this form of recognition been raised—just about the time the Federal Government got around to permitting its general use, but before many state and local governments have even tried it. A principal challenger is TVA, a mainstay of the teamwork approach. This organization, while not encouraging cash awards, has had the unique experience of offering to make money available for awards but getting rejection of the idea by its central joint committee, comprised of management and union representatives. The committee, as well as TVA management

[2] The author is indebted for this summary to oral discussion by Dr. Oakley Gordon of the University of Utah (1955). See also the excellent discussion by John M. Pfiffner, *The Supervision of Personnel* (New York: 1951), Chap. 13.

[3] Administrative Expenses Act, P.L. 600, 79th Cong., August 2, 1946, sec. 14.

[4] P.L. 763, Title III, 83rd Cong., September 1, 1954.

itself, felt that its group approach should not be jeopardized by overemphasis on individual gain and recognition which might discourage cooperation. It is argued that cash awards discourage group contributions by putting a premium on secrecy and individual gain; that it is difficult to evaluate and compare suggestions to determine relative values; that it is sometimes difficult to be sure the suggestion is credited to the proper employee or employees; that there inevitably develops an exclusive emphasis upon technical suggestions as contrasted with other types which might be equally significant but less susceptible of monetary evaluation. In view of TVA's notable success in work improvement and in employee relations in general, these considerations are sufficient to give pause to those who accept the traditional concept of cash awards.

Certainly a scheme of financial rewards raises the problem of equitably relating the reward to the value of the suggestion. In some private concerns, equipped with good cost accounting systems, it is possible to evaluate rather objectively those suggestions which are accepted for improving production methods and the like. A common practice under such circumstances is to award the suggester an amount equal to 10 percent of the first year's saving. But the value of many suggestions and of the vast majority in the public service cannot be determined in monetary terms. Thus there is certainly much to support the position that rewards for suggestions should come through the ordinary channels of increased official esteem, salary advancement, and promotion, together with appropriate public recognition. If nonfinancial incentives are to be used, however, it is necessary for the administrative staff to go to some lengths in sponsoring the policy and in making it known that an employee's suggestion record will be accorded due weight in connection with advancement and promotion.

The place of a special award or recognition system in a personnel program is nowhere better summarized than in the foreword to a U.S. Civil Service Commission pamphlet on the subject:

> Actually, motivation of a worker to do his utmost is a highly individualized matter. The problems of motivation vary with the nature of the organization, the attitudes prevailing among people who have been associated with the organization for a long time, different periods in an organization's history, and different stages in an individual employee's career. An award that may be a true incentive in one time and place may have little or no effect in another. An award, or expectation of an award, that spurs one employee to great effort may leave another employee indifferent. On top of this, there is the problem of handling individual recognition in such a way that cooperation among individuals is not jeopardized. Overstress on individual achievements may sometimes hold back good teamwork, as some of our great athletic coaches have learned. Also, it should be understood that incentive awards are concerned with "recognition" as well as with cash.
>
> "Bigness" in modern organizations, which tends to separate management from the worker, does not make an individualized approach easy. Success in the use of

awards, therefore, is more dependent on the qualities of supervisory leadership than on any other condition. This is usually the kind of leadership that understands and uses awards and recognition as only one facet of good employer-employee relations, only a part of the complex of drives that motivate people to do their best work.

These and many other problems make the subject of incentive awards one that cannot be reduced to a simple formula. It is not one to be settled merely by high-pressure campaigns to get supervisors and employees to make use of awards. A great deal of fact finding in an individual situation is necessary. An organization that successfully uses incentive awards usually relies more on careful analysis than on supersalesmanship.[5]

In addition to the above considerations, special incentives that reach particular groups must be taken into account. For example, scientists, engineers, social workers, and professional people in general usually identify themselves more with a profession than with an organization in which they happen to be employed. Usually a chemist thinks of himself as a chemist first, and an employee of such and such laboratory second. He is more concerned about the regard of his colleagues in his profession than he is about the appraisal of executives in his place of current employment. This is not to be deplored. Organizations merely need to recognize the fact and do something about it. Such professional pride can still be the foundation for strong morale, and management can still build strong organizational identification even though it is secondary. But it may be more important to capitalize on recognition given by outside groups, through awards or otherwise, than to insist on employer-centered awards. An example is the use of outside professional groups to decide on the granting of awards. Another is the financing of participation in professional meetings.

Before leaving this point, we must acknowledge that the most important single incentive for the public employee is the confidence that the American people accord government and its personnel an honored place in American life. The discussion in Chapter 3 on the importance of prestige in public employment is worth review in this connection.

With this introductory attention to the general subject of positive incentives through recognition of various kinds, particularly formal awards, let us now look at the problem of performance evaluation in the light of these considerations.

II. THE REQUIREMENTS AND PROBLEMS OF AN ADEQUATE REPORTING SYSTEM

A. OBJECTIVES

Like other personnel tools, the system of performance reports or of employee rating must be adapted to the ends it is to serve. These may vary

[5] *Recognizing Employees Through Incentive Awards*, a pamphlet prepared by an interdepartmental committee of personnel experts, U.S. Civil Service Commission (Washington: September, 1954), p. 2.

considerably from one jurisdiction to another. The more important may be considered under four headings:

1. To develop standards of satisfactory performance—clarifying what quality and quantity of work of a given type is acceptable and adequate for the interests of the service.
2. To improve employee performance by identifying and measuring strong and weak points of individual performance, recording evaluations in objective terms, encouraging employees in their work, and giving constructive counsel to employees concerning their shortcomings.
3. To refine and validate personnel techniques—serving as a check on qualification requirements, examinations, placement techniques, training needs, or instances of maladjustment.
4. To objectify the application of personnel policies—in selecting candidates for placement and promotion, in administering salary advancements within grade, in determining the order of separation under necessary reductions in force, and in otherwise recognizing superior or inferior service.[6]

One of the objections to rating systems in the past has been focused on the effort to serve too many purposes with a single tool. An evaluation method that is specific enough to be valid but broad enough to serve for future promotion selection, for diagnosing training needs, and for determining the order of retention in a staff reduction is almost impossible to achieve. For example, many thoughtful executives argue that you cannot gear selection for unknown future vacancies—with their variety of special qualification requirements—to previously recorded appraisals of past performance. Each candidate should be separately appraised as to his potential for each new vacancy for which he is eligible as it arises, so that the peculiar needs of a job and the employee's peculiar gifts and shortcomings can be matched on a concrete, realistic basis.

Nevertheless, whether for one or more purposes at a time, the evaluation of performance must be made—the problem being to make it both valid and valuable. The central administrative problem is how evaluations of many different supervisors can be properly and objectively recorded for practical administrative use.

B. VALIDITY AND ACCEPTABILITY

As in the case of tests, validity and reliability are prime requirements of an adequate rating system. Further, in so far as possible, the scheme should possess certain administrative virtues. Among the most important of these

[6] O. Glenn Stahl, "Overhauling Federal Efficiency Ratings," *Personnel Administration*, September, 1943, p. 12. After a survey of rating systems in ninety-four private concerns, the National Industrial Conference Board listed fourteen specific objectives of such systems; see *Plans for Rating Employees*, Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 8 (New York: 1938), p. 5. A later report by the NICB is *Employee Rating*, Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 39 (New York: 1942).

are simplicity, flexibility, and economy. Any reporting or rating system has to be operated by busy supervisors. It cannot, therefore, be elaborate or it will fail at the point of administration. An adequate system must also possess a good deal of flexibility.

Most important, evaluation methods are worthless unless they have the full understanding, participation, and acceptance of the employees being evaluated. This is the criterion on which many plans fall down. It accounts for the recent trend away from elaborate schemes that attempted to categorize employee performance and label the results in such a way that each person could be "compared" with others in similar jobs. The word "rating" is, therefore, giving way to "evaluation" and "performance reports." Emphasis now is on the first two objectives listed above rather than on the last two. In fact, the first Hoover Commission urged that "ability and service records" should be used only for supervisor-employee conference, with a view to developing employee performance, and not to govern salary increases, layoffs, or dismissals.[7] The second Hoover Commission followed this up with further urging that only exceptional performance—the kind demonstrating promotion potential, misplacement, meritorious recognition, or need for dismissal—be formally reported, with the appraisal and motivation of the mass of employees left to the day-to-day supervisor-employee relationship. A rating system "should not be an end in itself."[8]

The question is not so much whether certain administrative actions shall be guided by relatively objective measures as whether all can be covered by one grand system. What contributes to improving employee performance may not provide a suitable device for determining promotion potential. The use of "adjective" ratings, such as "excellent" and "good," may lead to invidious comparisons among the recipients and vitiate the very process of getting better work out of the least productive employees. To be told that he is getting along well may be precisely what a worker needs in order to perform more effectively. One of the most fundamental psychological needs is to feel that one is succeeding, a principle discussed in Chapter 11. This suggests to some that performance reports cause more harm than good. Yet the "invidious comparisons" implied by adjective ratings are sometimes suited to such administrative uses as reductions in staff and salary increases within class or grade. In short, all of the purposes and characteristics mentioned above are rarely compatible with one another.

C. THE PERSONAL FACTOR

In preceding chapters we have discussed the problems of job analysis, classification, and rating for wage purposes. Those techniques had to do

[7] *Personnel Management* (Washington: 1949), p. 33. See also Task Force Report, *Federal Personnel* (Washington: 1949), p. 62. For further discussion see R. C. Smyth and M. J. Murphy, *Job Evaluation and Employee Rating* (New York: 1946), pp. 188–194, 204–207.

[8] *Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), pp. 62–65; *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), pp. 91–94.

with rating the position and were designed to eliminate the factor of the incumbent. In the present instance the situation is reversed. We are now interested in methods of judging the employee while holding constant the job factor. In both cases an estimate or appraisal of value is involved, but the second process is more difficult than the first because it embraces a greater number of subjective elements. It is affected at every turn by the dynamics of human personality, as represented in both supervisor and employee. A basic difficulty is to devise methods which will adequately recognize such dynamics and still reduce subjective elements to a minimum.

Job rating has to do with what the employee does; personal rating, with how he does it. A major difficulty in the latter instance is that this can be determined for the most part only by the employee's immediate supervisor. Thus, while job rating or grading can be performed by personnel experts, the major part of employee rating must be in the hands of operating officers. One of the problems, therefore, is to secure reliable reports from various supervisory officers or to devise a system which will reduce to a minimum the element of personal bias entering into their reports on the performance and behavior of their subordinates.

At one time experts sought to mitigate the element of bias by devising mechanical scoring systems, leaving only the reporting of verifiable facts of performance to the supervisor. This system encountered the natural difficulty of overall results that did not gauge the supervisor's overall estimation of an employee, causing both supervisor and employee to be mystified or disappointed. More recently the attempt has been to avoid summary ratings except in broad, relatively noninvidious categories—such as "outstanding," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory." The Tennessee Valley Authority was one of the first agencies to employ such a plan. It is now generally applicable to the rest of the Federal service.[9] Certainly any scheme that calls for relatively precise measurements by the supervisor places a great burden on him. Under it, evaluations can be only as reliable as his individual judgment.

Many difficulties can be reduced by an adequate program of training, but where a judgment system is employed, the problem of securing reasonable uniformity in evaluations by different supervisors will always be serious. Even in the case of performance report systems, where the factor of individual judgment is reduced to a minimum, the quality of the reporting officers is of crucial importance, and intensive training is called for.

Perhaps a logical question here is not merely how to reduce the subjective element in evaluation but how to minimize overpreciseness in measurement so that too heavy a premium is not placed on a degree of objectivity and uniformity that is unreasonable to expect of supervisors and that experience shows is well-nigh impossible to attain.

[9] Performance Rating Act of 1950, P.L. 873, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950.

D. THE PROBLEM OF TECHNIQUE

Traditional rating systems are designed to assist supervisors and personnel officers in evaluating employees by (1) focusing attention upon significant traits, characteristics, or behavior and (2) providing some standard bases of comparison or units of measurement. In devising a reporting system, therefore, the two principal technical problems have to do with the selection of factors to be evaluated and the comparative evaluation of such factors. In both instances the questions involved are complex and often highly technical. In a general discussion we can do no more than hint at some of them.

A more recent principle is that evaluations be related to specific classes of work rather than to personal traits, and that standards of performance be established as the criteria by which an individual's performance is judged. This keynotes one of the trends in thinking on performance evaluation. Application of these ideas has developed gradually in a number of places over recent years.

1. The Selection of Factors. In traditional rating plans, the first step involved careful job analysis and the existence of a classification plan showing the relationships of various classes of positions. Obviously, it is important to choose factors which either are significant in themselves or are demonstrable indexes of characteristics related to success or failure in particular types of jobs. The principle here is similar to that involved in all test construction.

The selection of factors to be judged further depends upon clear-cut choices between a number of alternative rating possibilities. In the first place, authorities are not agreed whether the individual employee should be rated as a whole or whether specific traits or items of behavior should be evaluated separately. It is argued by some that the supervisor always judges the whole man and that it is impossible to segment behavior for evaluation purposes. Against this must be set the formidable argument that both the objectivity and the reliability of reports increase as the factors involved become more specific.

A second basic choice has to be made in respect to the character of things to be reported and evaluated. Thus, emphasis may be placed directly upon personality traits, such as tact, initiative, and integrity, or upon specific job behavior or activities, such as display of ingenuity in particular situations, extent to which work is done without immediate direction, and irritation of fellow employees. In the one case the attempt is made to estimate relevant personality traits directly; in the other they are translated in terms of prognostic behavior. To be sure, the two approaches tend to shade into each other, but they can be distinguished.

Evaluations, by their very nature, can never be wholly objective. Yet

the maximum degree of objectivity is desirable, and that is approached if the attention of the supervisor is focused upon specific job behavior or activities rather than upon generic traits. Moreover, since personality and character and social phenomena are of basic importance, a person's actual behavior in social (work) situations and the reactions of others to him in those situations are probably the best means of measuring them.

There are, of course, difficulties with a rating plan that relies upon reports of actual behavior. There is the problem, for example, of assuring that reported behavior is representative and not exceptional. This is especially pressing, for reporting officers tend to recall the exceptional and to overlook the normal. There is the further difficulty that much behavior is significant only as evidence of something else. It provides an index to the presence or absence of a relevant trait or capacity. For this reason, behavior which is relevant for evaluation purposes is more difficult to identify than general traits or characteristics. But in spite of these technical difficulties, the advantages of a system based upon observable behavior or activities are such that it is to be preferred.

Closely related to the selection of factors is their definition and the determination of those evidences which will be accepted as indicating the presence or absence of a particular one. In this connection a general rule may be laid down. No factor can be rated which cannot be precisely defined. Each item to be reported must be clearly described in simple, unambiguous terms and as concretely as possible.

As for actual standards of performance, a number of Federal agencies have had experience with setting goals of quantity and quality of work against which the employee's performance is judged. Often these have been set by supervisor-employee conference prior to the reporting time.[10]

2. The Problem of Evaluation. No matter how carefully factors have been selected and no matter how accurately supervisors observe and report the characteristics of their employees, the whole system will break down unless the conclusion based upon these is sound. This is the crux of the whole process, yet it is often the aspect most superficially considered.

From one point of view the act of rating is one of comparing individuals, in respect to certain factors previously selected as significant, with some sort of norm or standard. The standard may be either subjective or objective, but it must be there. The problem is to make it as objective and consistent as possible. Otherwise evaluations will be of low reliability, for the standard of comparison will vary from one supervisor to another and with the same supervisor as between different employees. It is as though

[10] See especially the symposium (seven authors) "Standards of Performance," *Personnel Administration*, July, 1948, pp. 21–47; Eldon E. Sweezy, "Developing Job Performance Standards in the Federal Government," *Public Personnel Review*, January, 1949; Lawrence Appley, "Emergence of a New Management Era," *Personnel*, May, 1949.

one were attempting to measure the sides of a room with a yardstick which continually expands and contracts.

Various devices have been developed to facilitate the establishment of such a norm. Nearly all of them have contributed to the process of ranking employees by improving the character of the qualitative analysis made by the supervisory officer. This is important. But almost without exception they have failed to provide an adequate measuring instrument.

The problem of a measuring instrument is important largely to the extent that we insist upon comparison of one person's performance with that of another. Evaluation against job standards alone reduces the problem of measurement to individual factors or job duties. If we eliminate the summary or conclusion rating, as recommended in effect by both Hoover Commissions, even the conclusions on individual factors may not need to be put in terms permitting comparison with the performance of others. They can merely be stated in factual terms for use in guiding the particular employee in making the most of his abilities. Hence, the future may see less emphasis on "measurements" in evaluation and more on "uses" of supervisor-employee understanding regarding performance.[11]

III. METHODS OF EMPLOYEE EVALUATION

Brief consideration will now be given to some of the plans and forms that have been developed for rating purposes. Some of the story is simply a matter of history, for in several instances devices once considered significant are no longer used or have been discredited.

A. PRODUCTION RECORDS

There are two types of positions in almost any working organization: in the one type, the work is largely of a routine, repetitive character and lends itself to unit measurements; in the other, it is so varied or involves so much administrative responsibility that it cannot readily be measured on the basis of output. The efficiency of the employee in the first type of position can be rated, in part at least, on the basis of production records; his efficiency in the second cannot.

The first type is represented by the work of a stenographer, typist, file clerk, or machine operator, of a copyist in the tax collector's office, of a meter reader, and the like. On the basis of time studies and, if need be, motion studies as well, an objective norm for work of this type may be set up, as is already done in many governmental establishments and in private business. In the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, for example,

[11] For interesting challenges to the traditional category rating still used in most performance evaluation systems see A. Q. Sartain, "What Research Should Industrial Psychologists Do?" *Personnel Psychology*, Winter, 1951, pp. 321–326; and Jack Pockrass, "Performance Evaluation—Forms or Substance," *Personnel Administration*, September, 1954, pp. 1–6.

the number of punch cards punched or verified, the number of errors, and similar information are recorded for nearly all of the 5000 employees of its division which keeps the millions of social security accounts for the country's wage earners. Similar production records are used in state unemployment insurance agencies.

It is obvious, of course, that production records cannot provide the only basis for judging an employee. Personality factors and considerations such as degree of coöperation are also important, even in routine jobs. However, the use of production records can greatly simplify the evaluation problem when they are available or can be developed.

B. PERIODIC TESTS

A second method of gauging the efficiency of the worker is through the administration of periodic tests. This method, like that of production records, is better adapted to routine and repetitive jobs, since duties/tests can be most easily developed for this type of position. Periodic tests have been employed in some public establishments as the basis for rating the efficiency of the employee.

The method of measurement upon the basis of periodic tests has this in common with ratings based upon records of production: both employ some form of production as an index. In the case of tests, however, the index is production at a specified time, while with production records the evaluation depends upon the average speed and accuracy of the worker over a longer period. Because of this fact, the production record system is more accurate. When applied, however, to less measurable types of work, tests may be very useful as a prediction of future performance on related jobs.

C. RATING SCHEDULES AND OTHER DEVICES

As suggested in the introduction to this chapter, the routine of certain phases of management imposes upon supervisors and executives the necessity of passing judgment on their subordinates. If this is not done formally, it is done informally. In view of the importance of the process and of the known vagaries of human judgment, a wide variety of schemes has been propounded and experimented with. These range from the assignment of numerical percentages or letter grades (A–F) on a kind of overall basis, to the grading of dozens of traits or behaviors all of which may be combined into a single score by an elaborate formula for weighting purposes. The former is too simple and opens the door to so many inconsistencies between individuals grading the same employee that it has been thoroughly discredited. On the other hand, the latter may be so complex, obscure, and difficult to handle that it falls of its own weight. Within the range set by the two extremes just cited are found various

"scales" and devices that have proliferated over the years. Suffice it to say that progress has been made since the days of the school grading schemes when 0–100 or A–F scales were being applied on an overall basis.[12]

Among scales that have been generally used are the following:

1. Man-to-Man Comparison Scale. This device, inaugurated by the Army in World War I, involved selection of key officers as representative of certain degrees of a particular factor being rated. It broke away from the blanket type of appraisal, which opens the door to prejudice and most recent impressions and which may unduly color one's judgment favorably or unfavorably, and from the overemphasis on certain qualities that may or may not be important for the execution of the duties pertaining to the officer's position. This scale also sought to objectify judgments by prescribing that for each trait the reporting officer shall visualize the best and the poorest and three intermediate steps in terms of individuals whom he knows.

This scheme marked a real advance over earlier experiments. It proved to be deficient, however, in two directions: (1) it specified qualities of too general a nature, which, even though carefully defined, might mean different things to different supervisors; (2) the "yardsticks" of various officers might or might not be comparable. One rater's "best" might be another's "better," and his "poorest" might be another's "fair." If there is to be comparability, the traits or behavior selected for evaluation, as well as the gradations in the measuring rod, must mean approximately the same thing to all those participating in the procedure.

2. Graphic Rating Scale. The graphic scale has been one of the most popular rating methods in use. It was originally developed by the Scott Company and has been widely employed in private concerns as well as by a number of public jurisdictions.

It consists essentially of two elements: (1) a list of traits or activities to be rated, arrived at by a subjective analysis of factors leading to success or making for failure on the job; (2) various descriptive phrases or ad-

[12] The reader interested in the development of various rating schemes is referred to D. G. Paterson, "Methods of Rating Human Qualities," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, November, 1923, pp. 81–93; Max Freyd, *An Appraisal of Relative Merits of Types of Rating Scales and Their Use*, American Management Association, Convention Series, No. 38 (New York: 1926); F. F. Bradshaw, "Revising Rating Techniques," *Personnel Journal*, December, 1931, pp. 232–245; J. B. Probst, *Service Ratings* (Chicago: 1931); R. O. Beckman, "A Yardstick for Employee Performance," *Management Methods*, June, 1932; M. W. Richardson and G. F. Kuder, "Making a Rating Scale That Measures," *Personnel Journal*, June, 1933, pp. 36–40; R. S. Driver, "A Case History in Merit Rating," *Personnel*, May, 1940, pp. 137–162; John C. Flanagan, "A New Approach to Evaluating Personnel," *Personnel*, July, 1949, pp. 35–42; American Management Association, *Rating and Training Executives and Employees*, Personnel Series, No. 100 (New York: 1946); Smyth and Murphy, *op. cit.*, pp. 167–237; Paul Pigors and Charles A. Myers, *Personnel Administration* (New York: 1951), pp. 202–207. This representative list is but a partial indication of the extensive literature on the subject.

jectives denoting the several degrees of a particular activity or trait. As the form is set up, these descriptive phrases are placed beneath a horizontal line graphically representing the entire range of the quality under review. They serve as a guide to the supervisor, who is then instructed to place a check mark along the line at a point representing his judgment as to the degree of that particular quality possessed by the employee being rated. The form of the device is indicated by the accompanying diagram.

Work Attitude	Complains or acts unconcerned.		Sometimes indifferent; goes about his work half-heartedly.		Average interest; likes most phases of his job.		Definite interest in work.		Enthusiastic, wholehearted, active interest.

The graphic rating scale may offer a valuable aid to making a qualitative analysis of the employee. It is open to objection, however, on two major grounds. First, it is set up on the basis of a rating of traits, and most of the qualities involved are too complex or general to permit essential standardization. Second, and more important, it breaks down at the point of evaluation. The device is scored by translating qualitative judgments into quantitative terms. A little analysis will show that the basis for any such procedure is questionable. The graphic scale consists essentially of a continuum along which the landmarks have been set entirely arbitrarily. There is no standard unit of measurement involved, and the device is not really a scale at all. It is a schedule, the various items of which are arbitrarily weighted and given a numerical value. The appearance of such precision is misleading.

It may be pointed out, however, that these criticisms of the graphic rating scale are not too serious *if there is no summary rating* and if the individual factors relate to actual job behavior rather than to surmised personal traits. Thus, such a device, used merely to facilitate a supervisor's thinking and discussion with an employee, may be very helpful.

3. The Probst Service Rating System. One of the devices for determining service value that created wide attention in the thirties was the system developed by J. B. Probst, then chief examiner of the St. Paul Civil Service Commission. Perfected after a number of years of research, it had many advantages over the earlier rating "scales" and unquestionably marked an important step in advance.[13] Probst listed about a hundred modes of behavior or characteristics, the majority of which were considered objectively

[13] J. B. Probst, *Service Ratings*, Bureau of Public Personnel Administration (Chicago: 1931). Later publications by Probst include *Origin and Development of the Scoring Stencils and Formula Scales in the Probst Rating System* (St. Paul: 1936) and *Measuring and Rating Employee Value* (New York: 1947).

observable. The raters—usually three for each employee—checked only those items which they felt described the employee. No estimates were required of qualities which they had no opportunity to observe. The actual rating of the employee was obtained through a separate evaluation, which took the form of the addition or subtraction of numerical values previously assigned to the descriptive phrases checked by the reporting officer as characteristic of the employee. This was a routine operation ordinarily performed by the personnel office on the basis of a series of weights developed by Probst.

The Probst plan has rapidly declined in use for several reasons: the sheer burden of considering over a hundred standard statements in the process of rating each employee; the doubtful procedure of having marks made on the same form by three officials ostensibly acquainted with the employee's work; and the mysterious and arbitrary method for attaching numerical scores to the particular combinations of statements checked by the rater. Unfortunately, its proponents made extravagant claims concerning its scientific character. It is now largely of historical significance.

4. Psychophysical Scales. Beyle and Kingsley took the Probst items and scaled them by the psychophysical methods developed by Thurstone. A number of the items on the Probst form were found, however, to be insufficiently sharp for inclusion in a measuring instrument, and there were gaps in the resulting scale. They therefore eliminated a number of items, added others, and modified still others. The final product of this process was the original Beyle-Kingsley Evaluation Scale, first developed in 1936.[14]

Such psychophysical instruments as the Beyle-Kingsley Scale consist of landmark statements of observable behavior or characteristics, the presence or absence of which in an employee can be readily reported by a supervisor. The Richardson-Kuder Scale is a similar device.[15] But both differ fundamentally from schedules like that of Probst *in terms of the means by which numerical values are determined for the landmark descriptions.* In the case of the psychophysical scale, numerical values are determined upon the basis of judgments of a large number of competent coöperators, rather than by one or a few. Moreover, the techniques involved assure distribution of the landmark descriptions along a continuum (such as value to the service) in spaces of apparently equal length and provide automatically for the elimination of ambiguous or fuzzy statements. In the case of the experimental study by Beyle and Kingsley, scale values were determined upon the basis of ratings by a hundred experienced personnel officers evenly divided between industrial and public service and a hundred employees similarly apportioned. The result would seem to be the construction

[14] Herman C. Beyle and J. Donald Kingsley, "A New Employee Evaluation Scale" (mimeographed) (Syracuse: 1936).

[15] Richardson and Kuder, *op. cit.*

of a real rating instrument in which objectivity is maximized and gaps in the scale are reduced or virtually eliminated. Experimentation with this approach, however, has been limited.

5. California Reports of Performance. The California State Personnel Board developed a service rating plan in the 1930's which attracted considerable attention.[16] It was based upon the statement of characteristics necessary for success on the job in terms of specific, definite, and observable actions. Like the Probst system, it was centrally scored. It departed from the earlier approach and from the systems currently in use in most other jurisdictions by the establishment of separate forms for the major types of work. Whereas Probst, for example, provided special instruments for firemen and policemen, teachers, and unskilled laborers, the California board developed no fewer than forty-five separate forms. Many students of performance reporting, as well as an overwhelming number of the better personnel practitioners, have long felt the inadequacy of a single, general instrument applied to a complex organization composed of widely varying types of positions. While the California system did not depart fundamentally from other schedule approaches, a greater degree of both refinement and objectivity was achieved.

6. Federal Rating Plans. As with so many other jurisdictions the United States government has experimented with a variety of rating schedules over the years. It cannot be credited, however, with developing new types of rating, having confined its contributions largely to the improvement of qualitative schedules and the simplification of reporting and reviewing ratings.

Since 1912 some effort at maintaining uniform rating practices has existed in one form or other, and under the first Classification Act of 1923 a uniform system was prescribed for all portions of the service coming under the jurisdiction of that law. From 1932 onward the U.S. Civil Service Commission had the leadership responsibility in development and enforcement of rating responsibility. The systems prescribed ranged from factor checking plans, which resulted in deceptively precise percentage scores, to the "Report of Efficiency Rating," which was in use during and after World War II and, with minor refinements, persisted until 1950. This latter system involved the checking by both a rating and a reviewing official of thirty or more "elements" of performance and conduct showing whether the employee was adequate, weak, or outstanding in each regard. Certain combinations of such marks led to one of five summary adjective ratings, but a supervisor, with special explanation, could use one of the adjective ratings that deviated from the pattern dictated by the combination of element markings. The same form applied to all occupations, the elements

[16] State Personnel Board, *Reports of Performance: A System of Service Ratings for the California State Service* (Sacramento: 1939).

were of necessity very general, and the whole process was saddled with a complicated appeals structure. Apart from its long life (no single rating system has ordinarily lasted more than a few years in either the business world or the public service), the Federal efficiency rating scheme had little lasting impact on the technique of performance evaluation.

The first Hoover Commission Task Force summed up the case against this system as follows:

> It has been observed that two important uses of efficiency ratings are not facilitated by the Federal procedure:
>
> 1. Employee development.—A very effective use of the merit rating in private employment is the periodic review between supervisor and subordinate of the weaknesses which the employee should seek to overcome. Such review is usually a highly personal, confidential relationship between the supervisor and the employee. In the Federal system higher reviews and appeals, together with penalty actions, militate against this use.
>
> 2. Employee growth potential.—The Federal efficiency rating is an evaluation of performance during a past period. It does not attempt to evaluate employee growth or to project the potential growth of the employee toward higher positions in the organization.[17]

Following this lead the U.S. Civil Service Commission recommended to the Congress basic changes in legislation pertaining to ratings which would: (1) abolish the uniform system; (2) permit each department to establish its own plan suited to its needs; (3) permit the dropping of "summary" ratings; (4) disengage ratings from personnel actions, such as salary increases, staff reductions, and the like; and (5) eliminate the cumbersome appeal machinery now prescribed for the rating system, substituting opportunity for "one impartial review" within the departments. This finally resulted in passage of the Performance Rating Act of 1950,[18] which incorporated the first two of these proposals and also required that rating plans be "as simple as possible" and designed to improve performance and supervisor-employee relationships. It did, however, continue substantially the same appeal system, kept the relationship to personnel actions, and required a minimum of three adjective ratings. The 1950 act's main virtues lie in its statement of objectives and in the experimentation induced by the provision allowing individual agency plans to be developed, subject to Civil Service Commission approval. The number of appeals under the new department systems are negligible by comparison with that under the earlier uniform rating plan.

The continued impatience with the relatively useless and invidious distinctions occasioned by overall adjective ratings, purporting to categorize the "whole man" for all future reference, was again emphasized by

[17] Task Force Report, *Federal Personnel*, p. 62.

[18] P.L. 873, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950.

the second Hoover Commission, which recommended elimination of the rating systems based on the 1950 act and urged in their stead a new system under which supervisors would report at least once a year *only* on those:

(1) Employees with potential capacity for further development and higher responsibilities;
(2) Employees deserving meritorious awards;
(3) Employees miscast in their present assignments and who should be reassigned to other work and/or retrained for other work;
(4) Employees undeserving of periodic pay increase because of unsatisfactory service (employees not so designated would receive their increases in due course);
(5) Employees requiring dismissal.[19]

In each such case the supervisor would submit reasons for his judgment and specific suggestions as to action called for. Appeals would be limited to one higher authority in the agency.

It is interesting that thinking regarding the Federal service has reached a point where it would make performance evaluation comport with the basic tenets of the incentive system. Undoubtedly the failure of rating schemes since they evolved over the past half-century has been in their violation of fundamental principles of motivation and in their preoccupation with finding a means for categorizing total employee performance and behavior into single objective expressions. There are times when employees have to be compared with each other, but comparing them as the occasion demands, with each special need controlling the specific method, is vastly different from generalizations.

7. Group Appraisal Methods. One of the best examples of performance evaluation for a specific purpose is the group appraisal and counseling technique employed in a number of progressive business establishments and governmental agencies. This is an approach designed especially for application to executives and upper-level supervisors. It consists of four steps: (1) appraisal of a man's performance and potential by a panel of superiors, including his line supervisor, acquainted with his work from different vantage points; (2) review of the group's conclusions by the next higher level of management authority to tie it in with overall organization effectiveness, possible reassignments, and the like; (3) discussion by the superior with the subject individual, pointing out strengths and weaknesses and suggested action as developed out of the group appraisal and review; and (4) guiding development of the individual through further training, greater delegation of authority, rotational assignments, committee work, and comparable steps.[20]

[19] *Personnel and Civil Service*, pp. 64–65.

[20] See Raymond L. Randall, *Developing Management Potential Through Appraisal Panels*, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Personnel Management Series, No. 8 (Washington: 1955).

As used in an increasing number of industrial and governmental organizations, there are numerous variations on this basic technique—including, for example, provision for the subject executive to choose one of the panel of supervisors who consult as to his appraisal. The process actually arose as a means for realistic executive development; hence it illustrates all the more pointedly the advantage of special-purpose evaluation methods over the omnibus ratings which have encountered so many difficulties and raised so many doubts.

The foregoing plans, which typify those in use in various public jurisdictions, have been described here briefly merely to demonstrate the nature and variety of approaches that efforts at rating have taken over the years. Future development will unquestionably see (1) more emphasis on supervisor-employee understanding; (2) decline of overall summary ratings; (3) recording of actual facts of performance rather than standard statements; and (4) use of special appraisal methods for each individual purpose to be served—such as promotion, retention, training, or special recognition.

IV. THE ADMINISTRATION OF AN EVALUATION PLAN

For any evaluation device to work, not only the supervisors but the employees also should be sold on the system. One of the difficulties with service ratings in the past has been the mantle of mystery in which they have been wrapped, so far as the working force was concerned. Every effort should be made to explain the operation of the system to the employees—however limited its purpose—and to build their confidence in it. In fact, it would be well if they could participate in establishing it.

The question of the frequency of reports is one that will be differently answered in different jurisdictions. Too frequent evaluations may be destructive of morale. On the other hand, if the period between reports is too long, when they are really needed, the utility of the system is lost. A common practice in governmental jurisdictions is for ratings to be made annually. Some organizations follow the interesting process of reporting more frequently on new employees but letting reports on longer-term workers depend on changes in performance or other special circumstances.[21] Actually the evaluation and stimulation of performance should be a continuous process. It is simply the recording of the judgment that calls for some periodic action.

The question of the review of appraisals and the adjustment of inequities

[21] For example, the Washington Gas Light Company (Washington, D.C.) has a descriptive "progress report" (no summary adjective rating) annually on employees with less than five years of service and biannually on those with six to fifteen years of service; no reports are made on those with over fifteen years of service unless the employee requests it or the supervisor feels that there has been a change in job performance which makes a report desirable. *Employee Progress Report Plan* (rev. ed., July, 1949).

between various units is a thorny one. If summary ratings are used, they must be reviewed by a central unit in the interest of uniformity. Some supervisors tend to rate their employees low, others high. Statistical treatment will disclose such tendencies. There should be no automatic equalization of ratings, however, even though this is standard practice in some jurisdictions. The remedy lies, rather, in training the reporting officers. Where obvious inequities appear, they may be ironed out in conference with the officers concerned. If summary ratings are not used, the comparative aspect is eliminated.

Employees should be informed of their evaluations and supervisors encouraged to talk them over with subordinates individually. This provides an ideal opportunity for personal counseling and guidance and for the improvement of morale. In fact, there is even opportunity to enlist the employee's participation in the evaluation. Most experiments with self-rating by employees have shown that they are generally more severe in estimating their performance value and sizing up where they need to improve than are their supervisors. Whether there is a formal means for employee self-rating or not, certainly it is profitable for the supervisor to take the subject of the rating in on the process, to help him and lead him into an appraisal in which he recognizes his own faults and virtues. This is likely to make the process a mutually acceptable one and, indeed, relieves the supervisor of the sole onus of making the judgment. The problem of performance evaluation and recording becomes a joint enterprise, as much the responsibility of the employee as it is of his chief.

Traditionally, ratings have been made one of the objects of supervisor-employee dispute and appeal. The major contributing factor to this condition has undoubtedly been the emphasis on *comparison between employees*, brought to focus usually through summary or conclusion ratings which categorize employee performance into some kind of rank order. As protection against unfairness or bias, the general practice is to permit employees to appeal their ratings to somebody that is outside the line of authority but is empowered to make adjustments. In the Federal Government such a procedure is even a matter of statute, as brought out in the chapter "Employee Organization and Representation." A board of review is set up for each organizational entity of substantial size, such as a bureau, consisting of a management-appointed member, an employee-elected member, and a chairman who is a Civil Service Commission official. These boards can receive appeals, hold hearings, and establish final ratings in their respective jurisdictions.

Here again, if summary ratings were dispensed with, as proposed for the Federal service by the Hoover Commission, there is reason to believe that the need for and interest in appeals would disappear. Attention would be focused on specific aspects of each employee's performance, not on how

he ranks in comparison with someone else. This does not vitiate the need for the best psychophysical methods for estimating and expressing the evaluations of specific phases of actual performance. Workers are not likely to become upset, however, over a profile of their performance which is not related in any conclusive way to that of their colleagues. An analysis of their work behavior and value, without summary ratings, is simply a matter between them as individuals and their respective superiors.

Finally, performance reports should *not* be instruments of discipline. Evaluation of job performance should be directed to the effectiveness of actual work, not to moralizing about attitudes or motives. Inasmuch as disciplinary measures are intended to punish willful misbehavior, they have no place in recording the adequacy of behavior.

SUMMARY

In the development and operation of performance evaluation systems there has been a tendency to overlook the fact that appraisals themselves influence motivation of the worker—for better or for worse. Whether periodic ratings or evaluations generally are handled in such a way as to bolster employee work satisfaction and foster productivity is, at this stage in the art, at least doubtful. Little research has been conducted directly on the point, but there is considerable presumptive evidence to indicate that positive incentives—the opportunity of reward and recognition for good work—are good motivators. There appears to be some gain, especially in laggard organizations that need "toning up," through the use of various formal means for employee or group award and recognition.

It is frankly recognized that past rating and reporting systems have provided rather crude and imperfect means of estimating and recording abilities and habits of work. But since they are better than scattered and unrecorded judgments of individual executives, the personnel profession should accept the challenge of the situation and seek to provide more adequate and useful instruments. Much needs to be done. Some challenging suggestions have been found in recent years in such ideas as those of the two Hoover Commissions. An aggressive personnel organization can do much to educate executives to a wholesome approach to the problem in any jurisdiction.

The most important single criterion of a sound evaluation program is whether it fosters the development of good employee performance. If it fails to do this, it should be discarded. One of the important keys to this objective is employee participation, both in developing the program and in the individual evaluations. From the point of view of the rank and file of workers such a program will have a heartening effect, for a proper approach gives the individual a chance to come into his own. He realizes that

his merits are recognized, that good service is appreciated, and he may further become aware of traits and habits that deter progress in his career. Performance evaluation must be a process that will promote interest and respect on the part of all concerned; otherwise, any formalization of the reporting task had best be avoided.

14

Staff Development and Training

> You have the opportunity to find by education the natural aristocracy that is fit to occupy positions of trust and power, seeking out virtue and talent from every condition of life.
>
> —*Thomas Jefferson*

In any personnel policy worthy of the name, the development and training of the staff is bound to occupy a most important place. Since it is the very essence of supervision, it assumes a role, along with pay and the human aspects of management, of great significance to the quality of service and output. Initial recruitment and selection are hardly more important. Until recent years, however, training was one of the most neglected aspects of public employment. The literature dealing with the subject was most meager.

It is not that those responsible for management entirely overlooked the need for informing and improving their subordinates on the duties to be performed—this would be the denial of management; but such activities were often carried out unsystematically, in a hit-or-miss fashion. As one public official is quoted: "I can't be bothered with all these training frills. I'm too busy breaking in new employees." The primary job has been to get the work out, not to lay the groundwork for broad skills and comprehensive understanding, not to develop suitable attitudes and a spirit of coöperation. Supervisors, for the most part, have given orders and, with a minimum of guidance and with the aid of their own ingenuity, have expected their workers to pick up from fellow workers the skill necessary for the task in hand. The costly method of unguided learning by doing, of trial and error, has until recent years been quite generally in vogue—and still is in all too many jurisdictions.

In the period since 1935—a period characterized by the progressive rationalization of management—training of employees has gained status as an appropriate and necessary function of administration. In more pro-

gressive units a staff member has been assigned the duty of surveying the need for training and the character of such as is offered, and of determining the steps to be taken in order to meet the need. The importance of supervisors in any training program worthy of the name has been recognized, and their training as trainers has received considerable attention.

One of the fallacies in the thinking about training has been that employees hired under a merit system are already qualified, are already "trained," therefore, for their jobs. To superimpose in-service training on top of this is either wasteful "boondoggling" or an evidence that the initial selection of personnel was inadequate. This naïve, short-sighted view overlooks the following facts:

1. That people are recruited largely for broad categories of jobs, not for each specific job, and therefore require orientation in the work of a particular agency or unit.
2. That public programs rarely remain static (they are frequently revised by legislation), and that the quickest way to adjust a going concern to such changes is through conscious, orderly training of its employees.
3. That training often accounts for the differences between organizations in such matters as knowledge of employees about the activities and rules of their total organization as well as their own jobs, courtesy and attitude of employees toward the public, interest of employees in their work, skill and speed in performing a service. All of us have observed differences in such aspects of behavior of organizations, whether they be railroads, restaurant chains, or government bureaus. Frequently their quality is in direct relation to the scope and quality of their training program.
4. That occupational fields usually evolve. Neither medicine, nor engineering, nor accounting, nor even stenography remains quite the same. Training is the process through which specialists can keep abreast of their specialty as well as avoid "the limitations of the expert."
5. That many occupations are entirely or almost entirely limited to the public service (policemen, firemen, tax assessors, food inspectors, mail carriers, sanitary engineers, social workers, and many others), so that such specific skills are not always trained for in general educational institutions.
6. That it is more efficient to improve the skills of existing employees to a maximum than to rely solely on initial recruitment to provide a hypothetical supply of the highest-skilled available.
7. That it is important, in order to achieve cohesiveness and coördination in an agency, for employees to understand the aims and functions of the rest of the organization, not by chance or in fragments, but by an

orderly presentation of policies and programs that builds mutual respect and confidence.

8. That films, talks, interesting reading materials, systematic tutoring, planned staff conferences, manuals, or other training devices go much farther in creating enthusiasm for one's work than does "turning a man loose" to learn by trial and error.
9. That in most situations training *of some kind* necessarily takes place anyway; it is largely a question of its being systematic or haphazard, efficient or wasteful, effective or useless.
10. That, if it were not profitable for organizations to carry on systematic in-service training, private industry would not have engaged in it so extensively.
11. That there are now sufficient illustrations of the success of systematic staff development in public agencies to prove the case for adequate provision for it from a budgetary standpoint.

The above points are, in effect, a charter for training in the public service, an outline of the need and purposes of systematic attention to the subject in all administrative organizations.[1]

The authors of the first edition of this work (1936) turned to private industry as the example in urging the desirability of a planned training program. Certainly, this is a field of personnel management in which large private concerns have led the way. Now we may refer for inspiration to such milestones in government itself as:

1. The executive order of June 24, 1938, authorizing the Federal Civil Service Commission "in cooperation with operating departments and establishments, the Office of Education, and public and private institutions of learning, [to] establish practical training courses for employees in the departmental and field services of the classified civil service,"[2] and authorizing the appointment of a personnel director in each of the departments and certain administrative agencies.[3]
2. The provision of Federal funds, under the George-Deen Act, for subsidizing training programs for state and local officials to be carried on under auspices approved by the Vocational Education Division of the Office of Education.
3. The establishment in 1937 of a Bureau of Public Service Training in

[1] For a comprehensive treatment of the subject see *Employee Training in the Public Service*, A Report Submitted to the Civil Service Assembly by the Committee on Employee Training in the Public Service, Milton Hall, Chairman (Chicago: 1941).

[2] Order Extending the Competitive Classified Service, No. 7916, June 24, 1938, sec. 8. Although superseded in 1947 by Executive Order 9830, the earlier order is still a "milestone" in view of the "legitimacy" which it created for training.

[3] *Ibid.*, sec. 6.

the New York State Education Department, to coöperate with all interested agencies in the development and coördination of training programs for state and local employees.

4. The enormous impetus given to in-service training by the new programs in Washington under the aegis of the New Deal and as the result of wartime governmental operations that called for maximum use of orientation and skill-improvement training to build efficient administrative organizations in a hurry. Educators, psychologists, and industrial engineers were corralled to direct extensive training programs of all varieties in the Federal Government. Of particular currency were the famous "J" courses—Job Instructor Training (training supervisors how to train), Job Methods Training (on how to analyze and develop improvements in work processes), and Job Relations Training (referring to human relations principles)—which were carried over from the Training Within Industry Program sponsored by the War Manpower Commission throughout war industries. Although they had the drawback of being "canned" and were not suitable for most professional and administrative jobs, they were useful stimulants to further training of supervisors and worked rather well for clerical or mechanical units.
5. The encouragement given to training programs by the reports of both first and second Hoover Commissions.[4]
6. The White House endorsement of employee training as "an essential aid to efficient operation of the Federal Service," in a policy statement issued for the President by Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in 1955.[5]
7. The growing and continuing interest in programs especially designed for executives and supervisors, including the proposal for an administrative staff college paralleling military institutions such as the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and the individual staff schools of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.[6]
8. The continual expansion of programs in state and local jurisdictions, particularly the larger ones, for both orientation and improved-skill training of public employees.
9. The growing interest of universities in large metropolitan centers in

[4] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel Management* (Washington: February, 1949), p. 23; *Task Force Report on Federal Personnel* (Washington: January, 1949), pp. 35–36, 40–41; *Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), pp. 45–51; *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), pp. 63–80.

[5] By letter to heads of departments and agencies, January 11, 1955. This statement required department heads to plan systematically for and encourage employee development, to see that resources are provided, and to make use of existing governmental facilities for training.

[6] See Society for Personnel Administration, *A Proposal for a Federal Administrative Staff College*, Prepared by a Work Group of the SPA, chaired by O. Glenn Stahl (Washington: 1953).

providing special out-of-hours courses on managerial as well as technical subjects of primary interest to Federal, state, and local government employees—often by special arrangement with public agencies and occasionally fortified by grants from private foundations which reduce tuition fees.[7] This is in addition to the extensive preparation pointing to public service which is now available in colleges and universities on the preëntry level.

These milestones, in conjunction with the actual achievements of a number of individual departments and agencies along training lines, provide an entirely new frame of reference. One can now deal with the subject of training less in terms of what ought to be and much more in terms of what is. Nevertheless, it must be stated that many public jurisdictions are still unaware of the gross inefficiencies in their administrations that are chargeable to the neglect of systematic and competently directed training of their employees.

The thesis of this chapter is that staff development and training is an essential aspect of the direction of human effort and, as such, is most effective when it is planned, systematized, and evaluated. Training is a function of management, but: "Management's first responsibility is to carry out the functions of an agency, as well as it can, and it should provide whatever training is needed to reach this objective. It may provide more training than this—training that is desirable but not essential to successful operations, training that is of primary benefit to the individual employee rather than to the agency. How far any agency may go in providing training must be made a matter of public and administrative policy, and this may appropriately depend on conditions which will vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction."[8]

At this point it may be appropriate to review briefly the extent of outside preparation for the public service undertaken by schools and colleges.

I. PREËNTRY TRAINING

Apart from the so-called "cramming" institutes which claim to prepare applicants for special examinations, preëntry training for the public service has gradually increased over the years. Of course, technical and professional education offered in the standard curricula of most universities, such as that for doctors, lawyers, economists, statisticians, chemists, and engineers, has changed little. For the most part, this type of education is not directed

[7] Outstanding examples include The American University, George Washington University, University of Maryland, University of Southern California, Wayne University, University of Chicago, New York University, University of Denver, Temple University, and various others.

[8] *Employee Training in the Public Service*, pp. 4–5.

to the public service, and its content and character have not been heavily influenced by the possibility of the graduate's later undertaking a public service career, although as a matter of experience many of them do so.

However, individual academic institutions have long offered well-rounded courses in a number of specialized public service callings, such as forestry, public health, welfare, highway engineering, recreation, social service, library science, and city planning, and, most common of all, in the fields of teaching and agriculture. Some universities have modified their courses to fit the requirements of the State Department. Many institutions have offered special work which aims to give some of their s udents the educational background required for openings in various branches of government.

The trend was accelerated by the establishment of Joint College-Federal Service Councils in the various U.S. Civil Service Commission regions to arrive at common understandings on such matters as modifications in curricula, timing of examinations, coördination of campus visits, and special problems in individual sciences.[9] Another technique that has been employed is the "job clinic," a planned program at a university campus whereby, through participation of government representatives, the students and faculty and even selected alumni are acquainted with vocational opportunities in the public service.[10] There is no doubt that a kind of rapprochement between colleges and universities and government has been taking place over the past two decades.[11]

Through interest in the New Deal and in wartime and emergency government, considerable impetus was given to the establishment of special curricula designed to prepare young people for administrative work. The movement was greatly stimulated by the action of the United States Civil Service Commission, which since 1934 has given annual examinations for junior administrative and junior professional assistants who are to be placed in various capacities in different departments, with the idea that out of this group there might emerge in the course of time men and women

[9] Ross Pollock, "The Joint College-Federal Service Councils: A New Recruiting Team," *Personnel Administration*, July, 1947, pp. 14–19.

[10] William G. Torpey, "University Job Clinics for the Federal Service," *Personnel Administration*, September, 1947, pp. 27–30.

[11] The conference held at the University of Minnesota in July, 1931, on the subject of University Training for the National Service, was an early outward sign of this interest. It was attended by college and university representatives as well as those from various units in the Federal Government. This was followed by two similar conferences, one held at the University of Chicago in 1934 and the other at Princeton University in 1935. See *Proceedings*, Public Personnel Conference, and Morris B. Lambie, *Training for the Public Service* (Chicago: 1935). The latter contains an excellent review of the earlier history of public service training. Another way in which rapprochement can come about is through use of university facilities for research. See the challenging article by John M. Pfiffner, "Public Personnel Administration and Universities," *Personnel Administration*, March, 1948, pp. 7–11.

qualified for supervisory and administrative responsibilities. In 1955 the consolidation of most Federal entrance examinations for college-caliber recruits gave further stimulus to preparation for public service.[12]

There still lingers, particularly among those who have not had the benefit of such education, a feeling of resentment at the obviously superior contribution which academically trained young people generally are able to demonstrate on the job. This probably explains, for example, the following provision of the Federal Veteran Preference Act of 1944: "No minimum educational requirements will be prescribed in any civil service examination except for such scientific, technical, or professional positions the duties of which the Civil Service Commission decides cannot be performed by a person who does not have such education."[13] This stipulation, applying to nonveterans as well as veterans, is of necessity rather strictly interpreted.

The author thoroughly believes in the merit system and the principle of competition but also believes that the way must be open and made attractive to young people of capacity and promise. For the most part, standard civil service examinations have sought to select candidates for the doing of specific tasks without reference to capacities for growth. It is not disputed that many people who have not had educational advantages have such capacities. But it is short-sighted to ignore the selective and screening process that goes on in a college course, as well as the mental training and outlook that result from it, particularly when these are reflected in high standings on eligible registers set up as the result of broad examinations. Despite repeated investigations by parliamentary commissions in England, the British civil service continues to give preference to honor graduates of English universities for openings in the administrative service. If academic degrees are to carry no credit, a type of examination should be devised which will discover candidates who have potential personal and intellectual capacities, intellectual flexibility and breadth of outlook, such as are requisite in those who at some time in the future will be competent to fill important administrative posts. Several years of work in a routine clerical position are no substitute and no equivalent for four or more years of sound work in a higher institution of learning. Otherwise we deny the value of academic training, as well as the merit of the policy long

[12] For a number of years an especially difficult examination known as the Junior Management Assistant (JMA), with both written and oral parts, attracted thousands of college graduates, but only a few hundred a year were appointed. This has now been merged in the general consolidation referred to above but as a special part requiring extra tests and higher standards for the filling of management internships.

The responsibility of universities in directing the best minds to the public service is emphasized in O. Glenn Stahl, "The Cream of College Graduates for the Public Service," *Higher Education*, November 1, 1947.

[13] P.L. 359, 78th Cong., 2nd sess., June 27, 1944, sec. 5.

since adopted by hard-headed business executives, who for years have culled the more promising graduates from college and university campuses as recruits for their administrative staffs.[14]

Taking it by and large, the more promising young people in this country do go to college. Through generous scholarship grants, veteran education privileges, and opportunities for self-aid, enrollment in college is by no means limited to those who belong to the privileged class. These young people do acquire valuable training as students. A selected group of such young people should be attracted to enter public employment in the interest of the public service. If no recognition is to be given to the four years of training—as seems to be implied by the attitude cited above—government employment will be shunned by college men and women except as a last resort, as previously happened in the Federal Government and as still happens in all politics-ridden jurisdictions.[15]

Of course, we would not in any way debar those who have not enjoyed the advantages of a formal higher education from examinations of the sort outlined. Such as have through private reading and study secured the equivalent of what an academic degree stands for should be given full and equal standing as candidates. But the bars should not be lowered in their interest. Even in a democracy the doctrine of equalitarianism can be carried to an unwarranted extreme.

A tangible result of the Federal examinations for professional aides has

[14] Numerous studies in the business journals show that the case is now rare where the non-college man reaches top executive posts. It is also significant that in a 1955 study of over 800 career executives in the Federal service at the top four grades only 7 percent were found to have had no college training before entering the service and only 3 percent had had none after having been in the service. Even excluding those who had some college work but less than enough to warrant a degree, 89 percent of this top-level group had college degrees, many with advanced degrees. Considering the fact that the average age of this group was fifty-two, including therefore many who entered at a time when university educations were not so common, it is clear that the younger men must be almost solidly college bred. From an unpublished study by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, "Study of Backgrounds and Reported Training Needs of a Sample of Federal Executives," April, 1955.

[15] Eldon L. Johnson has stated this point of view brilliantly in "Education: Antidote for Bureaucracy," *School and Society*, December 16, 1944, pp. 386, 387. Pointing out that government must be interested in more than job proficiency, he adds: ". . . It is interested in potentialities, breadth of comprehension, and all the other attitudes and attributes of truly *educated* men and women. It wants men who have developed critical intelligence, who are free from littleness and prejudice, who have not only *had* experience or experiences, as all animals do, but have generalized upon them and evolved principles and values for the future. Without such men and women, the complicated tasks of government simply cannot be done. The need is by no means vocational alone. It is cultural . . . in the sense of development of attitude, emphasis, and approach, which transcend content." Culture he defines as "the residue, the distillation" of facts themselves forgotten. "When all mere information and fact are gone, only attitudes and values remain—a certain outlook and approach to life, a set of criteria, an imprint of countless generalizations, a creative imagination, a certain self-discipline, a discriminating judgment—those cementing, unifying intangibles which fill the interstices of fact and experience. . . . If 'bureaucrats' are always to be with us, they should be the best that education can make them."

been the establishment in a number of institutions of courses which aim to prepare students for an administrative career. In this connection two schools of thought have developed. One follows the lead of Great Britain, which has been successful in recruiting for administrative duties the pick of the graduates from Oxford, Cambridge, the London School of Economics, and other established universities. There it is assumed that the best administrators are those who have had a general liberal education, which makes for flexibility of mind, imagination, and breadth of outlook. As Lord Haldane succinctly stated in hearings before a Royal Commission on the Civil Service a number of years ago, "We still consider it worth while for our administrators to know their Aristotle and Plato." In some respects the School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton subscribes to this point of view, as do the University of Chicago and the Littauer School of Public Administration, among others. There is increasing doubt expressed, however, about too heavy an emphasis on recruitment from those trained in the classics. The British service, on close examination, does not justify the unqualified reverence previously given to this mode of recruitment.[16]

In the second school of thought it is maintained that administration is not alone an art but also a science, and that certain principles may be deduced from administrative practices which, taken all together, provide a body of organized knowledge. For practical purposes this may be accepted as a working definition of a science. Those adhering to this school believe that it is possible to work out a graduate curriculum that will stand comparison with the curricula of the established graduate schools of business administration. Such proponents take the position that after four years of liberal arts training with a major in the social sciences, courses of a specialized and technical character can profitably be offered which will equip young people for a career in administration, particularly when combined with internship opportunities.[17] Those who subscribe to this ap-

[16] Speaking of the British civil service in 1944, J. Donald Kingsley states: "The argument that I wish to make is one for a broader intellectual training than that which is usual at the present time. I do not believe that the administrator in the modern State can safely be ignorant of the general character of social problems or of the fundamentals of, let us say, economics. Increasingly, the vision and understanding that he brings to his work will depend upon his orientation to social and economic questions and upon his clear perception of the relations of his own activity to the general picture. To be sure, such understanding may be acquired in the course of duty. But for large numbers, this is unlikely, unless institutional arrangements are provided conducive to such a development. What seems to be indicated by the changing administrative climate is either greater emphasis upon the social sciences in the entrance examinations, or a system of post-entry training designed to orient the young official in this area. In any event, existing arrangements seem inadequate."—*Representative Bureaucracy: An Interpretation of the British Civil Service* (Yellow Springs, Ohio: 1944), pp. 165–166.

[17] A far-sighted early report with special reference to municipal government was that of a committee of the International City Managers' Association, *Training for Municipal Administration* (Chicago: 1936).

proach argue that it is possible to provide vocational training for the administrator, the subjects covered being determined by what an administrator actually does. They would equip a student, accordingly, with some knowledge of administrative law, budgetary theory and practices, personnel administration, purchasing and handling of supplies, office procedures, reporting, statistics, research methods, and the like. The administrator, according to their analysis, should be acquainted with these various subjects, not as a practitioner or a specialist, but as one who should know how to deal with and utilize practitioners and specialists most effectively. An honest analysis of the work of the administrator will show that he is called upon to know more and more about more and more, but probably never enough about any of the many fields subject to his direction to qualify as a specialist. This type of school, therefore, aims to train prospective administrators as generalists, not as specialists.

The Training School for Public Service launched under the auspices of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research in 1911 was the pioneer in training of this type. Since 1924 the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University has carried on its program with this same emphasis. At the Universities of California, Southern California, Minnesota, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, and at New York University, to name only a few, considerable work is offered that looks in this same direction.

A natural limit on this second type of training must be acknowledged. Opportunities for its graduates are, for the most part, limited to the minor generalist jobs, such as small city managerships, which it is often difficult to find in any number upon graduation, or to junior staff and service positions in personnel, budget, and administrative analysis work. A much broader field for public administration training in universities is presented by supplementing the curricula of their technical schools so that graduates in various specialties will have "exposure" to the art and science of leadership. The bulk of the nonclerical public jobs necessarily call for technical knowledge in some field or other. The problem is not always solved by supplementing these specialists with generalists. The problem more often is to guard against the provincialism of the expert.[18] "On the theory that experts cannot escape administrative responsibility at some time in their careers if they are to rise above mediocrity, chemists and lawyers and doctors and statisticians and similar specialists should be expected to have in their professional curriculum certain minimums of the social sciences, social

[18] Every reader is urged, before he finishes this book, to study the brilliant and timeless article by Harold J. Laski, "The Limitations of the Expert," *Harper's Magazine*, December, 1930, pp. 101–110. Note, also, Kingsley's observation (*op. cit.*, p. 167): "The British Civil Service has yet to solve the problems presented by the emergence of the specialist and the growing impact of technical considerations upon policy."

psychology, literature, and English, and a liberal dose of administration or management science. Few vocations are without the need for executive capacity and an understanding of how to lead and to work with people."[19]

Thus, we have what constitutes still a third school of thought. A number of universities have come to stress this phase of their preparation for government service. Fortunately, the three approaches are not mutually exclusive. All are needed to one degree or another, but there is probably the widest field for the third approach.

Reference may also be made here to the experience with internships under the auspices of the National Institute of Public Affairs, which was located in Washington, D.C. This organization over a period of years placed a limited and carefully selected group of college graduates as interns in various bureaus where the interest and active coöperation of responsible supervisory heads could be secured. Such internships lasted for a year and carried no compensation. At the end of this period many interns entered the service, were given an opportunity to move forward as administrative aides, and since have risen in many instances to top career posts.[20] The NIPA was directly responsible for the subsequent creation of paid internships by the United States government itself.

Somewhat related to the internship policy just described was the plan launched by the Wisconsin legislature in 1937. Under it the executives of the several departments were authorized to hire, after requisition through the civil service commission, highly qualified college seniors and graduate students as apprentices. The coöperating colleges were the University of Wisconsin, Lawrence College, and Marquette University.[21]

It will appear from the above that preëntry training occupies a growing place in the educational institutions of the country. One finds today a broader and more sympathetic understanding of the possibilities of a career

[19] O. Glenn Stahl, "Straight Talk About Label Thinking," *Public Administration Review*, Autumn, 1946, p. 366. See also Stahl's earlier article, which first emphasized this point: "Public Service Training in Universities," *American Political Science Review*, October, 1937, pp. 870–878.

In Great Britain, the tradition has been to go "all out" for the generalist (often the amateur, says Kingsley) over the expert. The "expert in the Civil Service is a sort of step-child, regarded without enthusiasm by his administrative colleagues." The administrative class "tends to assume its own infallibility" and also displays a "lack of understanding of the proper sphere of the specialist in relation to administration. . . . Although the expert, *qua* expert, may be unsuited to administration, there must be persons of administrative capacity who have been trained in science or the law, let us say, just as there are persons of administrative capacity who have been trained in Greek. At present such administrative talent is wholly wasted."—Kingsley, *op. cit.*, pp. 175, 177.

[20] A few NIPA interns were paid salaries by the agencies where they worked, and a number were on scholarships or fellowships from their colleges and universities. Further observations on the institute's program may be obtained from *The Work of the National Institute of Public Affairs, 1934–1949* (Washington: October, 1949).

[21] *The Wisconsin State Government In-Service Training Apprenticeship Program*, University of Wisconsin (Madison: 1939).

in the public service on the part of those responsible for higher education than ever before.

The technical and vocational schools in the universities, as distinguished from the liberal arts colleges, are doing much but, as suggested above, might advantageously do more in the direction of developing their curricula for the education of students for public employment. For example, although a considerable proportion of the graduates of engineering and law schools enter the public service, the primary, if not exclusive, emphasis in such institutions is on the training of young people for the private rather than the public practice of these callings. It is recognized that practitioners in both fields will require the same basic courses. But in the latter two years, when specialization may take place, a series of well-integrated courses should be introduced that are specifically designed for the development of men and women qualified to practice public law and public engineering. It may prove to be unfeasible to provide for such concentration within a three- or four-year period, in which case an additional year might well be required.[22]

Other illustrations might readily be cited in support of the position that the vocational requirements of public establishments—Federal, state, and local—have not received the consideration they deserve at the hands of academic authorities which are interested in providing vocational education for many promising employment markets. It has already been pointed out that governments, taken all together, are the largest employers in the country, and that they have on their pay rolls more specialists and technicians than any other class of employer. With the extension of the merit system and the growth of the career idea, educators might profitably give the same systematic attention to the demands of the public employment market as they have in their vocational offerings given to those of private employers. On the other side, public personnel agencies should also have a clearer understanding of their future requirements and counsel with educators concerning these requirements with reference to the type of educational offerings that might well be provided for training young people along more specialized lines.

In regard to preëntry training, school authorities, particularly on the academic level, should extend the practice of combining forces with public officials in working out policies that will enable the educators to advise students and plan curricula with reference to probable public demands. This does not mean vocationalizing the whole educational system. It does

[22] The Law School of Syracuse University announced in 1940 a five-year course to be offered in coöperation with the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of the same institution. Later Cornell University combined business and public administration into one school. Other universities have similarly begun to season technical curricula with public service flavors. Many engineering schools have established five-year programs so that the humanities and social sciences can have more emphasis in the curricula.

mean that the system will do at least as good a job for the public employer as it has done for private enterprise. The gearing of the curricula of high schools and higher institutions of learning into the personnel needs of the public service should be looked upon as a major task by all who are concerned with the quality of public personnel.

II. IN-SERVICE TRAINING—ITS FOUNDATION

Preëntry training is necessarily limited to training for positions for which there is relatively large and continuous demand and at the same time for positions calling for acquaintance with a broad body of knowledge that has been pretty well organized and standardized. The application of such knowledge to concrete and specific duties to be carried out within specific governmental environments is the task of those responsible for postentry or in-service training, as is that of initiating new recruits into assignments for which no previous training has been available. Beyond this there is the responsibility to make older employees more efficient in the performance of their present duties and even to equip them to qualify for advancement in one or another direction. Viewed thus broadly, in-service training is never accomplished; it is always in process.

A. RESPONSIBILITY OF MANAGEMENT FOR TRAINING

We have already stressed the point that training is a part of management; in fact, some would say it *is* management. Nevertheless, someone or some staff must give full-time attention systematically to reviewing, planning, and perfecting training policies, methods, and techniques. In larger organizations this is a staff function, involving leadership, advice, and counsel, and perhaps offering courses for classes of employees who are found in various departments and divisions, as, for example, typists, file clerks, and information clerks. In smaller ones, the line operators often must train without specialized assistance. For more specialized fields of an academic character the personnel agency may make arrangements with local educational institutions whereby useful courses are made available to those interested.[23] A broad view of training requirements and much resourcefulness are called for to meet the needs satisfactorily. Accomplishment of these ends requires recognition of training as an important function of management and the use of a qualified staff.

Following out these principles, a warning should be sounded as to the possibility of treating the subject of training as a more or less isolated

[23] An unusual institution is the publicly sponsored but tuition-supported Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture in Washington. The American University and George Washington University in Washington also have coöperated with government officials in setting up a wide range of courses in which large numbers of Federal workers are enrolled. The University of Southern California has likewise developed an impressive curriculum with the coöperation of public authorities in Los Angeles. For others see footnote 7.

assignment which, once allotted to the personnel division, can be written off as a settled matter. Like other staff functions, it is to be constantly integrated into the whole management process. The chief executive and his assistants, the line executives and their assistants, are by virtue of their positions engaged in training themselves and are responsible for backing the training program among their subordinates. What is more, all such officials will be consulted in devising training plans and contributing to their execution. The rank and file of employees will also have their contributions to make. Training is far from being an isolated undertaking, separate and apart from the day-by-day production of goods or services. The supreme task of management is the infusion of the whole organization with a common spirit, a common understanding of the purposes and objectives of the organization and the relation of individual assignments to these purposes and objectives. These ends can be achieved through a sustained and well-rounded training program.

Despite the importance of group training in courses of one sort or another, the most fruitful and essential training must be done by the supervisory staff in its face-to-face dealings with subordinates on the job. As one views the whole government scene with regard to the theme of this chapter, the problem of developing supervisors and executives as *trainers* in some ways overtops all others. Many such officials have been promoted from the ranks because they were skilled artisans, unusually competent clerks, first-class technicians, or perhaps even good office politicians, not because they had the interest and skill required for guiding and training others. Then again, many of those now occupying supervisory positions take personal satisfaction in the exercise of authority. If systematic and well-coördinated training has been neglected, the first assignment to a staff agency should be to bring home to executives that good supervision involves good training and the next, to aid those in supervisory positions in perfecting methods and programs for training on the job.[24]

B. DEVELOPMENT OF A TRAINING POLICY

Management's responsibility for training, as for budgeting and hiring, can be best emphasized and coördinated by a written understanding within the organization as to the aims and methods of, and responsibilities for, development of the staff. It may well be developed with the participation of office heads, supervisors, and representatives of employees.

One of the techniques is to create a committee on training policy, including top operating executives, started perhaps by a word of interest and

[24] See Milton Hall, *Training Your Employees: Suggestions to Executives and Supervisors*, pamphlet published by the Society for Personnel Administration (Washington: 1940). A later example of a first-rate agency pamphlet was also prepared by Hall: *Staff Development—the Supervisor's Job*, Federal Security Agency (now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), Training Manual No. 6 (1948).

leadership on the part of the head of the whole agency. Creation of such a committee can serve several purposes: (1) it gets top management interest in its training responsibilities; (2) it helps focus attention on a statement of policy that will undoubtedly reflect how much training is a part of every supervisor's job; (3) it establishes machinery for continuous overseeing of training policies and programs.

A training policy must cover not only the basic issue of responsibility for training but also such specific points as the essential forms of training, how group training can be arranged for, kinds of training to be done on government time, what responsibility the organization will take for after-hours training, recognition of training in promotion policies, training records, selection of instructors, services of the training staff, films and materials available, evaluation, costs that can and those that cannot be borne be the agency, and statutory limitations. Although it would appear elementary that such matters should be agreed upon and written down, too few public agencies have written training policies.

C. DIAGNOSING TRAINING NEEDS

Analysis of needs for organized training in a public agency is not something that can be done once and for all. It is a continuous process. In an organization where the idea of systematic staff attention to training has not been fully accepted, it may be necessary to proceed slowly, to pick out one dire need and concentrate on it, perhaps on a demonstration basis. Many conditions give signs of training needs: low production, slow service, lack of movement of personnel, poor morale, bad supervision, lack of coördination, excessive bickering, and the like. Such situations can often be observed without any formal analysis, but the need is brought more sharply into focus if a little time is spent on a survey of the problem. In any event, administrators and supervisors must continually be on the alert to discover the needs of their employees for training. This is one aspect of the subject in which the full-time training officer can be of great assistance.[25]

Needs, first of all, must be classified as to the objects of the training, such as to increase present employees' effectiveness, to prepare them for advancement, to retain them for greater versatility or for changes in program emphasis, to develop "organization fitness" by promoting wider understanding and thus coördination of all parts of the organization, and to give new employees general orientation and preparation for specific job duties.

Frequently questionnaires to supervisors and employees provide a useful tool. A number of public and private enterprises require all unit heads

[25] Chapter 2 of *Employee Training in the Public Service* is the most complete discussion on ascertaining training needs.

regularly to analyze training needs. This part of the process is tied in with job analysis, standards of performance, and evaluation of performance. The very steps of job analysis or joint employee-supervisor development of work standards may point up the areas in which further training would help.

Whatever the method for diagnosing needs, it is usually unwise for training officers to proceed with a specific program until the need for it is recognized and felt by the officials concerned. Sometimes it is worth while to take several months or more to plant the idea and develop an appreciation of the need.

III. IN-SERVICE TRAINING—ITS SCOPE AND ADMINISTRATION

This section seeks first to survey briefly the various classifications of training activity from the standpoint of the purpose or object of the training and from the standpoint of the trainee being reached, then to examine the various forms of training as to method or technique.

A. THE OBJECTS OF TRAINING

1. Training the Trainers. One of the first considerations in working out a group training program is the selection and training of those who are to assume the responsibility for training others. It may be taken for granted that many a practitioner with a broad understanding of his field lacks the knack of taking on the role of an educator, but, given this knack, he should be stimulated and aided to organize the material to be presented so that it may be offered in a systematic and comprehensive manner. Whether one selects his group instructors from among successful practitioners or professional teachers, it will usually be necessary to groom them for the task in hand. The former are inclined to lose themselves in details and the latter not to appreciate the relation of theory and broad treatment to practical application.[26]

The need of training trainers has been more and more recognized. For example, in the policy adopted by the New York Conference of Mayors in setting up schools for police officers, it was found worth while to bring together the training heads of these schools for the purpose of orienting them in the "curriculum" they were to cover. The State Department of Education in California also worked out a course of instruction for those who were given the responsibility for training the policemen in the cities of the state. The personnel divisions of many Federal agencies devote much time to the training of supervisors, laying considerable stress on giving

[26] The criteria to be taken into account in the selection of instructors were first brought together by A. B. Hall, Chief of the Bureau of Public Service Training in New York, James W. Parry, assistant in charge of public service training in the state of Michigan, and a number of state directors of trade and industrial education. See Lyman S. Moore, *Public Service Training Notes*, U.S. Office of Education (Washington: 1939), pp. 4 ff.

them an understanding of classification and wage policies, promotion and grievance methods, and the like. In a very real way the supervisors become interpreters and field agents for the personnel function. This is as it should be, since the working out of personnel policies is, in the final analysis, in the hands of those who come into direct and day-by-day contact with the rank and file of the employees. Supervisors and subsupervisors may make or break any personnel program.[27]

The personnel division can aid in the actual training of supervisors as trainers. It can also assist in setting up job instruction sheets and further stimulate the preparation of necessary procedure manuals. Such a manual becomes valuable as a kind of textbook in group training as well as for general reference. It permits the supervisor to relate the work of the individual trainee to the total work program of the organization, thereby arousing intelligent interest and understanding on the part of the individual, as well as an appreciation of the significance of his job in the whole enterprise.

2. Induction and Orientation. These terms are used to cover the introduction of new appointees into their positions, first, from the point of view of the departmental and work environment in the broadest sense of the term, and then from that of the duties of the new positions, the prospects for future advancement, and related matters.

a. *General.* There are, in the first place, certain rules and regulations as to leaves, pay, overtime, retirement privileges, and the like which affect the whole service. There are also departmental regulations and the laws under which the department operates, with which new employees should be acquainted, if only in an introductory way. Then, too, they should be oriented in what may be called the departmental geography, covering the physical layout of the department, lines of promotion, and organizational relationships which should be understood as a basis of intelligent participation in the work of the department. Finally, attention may well be called to the significance of the role the department plays in the governmental structure and in the public service as a whole.

Many of the subjects suggested above may also be treated in a handbook. Recent examples of handbooks, which can be found in state, local, and Federal agencies, have the virtue of being written in popular style. Even though all the matters just discussed are brought together in an up-to-date handbook, the induction process would not be complete without some assurance on the part of a person in a responsible position that the newcomers have their place in the organization as persons and not just as working units. As one authority in the industrial field long ago pointed out: "A great deal

[27] In this connection see the excellent work *How to Train Supervisors*, by R. O. Beckman (New York: 1940). The Works Progress Administration, with which Beckman was associated, did pioneering work in such training.

depends upon the manner and spirit underlying the way the introduction of the new employee is handled. It is hard to overcome bad first impressions even though subsequent developments show them to be unfounded. It costs little or nothing to put this principle into practice and it bears beneficial results."[28]

This is an opportune time to put into use any films or exhibit materials which make graphic the nature and aims of the organization's program. It is also the practice in several Federal agencies to give an induction interview to each new employee, supplementing the handbook and providing an opportunity for questions.

We now turn to that part of the orientation procedure that has to do with the introduction of the new appointee to the duties of his job.

b. *Apprenticeship and Internship.* The term "apprenticeship" is used here not alone in its customary sense—that is, as a craft term—but also rather loosely in the thought that any new appointee must be made acquainted with the duties of his job and given rather continuous supervision until he becomes competent to stand on his own feet.

In traditional usage "apprenticeship" has been applied to the three-to-five-year period of training in the skilled trades. The emphasis is primarily on the development of practical skills under the guidance of journeymen and foremen. Organized apprentice programs are unusual in the public service, but they are found in the Government Printing Office, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Defense industrial establishments, and the Tennessee Valley Authority.[29]

Related to standard apprentice training, but much less formal, are the so-called internships. As we conceive the term "internship," it refers to a lengthy period of training—from six months to a year or more—when incoming employees are given a practical orientation in the work of an agency or of a special branch of it. The primary purpose of such training is orientation and the development of skills rather than production. This would not imply that production is ruled out, but rather that it is incidental to the development of the worker. Ordinarily he is shifted from one unit or division to another, in each case perhaps as soon as he has been initiated to the point where he might become a useful producer. This definition will not cover all the variations that are actually designated as internships, but it goes to the heart of the matter. The policy is to be commended on many grounds, particularly in the preparation of those who are to be associated with the management fields, such as budget, personnel, and accounting.

[28] Earl B. Morgan, "Placing and Introducing Employees," in W. J. Donald (ed.), *Handbook of Business Administration* (New York: 1931), p. 1106.

[29] For an example, see William J. McGlothlin, "The Apprentice Program of TVA," *Personnel Administration*, April, 1946, pp. 5–8.

One of the best illustrations of this plan is the Federal Administrative Intern Program. Inaugurated near the close of the war by the Civil Service Commission, this program makes it possible for selected employees to participate in a six-month period of rotation and evening courses designed to round out their experience in the management functions of personnel, budgeting, organization analysis, etc. Employees, in two levels, are selected from the junior and intermediate grades on the basis of an impressive battery of tests, interviews, and conferences. Approximately twenty-five or thirty interns are selected for each group for each six-month period from panels of candidates recommended by the various departments. Specific assignments in a group of departments are worked out for each intern. Actually this program is not primarily for new employees but is designed to give able existing employees a special opportunity for reorientation.[30]

Another example is the excellent state-wide plan in New York State inaugurated in 1947, under which twenty-five interns are recruited each year and assigned to a one-year program of rotating assignments and supplementary training. A coördinator in the Department of Civil Service looks after and guides the progress of each intern, working through the operating supervisors.[31]

In other instances individual agencies have conducted intern programs of their own. Most large Federal agencies annually recruit and train college-caliber interns from competitive registers—and from their own staffs, where many enterprising young workers have acquired college training by attending school at night. For the most part the intern programs that meet the definition are in the field of management, but a number of them are in engineering and other technical fields.

Another approach is through summer employment of students. Beginning in 1947 the Bureau of Standards and the Potomac River Naval Command worked out a plan for summer employment of young college juniors (in engineering, chemistry, metallurgy, etc.) before they entered their senior year. They are recruited from various colleges and universities by means of a competitive examination for "student aide." Upon successful completion of this three-month tryout, they are expected to return to the organization in a junior professional capacity after they are graduated the following year.[32] The Federal departments also have general authority

[30] Franklin G. Connor and Russell H. Landis, "The Federal Administrative Intern Program," *Personnel Administration*, December, 1945. This program is described from the point of view of an intern by Daniel O. Mathewson, "Internship from a Worm's Eye View," *ibid.*, May, 1947. Also, see J. Henry Brown, Jr., "The First Junior Management Intern Program," *ibid.*, November, 1950, pp. 15–19.

[31] Lynton K. Caldwell, "The New York State Internship Program," *Public Personnel Review*, October, 1948, pp. 183–190.

[32] R. L. Randall, "Research Apprenticeships in Science," *Personnel Administration*, July, 1949, pp. 19–21.

under civil service regulations to employ college students noncompetitively for temporary periods. An example of its use is the summer employment of premedical students to work in the laboratories of the National Institutes of Health. Although no strings are attached, this plan has the advantage of exposing these young people to the attractions of working in the public service.

Finally, reference should be made to the special category of internships which are financed, not by the government, but rather through grants or at the personal expense of the interns. The plans are developed coöperatively with government authorities. The best-known of these programs was that of the National Institute of Public Affairs, to which reference has already been made. The University of Kansas in 1948 started an eighteen-month "apprentice-training program in city management" which is conducted on the coöperative plan, with the students spending half of their time as interns with city managers. Another example is found in the "internships in municipal affairs" awarded by the Coro Foundation in California, with placements made in the city and county of San Francisco.[33]

For many years, leading private enterprises have culled the most promising graduates of colleges and universities and given them the type of internship we have been discussing, acquainting them in a broad way with the history, the background, and the operations of their respective concerns. Public jurisdictions are now doing more and more of the same thing.

c. *Formal Orientation.* It is now common for new recruits in the same occupation to be required to attend formal classes during their orientation to a new public agency. Such programs may run from a few days to several months, depending on the circumstances. This sort of "schooling" increased appreciably in public circles during the thirties. It is to be commended on many grounds, but particularly that of economy. Obviously this plan will be advisable only when a number of new appointees are involved.

In the Federal Government a number of units provide formal orientation training. The Department of Justice provides extensive training for the "G-men" of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The courses are given by experienced instructors who devote their full time to the task. For three months, intensive study is prescribed on a sixty-hour-week basis. The chief emphasis is on theory, but after the first month some opportunity is given for practical work in that the trainees are sent out on investigations in the company of a regular investigator. Newly appointed revenue agents in the Treasury Department are "sent to school" in Washington for a substantial period. The program covers in a systematic manner knowledge of the income tax law, basic accounting, and administrative procedures. Of somewhat similar character is the program of the State Department for

[33] Harry L. Morrison, Jr., "Training in Democratic Leadership," *Personnel Administration*, November, 1951, pp. 29–31.

the preparation of Foreign Service officers. Those who have passed the entrance examination satisfactorily go to school in Washington for two or three months, working under the direction of staff members. Following assignment to field consular and diplomatic offices, they are returned periodically for "Americanization," which consists of seminars, planned visitations to headquarters offices, and related programs. Comparable but less extensive programs are available to others being sent abroad on technical missions. Still another example is afforded by the Soil Conservation Service, with its periodic "training centers" for all new soil conservationists. For newly appointed administrative and professional personnel, the Social Security Administration has since its beginning prescribed a course for a one-to-two-week period, known as "basic training," covering social insurance backgrounds, trends in social security, and a broad treatment of the organization itself, the established procedures, etc. These examples indicate the best type of orientation training in the Federal Government.

In the state governments such courses are not notably extensive, but a few examples will be cited as representative of the best practice. At the head of the list may be placed the training of entrants into the state police forces. Following the lead of New York State, other states have, almost without exception, set up a rigorous and well-organized scheme of training for such officers. Various state departments and institutions in Maryland have developed comprehensive training programs. Some departments arrange for employees to take courses through a coöperative plan with an established college; others conduct training courses within the departments, such as the training courses for practical nurses given in the state hospitals; and still others provide tuition or scholarships for training. The training program conducted by the state police department enrolls policemen who are at the top of eligible lists and could reasonably expect prompt appointment. A special course is offered to those who have been appointed as guards in the various penal institutions in the state. In New York State the Department of Correction has a well-organized school for prison guards, and certain other departments are training specialized classes of employees on entrance. Other examples could be found in California, Wisconsin, and elsewhere.

In the local government service the most progressive work along this line has been done in connection with police and fire departments. For example, the course for law-enforcement officers (of the orientation type in part) sponsored by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in coöperation with state and local agencies, is participated in by thousands each year. In addition, there are a number of local programs, notably in Los Angeles, New York, and other major cities. The training of firemen is also well standardized and generally required. In many cities a special building is set aside as a means of giving the novices practical experience in scaling operations and

the handling of ladders, hose, and other fire-fighting equipment. For example, San Francisco has a seven-story building erected for this purpose which is in continuous operation. Over and above the training that they receive in their own departments, many thousands of firemen participate each year in state training programs throughout the United States and Canada. Such orientation of municipal employees is expanding each year.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize that the orientation or induction training with which we have been dealing falls within the probationary period of the appointment. It serves as a major barrier which must be satisfactorily cleared by the entrants into the service before appointment becomes permanent. The supervisors of this work have an excellent opportunity, through their more or less intimate contacts with the appointees, to get a line on their capacity for the job, as well as on personal characteristics which have a bearing on future success.

Practically without exception, this type of training is taken as a regular assignment on the time of the government. The length of the period devoted to the training schedule will naturally depend upon the techniques to be learned—whether broad knowledge is required or a command of more or less difficult skills must be mastered. Such an organized scheme of training as has been described presupposes a number of recruits for an expanding force or one with considerable turnover.

d. *On-the-Job Induction.* The bulk of the training of recruits is given on the job itself. It may be supplemented by a limited number of introductory lectures or talks of a general character, as was previously stated. For the most part, however, newcomers are trained on the job with the objective of securing production, perhaps from the first day of appointment.

It has been suggested that four steps should be followed in training for a specific job: (1) demonstration by the training officer, (2) trial by the beginner, (3) correction of mistakes, and (4) follow-up, in which each of the other steps is repeated until the correct work habits are firmly implanted.[34]

Further aspects of on-the-job training are dealt with in subsequent sections.

3. Improvement of Performance. Reference is made in this section primarily to efforts on other than an individual basis to increase the efficiency in the work in which employees are immediately engaged. We are not passing up face-to-face training on the job under this heading as unimportant. As stated above, it is probably the most basic part of the policy. The present section has to do with course work of one sort or another: "refresher" and extension courses, and those designed for acquainting workers with new techniques, with the content of new regulations or laws.

[34] H. G. Kenagy, "The Technique of Training on the Job," in Donald, *op. cit.*, p. 1218. This is similar to "job instructor training" procedure.

They may be given periodically or intermittently, in field or headquarters offices, or by correspondence.

a. *Federal Service.* The G-men in the Federal Bureau of Investigation are brought to Washington periodically for several weeks. The Defense departments likewise have conducted refresher courses in a broad range of subjects related to the work. The Division of Crop Estimates of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics brought its field men in small groups to Washington for a full-time six weeks' course, which was extended over a period of four years until all were trained in statistical methods and techniques. Numerous other examples could be given, particularly in the larger departments.

b. *The States.* No comprehensive study has been made of the extent to which state governments interest themselves in the type of training under discussion at this point. It is known that the state police are given more or less continuous training which requires their presence at headquarters at stated intervals for a brief period of time. The Division of Police in New York State has systematized its training program on a very comprehensive scale. It has run schedules of lectures covering topics as diverse as arson, airplane accidents, tear-gas weapons, and teletype machine operation. The more usual subjects dealing with the apprehension of criminals and crime prevention are also dealt with.

State universities also interest themselves in offering intensive, short-time courses in special fields, as, for example, in dairy and meat inspection, in highway engineering, and in the operation of stationary boilers.

The state of Illinois has undertaken a fairly comprehensive program, embracing special university extension courses, nominal-tuition courses offered by the State Civil Service Commission in such fields as accounting and letter writing, "human relations" conferences for all supervisors in state hospitals, and on-the-job classes for veterans supported under the GI Bill. These programs have apparently met with considerable receptivity and success.[35]

Still other instances of in-service training have come to attention, such as that offered in the Income Tax Division in Massachusetts and New York State, in the Sanitation Division and the Department of Mental Hygiene in the latter state, and in the Conservation Department in Michigan. Nurses' training work on an extension basis is also frequently found.

c. *Municipalities.* The most important advances in the direction of training for greater efficiency in the municipalities have been made in connection with the police schools. One of the consequences of the racketeering and crime waves that swept across the country in the twenties was the development of the science of crime detection and apprehension. More

[35] Robert L. Hunter, "The Illinois State In-Service Training Program," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1947, pp. 138–144.

systematic attention is also now given to crime prevention. This meant the elevation of the policeman from one who walks a beat to the level of an expert. The rehabilitation of the police force so that it could qualify for the new range of duties made training mandatory.

For example, in 1954 there were well over 2000 police training schools operated on a joint Federal-municipal participation basis, with the aid of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In most cases, assistance was also provided by local colleges and universities.[36] There are new proposals to consolidate police department and some college facilities. Some plans envisage a regulation that will require a new recruit to complete degree requirements. An increasing number of local colleges are providing in-service police training. In some instances the training is of the short-course type; in others it is fitted into the regular school term to correspond to other instruction.

The New York Police Academy won an enviable position for itself as a pioneer in systematizing instruction for the novices, for the regular force, and for those interested in promotion.[37] For a number of years the academy has opened its doors to officers from many other cities. Staffed by "ranking departmental officers of special ability" and "distinguished specialists from related professions," it is divided into various schools—on recruit training, detective work, safety, use of firearms, and the like. In normal times several thousand officers are enrolled. The academy is financed entirely by the city, attendance of students being based upon assignment by the police commissioner. Courses vary in length from several days to several months.

Police schools of high rank also are found in Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, Louisville, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Newark (New Jersey), and Wichita (Kansas). Another noteworthy example is the training program at Berkeley, California, originally organized by Chief August Vollmer, who recruited his force to a considerable extent from college graduates.

The leagues of municipalities of a number of states have made signal contributions to the training of police for their member cities. In fact, the programs for the training of police and firemen have been more generally adopted by the various leagues than those for any other single type of municipal official.

Northwestern University sponsored a series of conferences in crime detection before the war, and also has operated the only Traffic Institute in the country. Similarly, the University of Southern California has established a Delinquency Control Institute, with a unique three-month course in juvenile control.

Finally, attention should be called to the program initiated in 1935 by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the

[36] *Municipal Year Book, 1954*, p. 6; *Municipal Year Book, 1955*, p. 406.

[37] *The New York Police Academy*, descriptive brochure issued by the City of New York.

Department of Justice. Besides maintaining a training school for its own agents and giving periodic "refresher" courses, the FBI maintains a National Academy to which are invited promising police officers from state and local jurisdictions. The academy provides a three months' course, which it gives twice each year to groups of approximately eighty experienced police officers. One of the courses offered is "Training Methods," and most of the graduates have in turn set up training courses in their home cities. Other courses are similar to those given the G-men but are supplemented by special instruction which is applicable to local and state law-enforcement work. With the completion of its fifty-fifth session in 1955 this academy had reached nearly 3000 police officers. In addition to operating the National Academy, the FBI also participates in two to three thousand field training schools each year conducted by state, county, and municipal law-enforcement officers.[38]

Continuous training as a proper function of fire departments is almost as widely accepted as is that for police. Here, too, New York City pioneered by establishing a Fire College in 1907. Its curriculum is most comprehensive, including nearly every conceivable branch of fire prevention and fire fighting. The subjects range from the use of apparatus to the chemistry of fire and the resuscitation of those overcome by smoke. In recent years increasing emphasis has been laid on fire prevention, which covers building codes, methods of periodical inspection, the handling of explosives, fire-resistant materials, and public education. The Fire College has served as a school for fire captains from other cities for a number of years. It has also stimulated the movement for the organization of similar units in other cities. Among these the following may be mentioned: Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, and Pittsburgh. The leagues of municipalities have also actively promoted programs for the fire service. Additional evidence of the extent of training on and off the job is demonstrated by the fact that thirty-seven different states trained over 75,000 fire fighters in 1954 with Federal vocational aid provided under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden acts, and 125,000 firemen in the United States and Canada are estimated to have received training in the same year over and above that provided in their own departments.[39]

Instruction for improving efficiency on the job in lines of work other than police and fire was largely neglected or rather casual in character before the war. There are now many instances where systematic training has been offered. For example, the Sanitation Department of New York City gives

[38] Information regarding FBI training was provided by the staff of the National Academy, courtesy of Mr. R. T. Harbo.

[39] The first figure was supplied by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (The George-Barden Act superseded the earlier George-Deen Act.) The latter figure was reported by the National Fire Protection Association in the *Municipal Year Book, 1955*, p. 360.

courses for drivers, sweepers, and supervisors. Instruction on automobile equipment, collection methods, record keeping, etc., is provided. The leagues of municipalities have long extended their interest in this matter beyond the police and fire departments. The New York State Conference of Mayors and Other Municipal Officials has been particularly active in this respect. The International City Managers' Association offers correspondence courses in a variety of fields.

The program in New York was inaugurated by the establishment of schools for police and firemen on a state-wide regional basis in 1928. Their success led to the launching of training schools for four additional groups of employees in 1930—finance officials, civil service commissioners, building inspectors, and welfare officers. The project has continued to grow, with courses being presented for assessors, public works officials, milk and dairy inspectors, water superintendents and plant operators, purchasing officials, city and village clerks, and other classes of workers. Since 1935 the Municipal Training Institute, an educational corporation made up of members of the Conference of Mayors, has carried on this program. These schools are held, as a rule, in coöperation with departments of the state government, professional associations of municipal employees, or various national associations interested in particular phases of municipal administration.

The availability of Federal funds under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden acts, in combination with a rapidly growing appreciation of the meaning and importance of personnel management, gave considerable impetus to vocational training in the public service.

New York City has been particularly progressive in the development of employee training. Many thousands of city workers have been given instruction in fifteen different departments, exclusive of the fire, police, and health departments.[40] Another highly successful undertaking in in-service training is that carried on under the auspices of the University of Southern California, located in Los Angeles. In coöperation with city authorities, a Civic Training Center has been set up near the Municipal Building. The program embraces short-term institutes for special classes of officers, seminars, and regular evening classes which may lead to special certificates or regular degrees. An example of some significance is the public relations training program developed by the Milwaukee city civil service commission for those city employees whose duties bring them into contact with the public. Many states have arranged state-wide training institutes for local tax assessing officers. Paralleling the FBI Police Academy, the Federal

[40] The situation in New York some years ago, both from a preëntry and a postentry standpoint, is covered in O. Glenn Stahl, *Training Career Public Servants for the City of New York* (New York: 1936).

Government launched a National Academy of Public Purchasing in 1948. Other examples of in-service training planned on a continuous basis are found in Detroit, Pasadena, Wichita, and Kansas City, Missouri.[41]

With the extension of public service training, the aid of state and other universities is being increasingly invoked. According to the American Municipal Association, many colleges and universities either coöperate in or actually conduct in-service training programs. Several state universities hold annual institutes for city managers. Mention in another section is made of the institutions servicing the Washington area.

The political science departments in a number of state universities have officially joined forces with state leagues of municipalities and through specially organized units serve as secretariats of the leagues. It is a most logical development that the institutions maintained at public expense should place their facilities at the disposal of those authorities which are engaged in carrying on the public business. Also, faculty members and students specializing in government are bound to profit from direct contact with government officers, their activities and problems. Doors are opened to the former for observations and research that might otherwise be closed. These contacts have proved to be mutually beneficial and have facilitated a cross-fertilization of ideas that has been of distinct benefit to the public.

4. Broadening the Usefulness of the Staff. It is not possible to draw a hard and fast line between training for greater efficiency and training for advancement or further usefulness. Certain of the programs referred to in the foregoing section might properly be reviewed again under the present heading—for example, the Federal Administrative Intern Program and a number of the municipal programs.

a. *Increasing Organization Fitness.* Attention has already been given to the desirability of informing the staff of the total scope of the organization and where each function fits in. This is not alone a matter of initial orientation upon entry into the service. It is a continuous need, as organizations and functions change, as occupations evolve. The point is reiterated here because the need for continuous reorientation is so often overlooked. Yet it is a vital factor in equipping a work force to go forward to better service and better jobs.

b. *Improvement of Supervision.* No phase of training for advancement is more important than preparing potential and present supervisors for their human relations tasks. A rereading of the chapter "Leadership and the Will to Work" will point up the need. Supervisory training was widely extended in both industry and government as the result of wartime pressures. Reference has already been made to the "J" courses. Further improvements and refinements in teaching and practicing supervisory skills

[41] *Municipal Year Book, 1949*, pp. 111, 188, 192.

have been made in several states and in Federal departments.[42] They range from chart talks and distribution of lively pamphlets, on the one hand, to "role playing" sessions and seminars, on the other. No final technique has been found, which is all the more reason for further experimentation in and application of supervisory training.

State and municipal services, on the whole, have given far less attention to this field than has the Federal Government. Yet it can be said that even in comparison with the Federal Government, private industry still stands out as making wider use of various forms of supervisory training. Such comparisons, of course, refer only to the larger and more management-conscious segments of progressive industries rather than the great mass of private business. Actually, a higher proportion of Federal employees than of employees of business in general have probably been exposed to supervisory training. Not so, however, if we are speaking of the leading industries.

The content of supervisory training must necessarily include a good deal of emphasis on human relations improvement, because human relationships constitute the medium through which work gets done. However, this is not the sum total of supervisory training. There are also specific techniques and skills in the more mechanical aspects of supervision which can be taught. Among these are such fields as work process improvement, flow charting, job analysis, layout, and work planning. Furthermore, it should be understood that supervisory training is a continuous process. In fact, a great deal of it can be effective only after the learners are experiencing the problems of supervising currently. Thus, it must not be confined to potential supervisors; it must embrace all supervisors at all times, for this highly important and elusive area deserves the thoughtful analysis of the experienced as well as the unsophisticated scrutiny of novices.

It is a shame that many able technicians founder when they have supervisory responsibilities thrust upon them. American administrators find it difficult, in the first place, to select staff members for supervisory assignment on any other basis than their proficiency as individual workers. A look at their leadership qualities is too seldom taken. Add to this the neglect of *preparing* potential supervisors, through training techniques, for what usually turns out to be the most difficult part of their jobs—leading others—and we have an anomalous situation indeed. The most that can be said is that an increasing awareness of this need is evident on all sides.

[42] See Milton Hall, "Supervising People—Closing the Gap Between What We Think and What We Do," *Advanced Management*, September, 1947, pp. 129–135; also the following articles in *Personnel Administration:* Ronald Lippitt, "FSA's Approach to Supervisory Training," February, 1946; Leland P. Bradford, "Supervisory Training as a Diagnostic Instrument," September, 1945; John B. Whitelaw, "An Approach to Supervisory Training," September, 1947; and James G. Stockard, "Take a Look at Supervisory Training," May, 1948. Note also the Illinois "human relations" conferences previously cited (Hunter, *op. cit.*).

A word of caution is necessary here. It does not follow that supervisory behavior improves automatically as a result of supervisory training—particularly when directed in the "human relations" area. Some studies in industry by social psychologists cast doubt on the effectiveness of much that passes for training in human relations skills.[43] It is clear that unless supervisors can get some insight into themselves, no amount of learning of "principles" will have much effect on their performance. "Canned" courses might as well be avoided as a waste of time. The more promising approaches lie in the laboratory type of conference, in which there are such features as liberal "role playing," practice sessions, and analysis of real-life situations created on the spot and involving the individual personally.[44] The big need here, as in so many aspects of personnel administration, is more and more research.

c. *Preparation for Greater Responsibility.* In the matter of formal training, opportunities may be offered within the organization, or aspirants for higher positions may be stimulated to register for courses offered in a local educational institution or by correspondence. Finally, under the urge of their own ambition, they may register for these latter courses, having in mind preparing themselves for promotions either by examination or by appointment. Such training on one's own time is, of course, not strictly "in-service."

In the Federal Government the outstanding examples of formal intramural training are to be found in the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Standards. In the former a broad battery of courses is offered, while in the latter the courses are more limited in number, although basic in character. In both cases the work is on a graduate level and, indeed, is conducted in such a way that it is recognized in many colleges and universities as worthy of credit for advanced degrees.

The Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture was organized in 1921. Like any university organization, it has its regular officers, council, and instructional staff.[45] For the most part the latter has been manned by some of the strongest scientists and executives in the department and from other agencies, many of whom stand in the forefront of the specialists in their respective lines of work. The expenses are covered by almost nominal

[43] Studies of particular interest have been conducted by the Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan, under the direction of Dr. Rensis Likert.

[44] Of considerable promise are the periodic institutes conducted at various centers throughout the United States, beginning in Bethel, Maine, by the National Training Laboratories in Group Development. This organization, sponsored by the National Education Association, attracts business leaders, teachers, military officers, social workers, and government executives to sessions ranging from three days to three weeks concerned with the study of group behavior in particular.

[45] In 1955–1956, 488 instructors and lecturers were listed as constituting the teaching faculty. See the convenient summary on this institution by Vera E. Jensen, "A Training Center for Federal Employees," *Adult Education*, Spring, 1955.

tuition charges, and the work is carried on outside of regular office hours. The department contributes space and library facilities.

It should be noted that the courses are open to those employed in other governmental units. In fact, this wider enrollment is stimulated by the distribution of bulletins throughout the other departments. In 1954–1955 over 91 percent of the 5761 different individuals enrolled were from bureaus and establishments outside the Department of Agriculture. Some 350 courses were described in the catalog for 1955–1956, of which seventy-six are offered on alternate years or every three years. These included general courses, such as those in personnel administration, administrative law, physics, economics, accounting, the various modern languages, photography, statistical methods, and international trade, as well as such specialized and scientific subjects as soil conservation, weather analysis, geodetic surveying, morphology of soils, and electronic digital computing machines.[46] While not genuinely in-service, since students pay for courses and take them after hours, the Graduate School actually is in a twilight zone between in-service training related to one's job and further education designed to create new career opportunities. The convenience of location in a government building, with classes timed immediately after closing hours and costing only small fees, places it in a different category from the usual outside university.

The Bureau of Standards offered seventy-nine courses in 1954–1955, including such specialties as introduction to differential geometry and tensor analysis, radiation physics, and reaction kinetics. Although most of these courses were highly technical in character, a few were of a general nature—reading improvement, problems in supervision, and administration for scientists, for example. The "out-of-hours" courses, which are entirely supported by fees collected from students, are not restricted to Bureau of Standards staff members. There are also a number of "in-hours" training courses of graduate and undergraduate level, designed specifically to improve the qualifications of Bureau staff members for the performance of their official duties. These courses are ordinarily restricted to members of the Bureau of Standards staff, but special arrangements may be made to include other Federal employees. The classes were attended during 1954–1955 by approximately 1200 persons (about 145 from outside the Bureau).[47]

The bulk of the training for promotion in Washington is probably sought in the several universities located there, as well as in a large number of institutes, business colleges, and the like. Enrollments run into many thousands. Since the students are often taking courses which are not in line with the work in which they are engaged, many use government em-

[46] Department of Agriculture Graduate School, *Catalog*, 1955–1956.

[47] Bureau of Standards Graduate School, *Announcement of Courses for 1954–1955;* figures supplied by Graduate School Office.

ployment as a means of securing an education for their later career, which may or may not be within the government service. There can be no disputing the fact that one would go far to find a parallel to the Washington situation with respect to this ambition for educational advancement in conjunction with the doing of a full day's work.

Since 1934 The American University has been making more and more of a place for itself in relation to the Federal civil servants. It has built up its graduate curriculum partially, if not largely, with reference to the interests and desires of ambitious young workers in the service. It has also worked out coöperative arrangements with several government agencies to exchange instructors and give credit for specified in-service training courses. An appreciable proportion of its instruction staff is made up of government officials, many of whom have had considerable teaching experience. As previously indicated, various other academic institutions have successfully adjusted their course offerings to the needs of the public employees in their immediate vicinities.

Whether any sort of formal credit should be given to students of this sort by the employing agency is a moot question. There is no doubt that the personal records of those concerned should carry a note of such academic achievements. Whether or not a formal weight is given in the case of salary increases or promotions, the fact should be weighed informally in reaching decisions on these matters.

d. *Further Education.* In introducing this topic, it must again be stated that hard and fast lines cannot be drawn between this and the other types of training. As considered here, further education goes beyond the training for the immediate or the prospective job; it looks toward the broadening of the fields of interest and the intellectual horizon of those in the public service.[48] It is justified on the ground that the broader-gauged the officials become the more valuable they will be to the service and the more satisfaction they will have in their personal living.

England has been a pioneer in this direction. Sir Stanley Leathes expressed himself on this subject when he stated that civil servants in certain of the departments are encouraged to take courses "in art, in music, in calisthenics, in literature, not only in those subjects which are directly useful. . . . We recognize that anything that tends to make a better, a more complete, a more harmonious individual, tends to make a better civil servant."[49] Another English commentator, Sir William Beveridge, wrote: "If we are to have an increased number and variety of bureaucrats, it is essential to keep their souls alive; to get them to see all their work

[48] An excellent example of this during the war was the arrangement the National Housing Agency made with Harvard University to hold local seminars and to encourage a select group to spend a term at Harvard. See R. O. Niehoff and M. C. McFarland, "NHA and Harvard Train Professionals in Housing," *Personnel Administration*, October, 1945, pp. 10–14.

[49] "The Training of Public Servants," *Public Administration*, July, 1931, p. 247.

from a wider standpoint and in due proportion to the rest of the world. . . . It would, I am sure, pay the State definitely to assist and encourage the younger civil servants of all grades to follow some regular course in economics or political science and to give facilities for them to do so even in working hours."[50] The Whitley Council, the unique national organization consisting equally of the representatives of the rank and file and of the administrative staffs of the British government, has almost from its inception been interested in providing opportunities for further education and stimulating its members to take advantage of them. The National Association of Local Government Officials in England also has found a place in its extension program for emphasis on this type of education. It may be noted in passing that this British National Association, together with various associations of a professional character whose membership consists partially or entirely of government officials, has contributed in a substantial manner to the raising of standards by prescribing searching tests for membership and frequently providing the training courses for the preparation for such tests.

Although we have no counterpart of a development in exactly the same direction in this country, there has been continuous expansion in the organization on a nation-wide scale of professional associations of public officials. According to the latest directory, there are some 513 such associations. In addition, there are 134 regional organizations.[51] Many have been bringing together periodically, usually once a year, representatives of local, state, and Federal agencies. These conferences serve as a clearing house for the discussion of established policies, as well as innovations for improvement and raising of standards of the special calling. The fields covered run the gamut, from accounting to weights and measures. Many publish newsletters and periodicals, which contribute much toward broadening the outlook of the participants and developing professional consciousness. When one considers the rapid progress made in recent decades, one may be sure that associations of this character have exerted a most wholesome influence on the prestige of American officialdom and on the standards of the callings involved. Inevitably this will affect the character of the training required for professional recognition and status.

Special leave provisions to permit further education in outside institutions have been extended in various quarters in recent years. Not only do a number of Federal units (notably certain scientific and military operations) have statutory provision for leave with pay for designated professional personnel to pursue graduate study related to the program, but also

[50] *The Public Service in War and Peace* (London: 1920), p. 51.

[51] Public Administration Clearing House, *Public Administration Organizations: A Directory of Unofficial Organizations in the Field of Public Administration in the United States and Canada* (Chicago: 1954), p. ix.

the public assistance agencies in the states, by virtue of the grants under the Social Security Act, have a system for such leave. Efforts to broaden the Federal authority to cover all agencies and all executive and professional employees, subject to certain limitations, have so far not come to fruition, although several bills were introduced in the Eighty-third and Eighty-fourth Congresses. The granting of leave *without* pay, however, in the Federal service in particular, is not nearly so uncommon as one might expect. It is impossible to catalogue the extent of this practice from current information.

5. Development for Managerial Competence. A few years ago personnel administrators spoke only half-heartedly about the prospects of extending the training concept to top executive levels. Training was for the rank and file. Not even the wide experimentation in supervisory training had quite penetrated the upper crust in private or public enterprise. Executives, by virtue of the posts they held, were presumed to have "arrived," to have already demonstrated the qualities which others needed to acquire.

Along with the many other upsetting influences of World War II and the Korean conflict, this isolation of the executive from the need for educational influences began to break down. Perhaps owing to the insight and imagination of a few unusual executives themselves, some segments of private industry boldly took the lead in becoming conscious of their executive replacement problem and in developing men with potential to meet it. A pioneer was the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey and its affiliates.[52] At the same time that far-sighted corporation presidents were beginning to advocate recruitment of broadly trained liberal arts graduates for junior management positions, they were becoming increasingly aware of the broadening needed by their present middle- and upper-bracket leaders—especially if their enterprises were to play a serviceable as well as profitable role in the dynamic years ahead presaged by atomic energy, the role of the United States in world leadership, and a rapidly growing population.

Along with individual company programs of executive conferences, executive appraisal, and executive replacement, the alert commerce schools of several universities—notably Harvard and Columbia—began offering short-term "prestige" courses to attract top-rank leaders from business and government. Since 1950 particularly, these advanced seminars on management, lasting anywhere from three to as long as thirteen weeks, have blossomed in at least a score of universities in the United States. A few have attracted government personnel, military and civilian, although not in heavy numbers because of the limited authority in most jurisdictions to

[52] As demonstrated by George B. Corless, *Executive Development Program for Affiliates of Standard Oil Company* (New Jersey), American Management Association, Personnel Series, No. 100 (New York: 1946).

avail themselves of such opportunities. But the interest in private business concerns took hold like wildfire. Every major program of this sort in the country has its future insured by a waiting list of prospects from companies eager to expose their executives to the knowledge and understanding that early participants had reported on with enthusiasm.

Meanwhile government organizations—particularly the huge Federal Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force—have taken up the cause, with elaborate programs. It is certainly safe to say that executive development—like the executives themselves—has finally "arrived." It is a going concern. The literature on the subject has expanded so tremendously that it is impossible for anyone to keep abreast of all of it.[53]

The initial "campaign" stage of executive development has settled down so that many authorities now agree that the central ingredient of a "program" is an atmosphere receptive to growth and change. Development may take place through a number of ways; there are no royal roads to the well-rounded leader. Formal study, conferences, group appraisal, rotation in assignment, outside courses—all may play their part. But unless the chief executive of the organization is interested, they will all lack force.

Before mention is made of current governmental interest in executive development, it may be well to summarize the essential parts of the executive problem and action steps associated with them:

a. *Characteristics of an Executive.* There is still no complete agreement among the scholars either as to what an executive's job really is or as to the qualities he should possess to fill it successfully. Much research is going on,[54] but it is doubtful whether any generalizations can be drawn that will

[53] Just as a few samples, the following general works are cited: National Industrial Conference Board, *Company Programs of Executive Development*, Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 107 (New York: 1950); American Management Association, *The Development of Executive Talent* (edited by Joseph Dooher and Vivienne Marquis) (New York: 1952); Marvin Bower (ed.), *The Development of Executive Leadership* (Cambridge: 1949); Myles L. Mace, *The Growth and Development of Executives* (Cambridge: 1950); John W. Riegel, *Executive Development*, A Survey of Experience in Fifty American Corporations (Ann Arbor, Mich.: 1952); John J. Corson, *Executives for the Federal Service* (New York: 1952); U.S. Civil Service Commission, Management Staff Development Series, *How Federal Agencies Develop Executive Talent* (Washington: 1953), 5 vols.; Raymond L. Randall (ed.), *Executive Development in Action: Patterns and Techniques*, Society for Personnel Administration, Pamphlet No. 9 (Washington: 1955). In addition there are many pamphlets, and innumerable articles in both professional and popular magazines.

An unusual survey of professional opinion on executive leadership qualities and training is contained in an unpublished dissertation by Joseph L. Krieger, *Executive Development for Effective Executive Performance and Executive Success* (The American University, Washington: 1956).

[54] By 1954, 155 bibliographical items had been found on qualities of an executive—many reflecting scientific research on the subject. (Unpublished bibliography by Wilton H. Dickerson, U.S. Civil Service Commission, January, 1954.) For an armchair summary of executive qualities see O. Glenn Stahl, "What a Bureaucrat Thinks About Executives," *Journal of Social Issues*, December, 1945.

Educational Testing Service (Princeton, New Jersey), in coöperation with the Harvard

fit all situations. At this point in work on the subject we can safely conclude for government executives that they must be men or women of the broadest education practicable, endowed with keen intellect and insight, possessed of human sympathy and understanding, equal to the most critical demands on their integrity, and gifted with the persistence and patience necessary to achieve action—to say nothing of having a generous sense of humor.

b. *Planning for Executive Replacement.* Modern organizations plan for filling managerial posts five, ten, and even twenty years ahead. Executive ability is such an important asset that any sizable enterprise should know what its executive retirement and turnover rate is likely to be, appraise to what extent existing staff can replace this loss, determine at what points reinforcement by recruitment from the outside is necessary, and plan for a minimum intake each year of college-caliber people in junior levels to build up a reservoir of potential capacity to draw upon in the future. Not enough governmental organizations are being this deliberate in planning for their future executive needs. This approach is an essential ingredient of any serious effort at long-range executive development.

c. *Selection of Executives.* Although the problems of selection in general have already been discussed in Chapter 5, passing note should be taken here of the fact that development of executives can scarcely rise above the quality of the raw material. If an individual does not have the aptitude and emotional adjustment for managerial responsibility, programs for improvement of his competence can rarely do more than scratch the surface of his behavior and performance. Government has been slow in using modern methods for discovering executive talent—such as group appraisal, clinical psychological interviews, extensive qualifications investigations, and the like. A number of Federal agencies have taken significant steps in employing techniques of this kind, and we shall probably see their gradual extension in coming years. Too much stress has been laid, however, on knowledge of subject matter in the placement of individuals in managerial posts. Here again, the research and literature on the subject continue to expand, so that the personnel practitioner should have little difficulty in keeping pace with the most recent developments.[55]

Business School, is conducting a study, started late in 1955, to collect data on executive jobs in a representative group of American corporations, analyze the qualities and special talents needed for success in these jobs, and develop new techniques for predicting success at the executive level. Similar studies have been conducted in other places, such as those by Dr. Carroll Shartle at Ohio State University on characteristics of executives and those on leadership qualities conducted by the Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan, under the direction of Dr. Rensis Likert. Also, see Cecil E. Goode, "Significant Research on Leadership," *Personnel*, March, 1951, pp. 342–350.

[55] A standard work is Glen U. Cleeton and C. W. Mason, *Executive Ability, Its Discovery and Development* (Yellow Springs, Ohio: 1946). Examples of other studies are John Fraser Munro, "The Group Method of Selecting Executives," *Personnel*, July, 1949, pp. 50–58;

d. *Appraisal.* Another aspect of development of managerial competence is found in the process of group appraisal and counseling discussed in the preceding chapter. This is simply a method whereby the judgment of one executive is fortified with that of two or more of his peers in appraising the strengths and weaknesses of a subordinate executive under his supervision. After this panel of superiors—who are acquainted with the subject executive and his work—analyzes his qualities, suggests where his performance could be improved, agrees on methods (training, reassignment, etc.) to bring about such improvement, and appraises his potential for other top positions, the superior officer reviews the group judgment with the next higher executive up the line, gets further ideas, and then counsels the subject individual on the next steps in his development. This process has the dual advantage of making executive appraisal and development a conscious and vital concern of all segments of line management and, at the same time, bringing to bear the judgment and suggestions of various persons who see the executive's performance from different vantage points.

Appraisal panels with group participation are increasingly used in many large private companies and by a number of U.S. government departments. One of the best documents on the subject is a government publication.[56]

e. *Rotation.* Perhaps the most common device for development of executives is that of diversifying their experience through deliberate reassignment from job to job. Rotation has long been a cardinal feature in development of general officers in military services. Many industries follow the practice of seeing that their promising men get substantial periods of experience in a variety of activities in the corporation. Similar results have occurred in government more by chance than by design.

It certainly must be acknowledged that for many aspects of executive development nothing trains better than a variety of experiences. The man who has held positions in only one or two organizational divisions or lines of work is not likely to have the perspective on the total organization possessed by the man who has served in four or five. Yet this kind of perspective is precisely what is needed in the higher posts. It also makes for smoothness of operation. The traditional conflict between planning staffs and line operators, for example, is often ameliorated when the head and members of each group have served in the opposite capacity.

Some of these advantages were undoubtedly in the minds of members of

Milton M. Mandell, "Problems in Executive Selection," *Advanced Management*, March, 1952, pp. 14–18; Milton M. Mandell, "The Qualifications Investigation; A Tool for Improving Executive Selection," *Personnel*, March, 1952, pp. 387–390; Burleigh B. Gardner, "Executives: Their Personality and Its Appraisal," *Advanced Management*, January, 1953; and Arnold S. Judson, "New Approach to Executive Selection," *Harvard Business Review*, March–April, 1954, pp. 127–136.

Further discussion of selection for leadership appears in Chapter 11.

[56] Raymond L. Randall, *Developing Management Potential Through Appraisal Panels*, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Personnel Management Series, No. 8 (Washington: March, 1955).

the second Hoover Commission when it recommended a system for the U.S. government to facilitate movement and progression of top career personnel, in the proposal for the "Senior Civil Service."[57]

f. *Education and Training.* In spite of some continued resistance to them, formal courses for executives are becoming more and more popular. For the sake of clarity we may classify such programs as follows: (1) in-service conferences and workshops; (2) concentrated courses or institutes at university campuses or professional association quarters; and (3) educational institutions established within the administrative hierarchy.

1. There is no need to dwell here on the numerous types of executive conferences conducted by many a governmental jurisdiction and business concern as integral parts of the organization's work or of its in-service training program. The subjects may range from "leadership" to "production control." The periods may be a single day, several days, sessions of an hour or two spaced out over several weeks, or any other combination. Periodic meetings of regional or district directors of an operation often fall in this category.

2. We have already taken note of the burgeoning short-term, full-time management courses being offered by universities throughout the country.[58] The American Management Association in New York also sponsors a series of seminars throughout the year, aimed primarily at industrial leaders but attended frequently by public executives and military officers. In all these cases—whether the course is for a couple of weeks or several months—the principal advantage over other forms of executive development is the "sabbatical" aspect. The participant gets away from the pressures of the job; he has a chance to reflect, to exchange experiences with men who have comparable responsibilities, to get some perspective not only on his own duties but on his organization and its place in today's world. When his private and social hours, as well as his daytime hours, are suddenly shifted to an educational environment in a sort of "retreat," the chances are that he develops some fresh insights and gets a new slant on his work. Such programs are no substitute for diversification of experience or delegations of authority in the development of managerial competence, but formal study at outside institutions almost invariably adds "seasoning" to the broth and effectively supplements the other conditions and approaches in executive development. Every major career executive in the public service should have at least one such energizing experience during his career.

The pity is that so few governmental enterprises can avail themselves of participation in these university programs, owing to lack of authority to

[57] See the discussion in Chapter 8.

[58] See National Industrial Conference Board, *Executive Development Courses in Universities*, Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 142 (New York: 1954).

pay for them and to keep the participants in pay status during their attendance. The military organizations have been the most extensive users. This is one of the ways in which the public service suffers from the fear of legislators that they may be accused of spending the taxpayers' money on giving someone a free education. Little thought is given to the advantages to the service. More often than not objection comes from the same sources which are constantly haranguing the populace on "the creeping paralysis of bureaucracy." These sources usually make no contribution to a kind of "vaccination"—in the form of maintaining an imaginative and flexible corps of public servants—that insures against such paralytic tendencies in the public service.

3. Where formal training efforts are institutionalized as a school within the administrative structure we have a third form of educational program. Large private businesses in many cases maintain schools for such purposes as specialized training in their products, markets, and other interests, broadening executive knowledge, and preparing people for overseas assignments. In the public service these institutions are typified best by the Administrative Staff College in the United Kingdom and in this country by the Foreign Service Institute of the State Department and the advanced staff schools of the armed services, such as the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

Few state or local governments would be large enough to justify establishment of their own institutions for in-service training. So far they have been able to meet executive training needs by short-term in-service conferences, by attendance of executives and specialists at state, regional, or national professional meetings, and by encouragement of their key people to participate in local university programs on their own time and usually at their own expense.

Even in the huge and sprawling Federal service much is achieved through these same channels. However, the national government is so large and so critical in its globe-encircling role today that many thoughtful persons have urged that it establish for its civilian service an administrative staff college comparable to those that exist for military officers. It has been proposed as one means to extend the horizons of their thinking as executives reach senior career posts. "A period of advanced and detached study in such an institution would be an efficient means to broaden the perspective of Government executives as to national programs and policies, as to management concepts and techniques, and as to the nature and importance of leadership."[59] The United States, through its own technical assistance

[59] Work Group of the Society for Personnel Administration, O. Glenn Stahl, Chairman, *Proposal for a Federal Administrative Staff College*, SPA General Series, Pamphlet No. 5 (Washington: August, 1953), p. iii. This plan envisaged the possibility of private sponsorship as a device to get a staff college established. At this writing (1955), the Brookings Institution in Washington had received a grant from the Ford Foundation to start a series of Federal executive conferences designed to form the groundwork for such an institution.

program and through the United Nations, has been instrumental in setting up institutes of public administration in various other countries—Brazil, Egypt, Iran, Israel, the Netherlands, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam, etc.—which serve similar purposes in the public services of those nations, but we have yet to recognize the need for such an institution for civilian executives in our own government.

By way of conclusion to this section, it can be said that much is going on in many public jurisdictions to influence managerial competence for the better. Much is being achieved in the Federal civil service, but more uniform authority and support and more central leadership through such instruments as a staff college are needed. Less consciousness of need and, therefore, less in the way of formal programs are found in state and municipal governments. They will probably continue for some time to rely on the hit-or-miss effects of voluntary participation in local university programs as their primary role in executive training. A few of the larger jurisdictions are awakening to the need, but such approaches as group appraisal, rotation in assignment, and off-location courses at public expense are still rare.

The most critical need in public service training today is at the executive level. It is most critical because so many current executives have such inadequate or narrow preparation for their responsibilities, because we need to plan now for replacement to meet an executive shortage in coming decades, and because the quality of managerial leadership is the most vital factor in the success of any going enterprise. Poor training of clerks and janitors and even of engineers and technicians—however important—may not show its mark so clearly or so extensively as does poor preparation of top leaders. The behavior and performance of executives cast a long shadow in an organization. They affect the work of all others.

It is significant that the second Hoover Commission laid great stress on executive development. Basing its findings on the excellent study made by its Task Force, it concluded: ". . . As the employee enters executive ranks he needs to gain a working knowledge of Government programs outside his own, a more thorough insight into public attitudes and legislative issues and a more comprehensive view of the techniques of management. As an executive in modern day American government, he must be able to see and grasp the relationships between local and national considerations, and between domestic programs and our foreign, military, and defense mobilization policies and programs."[60]

[60] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), p. 49. See the Commission's *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), pp. 63–80.

A strong plea had also been made by the Sixth American Assembly for "extension and improvement of existing methods for training and developing of individuals within the Civil

B. FORMS AND METHODS OF TRAINING

Here and there, in the course of our discussing the objects of training, reference has already been made to various techniques and approaches. Many of these do not require further elaboration. But it may be desirable now to list systematically some of the different classifications of in-service training as to method and form.[61]

1. Group Training. The most readily understood form of training which is recognized as such is that in which people are brought together in groups. Examples of group training are the most numerous cited in this chapter because they are relatively tangible and measurable. They include formal courses, with outside study, class discussion, and quizzes; formal lectures; conferences of the seminar type; demonstrations; laboratory practice; and group field trips. Two commonly overlooked forms of group training are (a) the device of regular staff meetings and (b) periodic assemblies of all employees of an organization.

Regular staff meetings between a unit chief and his subordinates are not always thought of as training sessions. But, wisely conducted, they are indeed very fruitful conferences for both the supervisor and the staff. They are frequently found in public agencies, but it is still uncommon for them to be conducted on a democratic basis. Too often they become merely an "order-giving" period for the supervisor rather than a free exchange of ideas on the work of the unit. This is a point where the training officer can be of special assistance, counseling supervisors on how to conduct staff meetings.[62]

Periodic assemblies of all employees in an agency often have a remarkable effect on the *esprit de corps*. Here is an opportunity to build a kind of unity of feeling and purpose that should be the goal of any organization. Short talks by the head of the agency, movies depicting little-known phases of the agency's work or of that of related agencies are examples of how such assemblies can be used effectively. One obstacle is ordinarily the lack of an auditorium or meeting room large enough to accommodate the whole group, but courtyards and even roped-off streets have been known to serve the purpose.

2. On-the-Job Instruction. Individual instruction on the job is perhaps the most widely used form of training but the least recognized as being just that. Some kind of aid from a supervisor, particularly to a new employee, is taken for granted. The problem is to get the supervisor to plan his instruction and to go about it in an organized, systematic fashion. Occa-

Service for managerial posts."—*The Federal Government Service: Its Character, Prestige, and Problems*, final ed. (New York: 1954), p. 183.

[61] See *Employee Training in the Public Service*, Chap. 5.

[62] The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has used a helpful little leaflet, *Making Staff Meetings More Useful*, Supervision and Management Series, No. 2.

sionally, where a group is large enough, one person may be assigned to give full time to instructing other employees at their desks or their work benches. But in most cases the supervisor is the best-qualified, and he usually does give the instruction in the skills required.

Much has already been said about the training of the trainers. Suffice it to add here some reference to two devices of a special type: supervised practice and rotation of assignments. A number of Federal agencies, in particular, have used these methods. Some specialized jobs, usually too few in number to warrant a group approach, can be learned in no other way than by systematized supervision on the job, with periodic checkups on performance and progress. The so-called understudy method, advocated chiefly for administrative positions, is a familiar type of supervised practice. Internships best illustrate the system of rotation of assignments, but such rotation can take place at any point in a man's career. Deliberate movement of station heads and other middle management or professional personnel from time to time has long been the practice in such highly effective organizations as the Forest Service, the Food and Drug Administration, the Public Health Service, and the Foreign Service.

Manuals and Bulletins. In addition to what has already been said about the use of printed materials, emphasis should be laid on the readability and genuine usability of instructional or reference writing. Handbooks, procedure manuals, or periodic bulletins are of little value unless they are attractive. Attention may also be given under this heading to guidance of employees in the use of library materials. The circulation of new books and periodicals in the trade can be of considerable stimulation to the staff.

Correspondence Courses. On account of the fact that in some agencies the majority of the employees are in the field, recourse has been taken in a number of instances to correspondence courses. These are typified in the Federal Government by the programs found in the Bureau of the Census, the Forest Service, and the Internal Revenue Service. Reference should also be made to the series of correspondence courses launched in 1935 by the International City Managers' Association in its Institute for Training in Municipal Administration. These are specially designed for city managers and administrative officials, many of whom have progressed to their present positions through specialized education and experience that is not of the type required in their present positions. Courses have been offered in personnel, finance, planning, public works, police, fire, recreation, and other functions. This is an undertaking which has reached thousands of officials.

Correspondence courses are not very satisfactory as training devices because of the expense of administering them and the lack of personal discussion and interchange of ideas. For these reasons they are desirable only where no other arrangement is feasible.

5. Use of Audio-Visual Aids. We have mentioned in several places the usefulness of films and other exhibit materials. The point is made here again for purposes of emphasis. Few training devices have quite the appeal and force of graphic or auditory presentations. They include such media as still pictures, models, specimens, posters, maps, charts, film strips, slides, and, most important, motion pictures. Among the auditory devices are phonograph records, wire recording, and radio transcriptions.

Movies are the most widely used medium and have had particularly extensive use in the Federal service. Most cities use films in their public schools. Films are cited as especially valuable in training courses when used to provide emotional setting and enthusiasm, to arouse interest, to develop originality and participation, to provoke discussion, or to summarize a subject.[63]

6. Other Methods. This section should not be closed without some recognition of many other useful, and usually more subtle, methods for staff development and training. Fundamentally, the conditions for easy and willing learning in the modern schoolroom apply with equal force to the office, the laboratory, and the plant. The findings of progressive educational research are as applicable here as they are in public schools.

These considerations embrace creating an atmosphere and environment conducive to learning, developing a climate in which hope is the dominant motivation rather than fear. Every program to increase employee participation in policy development or work improvement is in many respects a training implement. Every assembly or printed circular or procedure that creates an opportunity for such participation is, in effect, training supervisors and employees in human relations and in the habits that build morale and productivity.

And so it is with such programs as better writing of instructions, wider and smoother communication up and down and across organization lines, exchange of information, circulation of reports and releases, making attitude surveys in which supervisors analyze the results themselves, and all the multifarious devices of stimulation and inspiration which characterize an alert management. It is impossible to overemphasize the point that a staff grows and develops not by direct training techniques alone but also by living with an *attitude of management*, permeating all operations, that makes such growth and development attractive, natural, and satisfying.

C. EVALUATION OF TRAINING

The Civil Service Assembly report on training stresses that evaluation of a training program must be made in terms of objectives. These objec-

[63] *Employee Training in the Public Service*, pp. 98–99. The pioneer study on films is John E. Devine, *Films as an Aid in Training Public Employees*, Social Science Research Council (New York: 1937).

tives "may be immediate in terms of an individual class or the training of a subordinate on the job by his supervisor, or more remote in terms of the public purposes of the government agency in which the training is given."[64] Thus, the first step in evaluation is to define objectives as completely and precisely as possible.

Some executives despair of attempts at evaluation because they seek precision and certainty. At best, one can only approximate the results of training, since it often deals with intangibles and may be only one of several circumstances that bring about a given result in administration. But this does not mean abandonment of a scientific method in gauging the effectiveness of a program. The soundest judgment is likely to be one which indicates the *extent to which* a plan is effective and objectively accepts also its deficiencies. Finally, few can quarrel with the fairness of the evaluation if it contains as many objective data as possible and also the factual opinions of all parties involved, the trainees and top management as well as the trainers.

One method of training course evaluation that has been successfully used is through the training committee, composed of representatives of participants, management, and the training staff. The collective observations of such a cross section of interested parties is likely to provide a fairly accurate appraisal. Many agencies have made good use of this device. Another technique, which relies more heavily on participants, is the questionnaire to those being trained. This is usually very useful in recasting a program to meet more precisely the purposes it set out to achieve. Of most importance, of course, is any evidence of improved job performance. Techniques in self-defense learned by a patrolman or in lifesaving learned by a fireman often pay out in actual experiences that save lives and property. Where costs of operation or improvement of service can definitely be measured, by all means the facts should be found and publicized.

Even more significant are the end results of a given program. For example, some years ago, in California counties where highway patrol officers had undergone special training, traffic fatality rates did not increase nearly as much as they did in counties where the officers had not taken such training. Fire protection is equally susceptible of measurable progress. A state welfare agency found success in its training activities through such results as reduction of backlog, increased speed in review of cases, and a better community understanding of the agency program. The FBI, in the early days of its in-service refresher training for its special agents, was able to show an increase in average number of convictions and in recoveries, fines, and savings effected by the agents. The International City Managers' Association can show an impressive list of improvements chargeable to its correspondence courses. Likewise, the International Association of Chiefs

[64] *Employee Training in the Public Service*, p. 133.

of Police can prove that decreases in traffic fatalities definitely occur in those communities in which police officers have taken its safety training course. Sometimes training results are indirect, in the form of trainees' suggestions for work improvement as well as in the overall end results of a program.[65]

The process of evaluation can easily be confused by uncontrollable events, such as new statutes, new top executives, budget decreases, newspaper campaigns, political activity, and other extraneous factors. But such difficulties need not stand in the way of a real effort to see how well training is paying off. Concentration on objectives and on end results of the operating program will in the majority of instances make it possible to evaluate the training fairly accurately.

D. FUNCTIONS OF THE TRAINING STAFF

In the discussion of "Responsibility of Management for Training" the proper place and use of a full-time training staff were suggested by the thesis that training is essentially the line supervisor's responsibility. If we accept that thesis, then it follows that training specialists are cast principally in the role of advisers and coördinators, rather than trainers. Individual training officers may function as actual instructors for such centralized activities as secretarial training, supervisory training, or certain phases of oreintation. Otherwise they should be chiefly concerned with stimulating and improving the training done by others. For the most part, they need to be broad-gauged persons, masters of educational technique, and, even more important, possessed of a keen insight into human nature and a full grasp of the purposes and functions of the organization for which they work.

It goes without saying that, in order for a top public executive to sponsor and direct a comprehensive training program for orientation and work improvement, the following duties must be performed by someone: (1) conducting surveys and analyzing training needs; (2) conducting research in training methods; (3) advising and working with operators on educational methods, on planning programs, on use of materials, etc.; (4) selecting or assisting in selecting instructors from the operating staff to lead group activities; (5) preparing training materials for general projects that cut across the organization; (6) making arrangements with outside institutions for various services; (7) stimulating interest in training; (8) coördinating training activities, to avoid duplication and gaps; (9) directing the evaluation of training programs. For these things to get done, a specially prepared individual or staff (depending on the size of the organization) is clearly necessary. No one operating head within the agency can take care of these training responsibilities that go beyond his own unit. At first the tendency

[65] *Ibid.*, pp. 128–133.

was to locate a professional training staff in the central personnel agency, the civil service commission. More and more the trend now is to establish training assistance at the operating department or bureau level, leaving only jurisdiction-wide training to the central unit.

This trend is demonstrated in the Federal Government, where almost every major department and bureau has a heavily used training staff. In fact, the U.S. Civil Service Commission is able to give only limited central leadership in such programs as executive development. It no longer has its wartime clearing house and central staff service on employee training. Some economies that could have been realized in the continuation of this staff—certain handbook preparation, and provision of training courses for fields in which individual departments had only small numbers of employees, for example—were overlooked by those who denied funds. Instead, each department is forced to undertake all these activities individually, at what is undoubtedly a greater total cost. In any event, the principal in-service programs would still have to be carried on at the department and bureau levels because, as we have seen, they must be intimately tied in with line operations.

Examples have already been given of the establishment of training staffs in states and municipalities, notably New York State, California, Illinois, and New York City. In a number of cases excellent arrangements have been worked out with public educational institutions for special training services. Still others have made profitable use of staff assistance supplied by national professional organizations. But there is a wide field yet in state and local government for recognition of the need for full-time technical assistance in systematizing and improving the inescapable training functions of management.

SUMMARY

In bringing this chapter to a close, the author cannot fail to stress the fundamental significance of training in increasing the effectiveness of employees for their immediate and future tasks, and the progress to be made in various directions which has been proved to be feasible in the experience of many public employers in this country. A systematic approach to the problem of training is dictated not alone in the interest of the public service itself but also in the interest of the workers who constitute it. The opportunity for intelligent participation and interest in one's lifework, and also the right to grow in one's job, ought to be looked upon as the rightful heritage of anyone who is devoting his life to the public service.

Where one has to do with a large department, the central personnel agency should limit itself to an advisory and stimulating function, but even here it might prove to be advantageous to organize courses which would be attended by a number of employees who are recruited from

several departments when it is found that there are too few in any single department to warrant the organization of a course. In those cases where specialists of a certain type appear only in one department there would be no reason for setting up instruction elsewhere. Again, it may develop that there are no officials qualified to instruct in one or another subject, whereas a local educational institution may have on its faculty an experienced instructor able to give the desired course. The propriety of turning to tax-supported academic institutions for educational aid requires no argument. Also, the creation of staff schools within the government itself is often called for by the circumstances.

There is a variety of conditions which must be taken into account in the determination of the most fruitful training policy. This calls for a broad view of the whole situation, for initiative and resourcefulness. The official establishment of a training division or a training head in public agencies has usually yielded substantial returns on the investment in a comparatively brief space of time.

The impression cannot be avoided that training both for induction and for improved efficiency is still inadequate in the public service. All circumstances point to its expansion, and the success in those agencies which have engaged in it demonstrates its value. Moreover, in case after case the employees who have had an opportunity to participate have shown an eager interest in a training program, as well as a willingness to devote time and, in certain instances, even money to it.

As John M. Pfiffner was once heard to say: "Organizations resist intellect." The perpetual problem of training is to see to it that intellectual influences blow their fresh winds periodically through the stale airs of organization structure. This is the basic reason why so many groups have urged more attention to training in the public service and particularly to the development of executive competence.

15

Health, Safety, and Welfare

Human failure is a matter of cost in a manner very similar to machine failure.

—*H. W. Lawrence*[1]

It was not many years ago that the phrase "human factor in industry" was coined and its significance for management translated into policies and programs. Before this period the assumption seemed to be that workers were easily replaced, that accidents were more or less inevitable, and that workers' attitudes and personal well-being made little difference to management. But in recent decades, in the interest of increased output, reduced turnover, and social responsibility, the doors have been opened to industrial physicians and nurses and even to industrial psychologists. The aid of those versed in the science of human beings has been invoked. Workers are not to be used today and scrapped tomorrow. In the present struggle for world security, scientific methods are brought to bear to conserve these vital resources and to maximize their production.

In the United States increasing attention is directed to the problem of keeping the worker "fit," with special emphasis on physical fitness. Some reference will also be made in this chapter to several measures that are designed to contribute to the social and economic well-being of the members of the working staff. Well-rounded personnel programs in effect in private enterprises have for a long time included provisions for attention to the items considered here. But it is only in the past twenty years or so that these subjects have found their way into the reports of public personnel agencies. Of all standard personnel functions these are the ones most neglected in public circles.

I. PHYSICAL WORKING CONDITIONS

A striking instance of inadequate authority and poor administrative organization appears in the handling of physical working conditions. The

[1] "The Medical Department and Its Relation to Other Personnel Activities," *Industrial Medicine*, August, 1939, pp. 342 ff.

responsibility for satisfactory standards is usually assigned to the building superintendent, who is, more likely than not, unschooled in the techniques that have been devised by the industrial hygienist and psychologist. Among progressive concerns this responsibility is ordinarily centered in the personnel division.

Reliance on building superintendents for proper standards has failed to bring the desired results. Except in the more modern buildings—and most public buildings, especially those of the monumental sort, do not belong to this class—working conditions are generally well below par. Defective lighting is rather the rule than otherwise. From the standpoint of cleanliness, the state of walls, floors, windows, and ceilings leaves much to be desired. All too frequently the surroundings are not only dirty but drab. Industrial psychologists have demonstrated that color exerts a marked influence on the attitudes of workers and have urged the necessity of cheerful surroundings as prerequisite to good work. One need only visit a few county courthouses, city halls, or even imposing state capitols to realize that such teachings have not penetrated into these areas.

Moreover, casual investigation will disclose that, despite the rigid standards as to toilet and sanitary facilities set forth in the various state industrial codes, those observed in the washrooms of many public and rented government buildings themselves are far from satisfactory. It would appear in such cases that governments have been more concerned with the welfare of the employees of private concerns than of their own. During and after both world wars thousands of Federal employees were housed in office structures that would have been condemned by public inspectors as firetraps had private concerns been involved, and similar conditions might have been discovered in the rented quarters used to house some of the Federal agencies. In general, however, Washington is well ahead of the rest of the country in providing suitable space for its employees. A visit to the magnificent Pentagon building is reassuring.

Attention will now be turned to a few specific aspects of the working environment—ventilation, lighting, sanitation, etc. Although the detailed treatment of any of these is beyond the scope of the present work, a few observations may be presented.

A. VENTILATION, TEMPERATURE, AND HUMIDITY

The aim of ventilation has been described as the "maintenance of the proper temperature, diversity, humidity, circulation, and purity of air in confined spaces in order to secure the most healthful conditions."[2] Thus, the term "ventilation" may be used to include both temperature and humidity. Ventilation may be said to be perfect when such atmospheric conditions are regularly maintained in the workroom that (1) a normal

[2] James D. Hackett, *Health Maintenance in Industry* (Chicago: 1925), p. 324.

proportion of oxygen is present in the air (under ideal conditions this is approximately 21 percent); (2) the temperature and humidity fall within the comfort zone; (3) the air is free from dust, odors, or bacteria; and (4) there is suitable circulation of air. Under ordinary urban conditions, and particularly with a large work force, perfect ventilation can usually be approximated only if some sort of mechanical air-conditioning system is employed.

Atmospheric conditions in the work place are of considerable importance, not only because of their immediate bearing upon fatigue and employee efficiency, but also from the general health standpoint. Investigations by the research laboratory of the American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers have established the fact that temperature, humidity, and air movement are the major factors in proper atmospheric conditions, rather than the proportion of oxygen or of carbon dioxide in the air.

With the exception of the Federal Government, few public authorities have paid much attention to the question of ventilation for their own employees. Although conditions in the Federal service are still not fully satisfactory, there has been an increasing recognition of the importance of dealing with this problem in the capital. Because of the high temperatures and humidity in Washington during the summer, the problem has been particularly acute in the departmental service. At present, most of the newer buildings in Washington are air-conditioned. But many employees in Washington are still located in buildings without air conditioning, resulting in substantial losses of time and in decreased efficiency. The loss of efficiency during hot humid periods, customary in Washington in the long summer, is simply incalculable.

The quality and temperature of the air in the workroom and the office are recognized as factors which affect both physical and mental states of workers and thereby their output. It is good management to assign the job of checking on air conditions to competent and responsible officers.[3]

B. ADEQUATE LIGHTING

The question of proper lighting is of importance from a number of standpoints. For example, eyestrain is known to be a contributing cause of fatigue. Moreover, poor lighting conditions, if long continued, may result in a permanent impairment of the sight of employees, particularly of those engaged in close work. Aside from the humanitarian considerations involved here, such a result leads to unnecessary compensation cases in some

[3] In more progressive industries such an officer would be an industrial hygienist whose services include, according to a summary statement, taking "samples of possibly contaminated air, samples of materials, physical determinations of heat, light, and ventilation, and many other items too numerous to mention." See H. G. Dyktor, "Integration of Industrial Hygiene and Industrial Medicine," *Industrial Medicine*, April, 1940, pp. 193 ff.

instances, to premature retirements, and to a generally lowered efficiency, all of which are reflected in operating costs.

Whether one depends on natural or artificial light, or both, adequate standards should be maintained by means of systematic tests carried on by a competent person. The photometer is an inexpensive and indispensable aid in making light surveys. Periodic tests are called for because of the gradual deterioration of electrical equipment. It is generally accepted that artificial lighting effects should approximate daylight so far as possible, that combinations of indirect and direct light are superior to either alone, that fluorescent bulbs are more versatile than incandescent, and that the color of walls and ceiling is an important factor in securing agreeable and desirable effects.[4]

The fact that there is a close connection between productive efficiency and illumination has been established by a number of investigations. In addition to early surveys in U.S. post offices, a study in 1945–1946 of card-punch operators in the Internal Revenue Service concluded that visual improvement contributed to "increased production and well-being."[5]

As a result of investigations in private and public employment, the conclusion has been reached that illumination equal to twenty foot-candles[6] is best for general office work. In arranging for good lighting, a number of other factors than brightness require consideration: (1) the type of lighting unit; (2) the diffusion of light from the unit and absence of glare; (3) the location of desks and workbenches with reference to lighting units; (4) the color of walls and ceiling. Standards have been developed for each of these several items. In view of the relatively low cost of electricity and bulbs, there seems little excuse for inadequate illumination.

Despite these facts, a survey of conditions in a number of state and local jurisdictions revealed illumination to be almost universally neglected. In these jurisdictions it was the exception to discover anyone charged with responsibility for lighting conditions. Although there is wide variation in conditions among the Federal buildings, the general situation has been considerably improved since the twenties. In a few cases periodic light surveys are made. On the other hand, in most of the other establishments, investigations are made only upon complaint, if at all. Conditions are also bad in a number of the agencies housed in so-called temporary buildings, some of which have been "temporary" for nearly forty years.

[4] For an enlightening treatment of the subject see Matthew Luckiesh, *Seeing and Human Welfare* (New York: 1935), Chap. 6. A practical handbook is *Recommended Practice of Office Lighting*, Illuminating Engineering Society (New York: 1947). The Public Health Service publishes an excellent popular booklet, *Set Your Sight High* (available from its Industrial Hygiene Division).

[5] *The Influence of Lighting, Eyesight, and Environment upon Work Production*, Report of a Two-Year Study Made Jointly by the Public Buildings Administration and the Public Health Service (Washington: 1947).

[6] A foot-candle represents the intensity of illumination upon a perpendicular surface one foot away from a standard candle.

C. SEATING

Fatigue, according to an early pamphlet issued by the Public Health Service, is the "greatest single obstacle to maximum output."[7] Since a close connection has been shown to exist between working posture and fatigue, the question of proper seating assumes importance. The work must be so arranged that posture can be varied and that good posture is possible during the working hours. Both of these depend upon the character of the seating arrangements. Nevertheless, almost no attention has been paid to the seating of most government employees, although the purchase of adjustable typists' chairs is a common exception to this neglect.

D. NOISE

Just as one uses a photometer to test the adequacy of lighting, so here one may use a sound-level meter, which, with the application of electrical impulses, records the amount of noise in terms of decibels.[8] Despite the lack of dependable standards, observations made with the use of the sound meter might well lead to the reduction, if not elimination, of elements in the workroom that give rise to disturbing noise.

Unnecessary noise is expensive from a number of other standpoints. It makes the holding of telephone conversations or interviews difficult and complicates the taking of dictation. In offices, noise can be reduced by providing a soft floor covering and noiseless typewriters, and by treating the walls with effective sound-absorbents. Planning office layout can help by isolating noisy machines, keeping typing operations separate from interviewers, and the like. Overcrowding also may be a factor contributing to unnecessary noise.

Although operators of office machines such as typewriters may not be particularly distracted in their work by noise, some studies have shown that noise contributes to fatigue without the worker's realizing it. A common error in government offices, even in modern buildings, is to require administrative and technical employees who are expected to do creative work to sit at desks close together—often four, or as many as ten or a dozen, to a small room. Concentration on a problem or a report becomes almost impossible when one or more others in the room are engaged in necessary telephoning or conferences with colleagues on their work. The amount of continuing production lost is incalculable. Certainly it is far greater than any temporary savings in space or in cost of installing simple partitions. The solution is usually to provide small, quiet private or semi-private offices for all employees who are called upon to do research, solve

[7] U.S. Public Health Service, *How Industrial Fatigue May be Reduced*, Reprint No. 482 (Washington: 1918).

[8] A decibel is the smallest change perceived by the ear in the power level of a sound. The variations in intensity are indicated by the range from 35 decibels in an average dwelling to 120 decibels as the measure of the sound of an automobile horn.

technical or management problems, conduct interviews, carry on extended telephone or personal conferences, develop policy proposals, or otherwise perform more than repetitive or manual tasks. The total space required need be little greater than is used in the open "bull pen" type of office space, and the cost of simple partitions is easily offset by increasing productivity even within a very short period of time, to say nothing of the continuing advantages.

E. SANITATION

General cleanliness is the first requirement for sanitary working conditions. Floors should be cleaned, windows washed, and desks dusted regularly. These tasks are best done outside of working hours. Aside from such elementary considerations, however, attention must be given to drinking water, toilet facilities, and wash and locker rooms. An abundant supply of pure fresh water is essential to the welfare of the employees. This fact has been recognized to such an extent that in some private plants, where workers cannot leave their benches, water is regularly served to them by attendants. Drinking water should be tested regularly for bacteria and should be supplied to fountains at a temperature of about 50 degrees Fahrenheit.

Toilet facilities should be adequate. This means the provision of at least one toilet to each twenty workers. They should be comfortably heated in winter and cleaned daily. Good practice also demands the provision of ample washing facilities and, where the work is dirty, of showers and individual lockers.

The general impression created by the conditions of work on workers who spend the best part of their waking hours on the job is a potent psychological factor. The man who spends seven or eight hours every day in clean, cheerful, and comfortable surroundings is likely to have a very different outlook from that of the man who is forced to spend his days in a drab, dirty, or uncomfortable working environment. Such broad considerations are not disregarded by progressive private employers; they should surely be recognized by the State. Aside, then, from attendant losses in efficiency, the less than desirable standards in vogue in many public jurisdictions are indefensible on broader grounds.

II. ACCIDENT PREVENTION AND SAFETY PROGRAMS

The accident-prevention movement which swept over private industry after World War I received its impetus from two primary sources: (1) from the workmen's compensation movement, based upon a recognition of the employer's responsibility for industrial accidents; and (2) from the desire of employers to eliminate the production losses attendant upon accidents. The movement for workmen's compensation laws, which really got under

way in 1914, was probably the more important factor.[9] By making the cost of accidents a cost of production, these laws provided the employer with a financial incentive for accident reduction. The result in many cases has been phenomenal.

There has been far less progress along this line in the public services than in private industry. This lag is due to the frequently noted tendency for governments to be less concerned with their own employees than with those of private employers. But it is due also to the fact that, although many public employees are covered by compensation laws, these laws ordinarily do not make the cost of accidents a charge against the budget of the department or bureau involved. Whereas industry has been forced to embark upon safety programs for its own protection, governmental agencies seem not to have been under any such compulsion. In the Federal Government, for example, most employees have been protected by compensation benefits since 1916,[10] but these are paid out of a general compensation fund having no relation to departmental budgets.

The upshot of this is a shocking lack of interest in accident-prevention work. Even today, as in 1920, "the government is paying heavily in the form of employees' compensation, as well as in loss of time and efficiency, for its failure to adopt a thoroughgoing safety program,"[11] although many individual agencies now have well-conceived and persistent programs. The losses in the Federal service are not such as to warrant complacency. In the single fiscal year 1955, 89,329 new injuries were reported to the Bureau of Employees' Compensation. Although this was a substantial decrease from the war years, the number was double the prewar level. The bureau paid out over $32,000,000 in fiscal year 1955 for benefits to injured civilian employees. Chargeable time lost because of accidents totaled nearly three million days of pain and suffering—a reminder that much still needs to be done in the field of Federal accident prevention.[12]

Organized safety programs are now in operation in about twenty Federal departments and agencies, as against eight a decade ago. Also, during recent years the Federal service brought most occupational casualty rates to an all-time low. As a result of safety efforts, the probability of sustaining a disabling injury is at least 25 percent less than in prewar years. Neverthe-

[9] The first workmen's compensation laws were enacted in Maryland (1902), Montana (1910), and New York (1911), but were all declared unconstitutional. The first laws upheld by the courts were those of New York, Washington, and Wisconsin, adopted in 1914.

[10] The basic laws: U.S.C., Title 5, secs. 751–759; U.S.C. Supp. 7, Title 33, secs. 901–950; 45 Stat. 600.

[11] Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries, *Report*, p. 20.

[12] Data provided by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor. Legislation to liberalize injury compensation for Federal workers was enacted on October 14, 1949 (P.L. 357). See also the plea by R. R. Zimmerman, "Are Federal Employees Expendable Too?" *Personnel Administration*, April, 1944. For further data see Bureau of Employees' Compensation, *Federal Work Injuries* (issued annually).

less, considering the high financial costs and the attendant human costs in terms of suffering, broken lives, and death, broad-scale, systematic efforts to reduce accidents and injuries still must be extended in the Federal Government. In the states and cities, apart from a limited number of progressive jurisdictions, the safety-first movement has not gained even this headway.

The well-constituted safety program deals with (1) accident prevention and amelioration and (2) fire prevention and protection. Both its development and its administration require some centrally constituted authority which enjoys the definite and intelligent backing of the chief executive. The generally low standards prevailing in the public services may be traced in part to the absence of any single unit charged specifically with these functions. In the Federal Government the Bureau of Employees' Compensation has no authority in this respect, although it assists the various agencies in eradicating unsafe working conditions and minimizing unsafe acts by employees. The Interdepartmental Safety Council and various individual agencies have stimulated much more attention to safety in recent years. The personnel office or some other authority should be charged with this responsibility in each establishment.

In the development of an accident reduction or prevention program, the point of departure consists in the determination of the number, character, and causes of accidents. This means reports on prescribed forms, investigations by competent officers, and analysis in a central office. Accidents are due either to working conditions, machine failures, and the like, or to primarily personal or human factors, such as carelessness and ignorance. In the case of the former a competent safety engineer may be able to improve the conditions of work so that a large number of accidents are prevented.[13]

The second class of accidents, those due to carelessness, inexperience, and the like, on the part of employees, can be materially reduced by safety education. The techniques involved in a program of safety education have been extensively worked out in industry, and it is unnecessary to consider them in detail here. The particular program adopted may take a number of forms, depending partly upon circumstances. It may include safety instruction, the use of posters, the institution of shop or organizational safety committees, and interorganizational contests.[14] But, whatever the program, it can be successful only if someone is specifically charged with this aspect of personnel administration.

[13] See R. A. Blake, "The Place and Functions of the Safety Engineer," *Personnel Administration*, March, 1946, pp. 13–15.

[14] See, for example, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, "Safety," *Bibliography of Management Literature* (New York: 1931); C. R. Dooley, "Supervisors and Safety," *Personnel Administration*, November, 1945, pp. 4–75; and the various reports of the National Safety Council (Chicago).

The utility of putting a safety program into effect in a public jurisdiction has been demonstrated time and again. Within recent decades Milwaukee, San Diego, and Cincinnati have made dramatic reductions in accidents and resultant injury compensation payments. Similar achievements could no doubt be found in a number of other municipalities and in some of the states, but there is no central place for reporting such information. Since World War II the U.S. Department of Agriculture has made notable strides in reducing injuries—both within its own staff and on American farms.

There will probably always be a certain number of unpreventable accidents. The problem presented by these is one of amelioration, one of decreasing the seriousness of the consequences of accidents. At this point the safety program ties into the general health program. The potential seriousness of accidents can be reduced, of course, by immediate emergency treatment and by proper hospitalization. The safety program, therefore, requires the provision of emergency first-aid stations and hospitalization facilities. These are discussed at greater length below.

The comprehensive safety program must also include positive efforts for fire prevention and protection. This has rather far-reaching implications. It means not only that government buildings should be so constructed as to be fireproof, with sufficient fire escapes and other exits to accommodate the maximum number of occupants of the building, but that regular inspections must be made to prevent the development of situations conducive to fire and that an educational program must be carried on among the employees. At the present time, considerable numbers of public employees are working in buildings which are firetraps and under extremely hazardous conditions of overcrowding. City-hall basements and attics around the country are filled with accumulations of rubbish, piles of old records, and the like, which constitute a definite menace. Even in firehouses unsatisfactory conditions have come to light from time to time. No employer, and particularly not the government, has the right to subject employees to unnecessary hazards of this type.

III. HEALTH ACTIVITIES

The importance of health as a national asset and a national responsibility has come to be accepted in ever-widening circles. An integral factor in this enlightenment is the growing appreciation of disease prevention or, more broadly stated, health conservation. The safety movement stimulated by the workmen's compensation acts, with increasing emphasis on compensation for industrial diseases, has, as has been stated, gained great headway among private enterprises. Compulsory health insurance is rapidly gaining adherents. Group health insurance has been established in many industries. Forward-looking plants have seen fit to employ physicians as regular staff members in the name of economy, being aware that absenteeism on account

of sickness and possibly subsequent turnover entail direct and indirect costs in excess of the costs of maintaining the health of the work force. Public employers are laggards in this sector of personnel management, although social considerations should presumably weigh heavily with them and although most of them have long given extensive sick leave, which is nothing more or less than a form of health insurance.

The functions of the medical departments in industrial establishments are four in number: (1) to assist in proper placement, (2) to procure and maintain a physically fit personnel, (3) to educate the worker through physical examinations in matters of personal hygiene, and (4) to reduce loss of time through tardiness and absenteeism. Among their specific activities may be mentioned: (1) administration of physical examinations, (2) treatment of injuries resulting from accidents, (3) diagnosis and treatment of minor illnesses, (4) reduction of fatigue and boredom, (5) health education, and (6) supervision of sanitation and other working conditions affecting health. There is nothing in this list that is not directly applicable to public employment. To keep employees fit in the interest of good standards of production, as well as in that of their own personal welfare, is a motive that should actuate public no less than private employers; unfortunately there is surprisingly little appreciation of this motive in public circles. A report by the Public Health Service in 1950 showed that among industrial establishments with over 10,000 employees 91 to 94 percent of them provided dispensary services, physical examinations (of the preplacement, periodic, and return to work variety), and safety and sanitation services, while well over half of them also had safety and health instruction, dental services, exit examinations, and reports on examination information to individual employees.[15]

Maintenance of the health of the working staff is certainly as important as maintenance of physical equipment and is a distinct personnel function. Health functions cannot ordinarily be performed by the personnel agency, although that agency may guide and coördinate them. It certainly has a stake in them, not only because it is charged with the maintenance of an efficient staff, but because the administration of the health program intimately affects other aspects of personnel administration, such as setting minimum physical requirements, control of attendance, administration of leave policies, and disability retirement. In some states the industrial hygiene division in the industrial commission or labor department might be

[15] Margaret C. Klem, Margaret F. McKiever, and Walter J. Lear, M.D., *Industrial Health and Medical Programs*, Public Health Service Publication No. 15 (Washington: September, 1950), p. 148. This is the most comprehensive work on industrial programs. For other information on industry, see the following reports of the National Industrial Conference Board: *Company Medical and Health Programs*, Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 96 (New York: 1948), which covered 333 establishments employing 1,598,488 employees; and *Company Health Programs for Executives*, Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 147 (New York: 1955).

commissioned to share in the program. But in organizations of moderate size at least one full-time industrial physician would find his time fully and profitably occupied—if we are ready to accept the experience within private commercial and industrial organizations as a guide and criterion.

The principal exception to the general neglect of public employee health problems is found in the Federal Government. But even there the program is most inadequately supported. However, the signal step of statutory recognition has been achieved. The Federal Employees' Health Act of 1946 provided that each department or agency could operate its own health program on the basis of a plan on which the consultation and recommendations of the Public Health Service had been secured.[16] For this purpose the Public Health Service established a Federal Employee Health Division, which also operates programs for some agencies by contract on a reimbursement basis.

Prior to this time a number of Federal agencies had for some years operated "emergency rooms," with nurses in attendance, notably in the industrial operations, such as the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the munitions plants. But few really had comprehensive programs of the type described in the ensuing sections of this chapter.

Working closely with the Federal personnel directors, the Federal Employee Health Division[17] completed on-location surveys of health needs, for purposes of its consultative function, in a number of departmental agencies and major field centers. As a result of these surveys, medical officers with supporting staffs have been set up in several departments, usually within the framework of the personnel division. Other agencies have been unable to get financial support for much more than the usual emergency nursing service. The problem in the field is usually one of providing a centrally operated health service to serve all units which have too small a representation in any one location to warrant a separate service of their own. Such a joint health service, with full-time medical staff, has so far been set up only in Denver. Of course, several Federal agencies are fairly well taken care of in the field through their own resources, examples being the Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration.

The Employee Health Division, on a contract basis, operates health room services, either with or without a full-fledged medical staff, for fifteen Washington units. It has also provided guidance and advisory service to several units operating their own health rooms.

So far as can be determined, Connecticut is unique among the states in development of a comprehensive health program for its public workers. Its Division of Health Services for State Employees, first established in 1950,

[16] P.L. 658, 79th Cong., 1946.

[17] Now the Federal Employee Health Branch, Division of Hospitals, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

provides preplacement, periodic, and on-request physical examinations; emergency medical service; treatment on written request by private physicians; health counseling and education; immunization; and health surveys.[18]

At this point let us examine the nature and scope of a modern employee health program.

PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS

In the discussion of the selction process it was pointed out that a physical examination is one of the hurdles to be cleared by the prospective entrant to many public services. This is a desirable requirement and indeed an essential one if retirement and compensation systems have been established. No system can in the long run be kept solvent when the doors are open to recruits with organic and other physical defects.

The preëntry examination not only sifts out those who have a contagious disease or are physically below par and constitute a definite employment risk but also discovers defects of one sort or another that should be considered in the placement process. Further, it may bring to light incipient predisposition to disease that should be periodically checked to avoid later illness. The record of the results of the preëntry examination should be filed with other health records for future reference. Nearly three-fourths of industrial establishments surveyed in 1950 utilized preëntry physical examinations,[19] and they are common among public jurisdictions.

The fact of good health at the time of entrance into the service does not preclude the possibility of health deterioration thereafter, a deterioration which not only may result in marked decreases in individual efficiency but may also endanger the health of fellow workers in some instances. The logical basis for a comprehensive health program is, therefore, a periodic medical examination. Periodic medical examinations are nearly as common among industrial and commercial concerns as preëntry examinations.[20] As a result, prevention rather than cure is now the motto. But, despite such policies by progressive industrial establishments throughout the country, a regular checkup on public employees is seldom provided. One of the first public agencies which adopted periodic physical examinations was the Tennessee Valley Authority. Among cities which require periodic and return-to-work checkups at least in certain occupations are San Jose and San Diego, California.[21]

[18] Division of State Merit Systems, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Merit System Methods*, No. 85, January, 1954, p. 1.

[19] Klem, McKiever, and Lear, *op. cit.*, p. 148; 72.7 percent of 278 firms reporting.

[20] *Ibid.;* 60.7 percent gave periodic examinations.

[21] "City Uses Physical Exams as a Selection Aid," *Public Personnel Review*, October, 1950, p. 198; Raymond Krah, "Adopts Health Standards for New City Employments," *Public Management*, February, 1952, p. 36. For a good general discussion see Lew Fay and Gordon W. Peterson, *Medical Examinations for Public Employees*, Civil Service Assembly Personnel Report No. 545 (Chicago: 1955).

B. TREATMENT OF INJURIES RESULTING FROM ACCIDENTS

The relatively high accident rate in the government service has already been commented upon. Since with even the most comprehensive safety program accidents will happen, the progressive employer makes provision for the prompt and effective treatment of the resultant injuries. Emergency first-aid service is dictated not only by considerations of the welfare of the employees but by those of economy as well. If the employer is called upon to accept a part or all of the financial burden of accidents to employees, it is common sense to attempt to ameliorate their consequences.

The proper treatment of injuries requires the provision of an emergency room for each large establishment or building. It should be under the supervision of either a full- or a part-time physician, depending upon the size of the organization, and staffed with at least one full-time nurse. Provision should be made for dealing with all sorts of injuries, although the more usual are likely to be cuts and bruises, sprains, fractures, faintness, shock, and burns. The necessity for adequate staffing cannot be overemphasized, for each minor injury should receive consideration.

Although this aspect of the medical program is inadequately handled in the public services at present, it has received more consideration than most of the others mentioned. Emergency rooms are rather commonly provided today; however, they are more often than not understaffed, and the quality of the service rendered varies a good deal from one department to another.

C. DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF MINOR ILLNESSES

The work of the medical department cannot be confined to the treatment of injuries resulting from accidents if it is to achieve one of its chief aims—a reduction in lost time. Records of absenteeism in industrial plants often show many times as much time lost on account of illness as on account of accidents,[22] and in many governmental units the ratio is even higher. Moreover, as the National Industrial Conference Board has pointed out, "if an employee loses a week, it matters little whether it is because of an injured finger or of tonsilitis. While compensation costs may not enter into the latter instance, there remain the costs of training a new worker, disruption of production schedules, and other losses attendant upon absenteeism."[23]

Experience with industrial medicine reveals that the medical department needs to concentrate upon a few particular illnesses. From the standpoint of time lost, the greatest offender is the common cold. Next to this come other respiratory diseases and digestive diseases.

[22] See Klem, McKiever, and Lear, *op. cit.*, pp. 102–103.

[23] NICB Report No. 17, *Medical and Health Programs in Industry* (December, 1939), p. 49.

The experience of various private concerns further indicates that much absenteeism can be prevented by (1) proper sanitation in the work place, (2) health education, and (3) early diagnosis and treatment. Each of these should be a responsibility of the health service in public agencies as well. Moreover, the administration of sick leave requires a considerable activity in these directions. If it is to be properly controlled, visiting nurses and physicians should be provided. This is the exception rather than the rule at the present time, although some of the Federal establishments and a few state and local agencies have made provision for visits by nurses or doctors to the homes of absent employees.

D. FATIGUE AND BOREDOM

"Fatigue" is a term variously interpreted; it indicates a state that is due to a variety of causes and that may manifest itself in different ways in different persons. For our purposes it denotes a physiological state which expresses itself in a lowered capacity for work. Boredom, on the other hand, suggests a mental state characterized by lack of interest in the task at hand. Both fatigue and boredom are likely to be reflected in lowered quantity and, possibly, quality of output.

Considerable research carried on by physiologists and psychologists and numerous practical experiments have seemingly proved that rest periods and variations in work assignments are conducive to the reduction of the harmful effects of fatigue and monotony. Among these effects are, it is claimed, the undermining of health, lowered standards of output, and possibly a shortening of life. As a consequence, many public as well as private employers have adopted the policy of providing regular rest periods in the middle of the morning and afternoon.

E. HEALTH EDUCATION

Some of the most effective work of the medical department or official may be done in connection with health education. This should include not only the dissemination of information on ordinary matters of personal hygiene, such as sleep, cleanliness, and diets, but also instruction in home remedies for colds and other common ailments. In this connection the Public Health Service has done a rather fine piece of work among Federal employees, supplying operating officers with advice and information on particular questions and issuing numerous bulletins and reports. The public health department in most jurisdictions is equipped to perform such a service and would undoubtedly willingly coöperate in a program of health education if so requested by the personnel agency. What is missing in this case is not so much a matter of facilities as of motivation.

F. SUPERVISION OF SANITATION AND WORKING CONDITIONS

The working environment and work processes have proved to be prolific sources of conditions that are unfavorable, if not inimical, to the physical well-being of employees. The leading state governments have long considered such conditions to be a matter of concern to the state and have authorized special agencies to make investigations, to set standards, and to carry on periodic inspections. Indeed, during the early period of grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act (1936–1939), twenty-one industrial hygiene units were established in as many states.[24] That the physical welfare of public employees may be adversely affected in various directions by the conditions under which they work has been amply demonstrated in the foregoing pages. In many respects the conditions obtaining in private establishments which are subject to inspection and to a call for remedial measures are not markedly different from those met with in public establishments.

It is strange that public health departments engaged in health education and industrial hygiene for the general public often hold themselve aloof or are held aloof for the section of the public which is employed in the same building or the same organization as the health agency. Personnel agencies would do well to mobilize the forces of public health agencies for the benefit of public employees, with reference not only to health education but also to the other phases of health maintenance considered in this chapter.

As with liberty, the price of maintaining health for the working force and executives is eternal vigilance. Gratifying progress has been made generally in making people "health-conscious" and in providing safeguards against the incidence of disease. Every employer—not least, the public employer—has a definite responsibility to contribute to these ends. Local, state, and Federal governments are continuously increasing their contributions to the general public through their public health departments. They are teaching and preaching preventive measures on every hand, but most of them seem to have by-passed the sector of the public which is made up of their own employees. It has been urged frequently that public agencies should be model employers. But to get into step with enlightened private employers in the matter of health conservation, most public executives would have to change their direction and quicken their pace. They would be moved to introduce policies where now there is no policy. As the health program is closely related to the traditional personnel program, and indeed almost interwoven with it, it is appropriate that the personnel agency should stimulate interest and action on this issue.

[24] Surgeon General of the United States, *Annual Report, 1939*. Forty-six states and twelve local governments now have industrial hygiene divisions.

IV. WELFARE ACTIVITIES

Civil servants must be constantly regarded by the employing government not only as employees but as those performing essential services, as persons in their own right. Of all employers, the State can least readily justify disregard for the welfare of its workers.

Despite this fact, many progressive private concerns have exhibited greater interest in the welfare of their employees than has the government in its servants. Numerous private concerns maintain savings, loan, and home-purchase plans, operate restaurants, cafeterias, and stores for the benefit of employees, engage in legal-aid work, stimulate coöperative purchasing and a varied group of recreational activities, to a degree not matched in public employment.

In a broad sense, of course, employee welfare is affected by all the conditions of service. What is meant here is in addition to the ordinary employment procedures and the health and safety measures just discussed. The welfare program extends beyond responsibility for the employee at work to interest in his welfare outside of working hours. Because of this, there is always the danger that the welfare program will degenerate into something that smacks of paternalism. Possibly the best protection against this is the democratic organization of service activities.

In view of this fact, most welfare activities can be most effectively performed through the medium of employee organizations or committees. In the Federal service, for example, many of the unions operate loan associations and credit unions, and sponsor picnics, outings, athletic programs, and the like. In other jurisdictions it has also been found desirable to work through employee organizations. Many instances might be cited where efforts along some of these lines have originated spontaneously on the initiative of the workers themselves.

But employee welfare cannot be left entirely to the initiative of the employees. The stimulation of one program or another then becomes the joint function of the personnel agency and the operating executives. The exact nature and management of any program will, of course, depend upon circumstances. In a small jurisdiction where most of the employees return home for lunch, it is unnecessary to sponsor a coöperative restaurant or cafeteria. In many jurisdictions, on the other hand, the employer can perform a real service by providing the impetus for such an institution. Moreover, the employee restaurant may fit into the general health program by providing facilities through which adequate and healthful diets may be secured at low cost.

The most comprehensive and varied program of the sort under discussion is to be found in the Federal service. Some years ago a survey classified the activities in twenty-two Federal establishments under the following head-

ings: direct aid, budget planning, health, discount or wholesale buying, notary, legal and insurance, recreation, orientation, education, and employee publications.[25] Recreation was the broadest category, comprising social, athletic, and other features, such as dancing, dramatics, music, bridge, and photography. This study is still substantially accurate. The Welfare Association of the Department of Agriculture has sponsored numerous activities, including a chorus, an orchestra, and a symphonic choir. Several other departments have employee associations which sponsor choral groups, hobby shows, picnics, boat rides, and the like.

From the point of view of organization and management, the association in the Department of Agriculture appears to have developed its program more systematically than have others. This association sponsors, and assists in, nearly every employee activity taking place in the department, although the inception of new activities goes back to individual groups. The association is financed from the profits derived from the Agriculture Cafeteria. Its administrative board is representative of all the various bureaus in the department.

Mention should be made of a kind of holding and operating company that was incorporated in Washington in 1930. It was first designated the Welfare and Recreational Association of Public Buildings and Grounds and was organized "to operate cafeterias and newsstands in Federal Buildings for Federal employees, to render first aid in case of sickness or accident, to assist government employees in cases of emergency or distress along recognized lines of welfare work, to conduct tourist camps, bathing pools, and to provide lunch and refreshment stands and recreational facilities for said employees and for the general public."[26] The charges for such services are supposed to be as low as possible, and whatever profits may be earned are to be used for increasing facilities and equipment. The name of this organization is now Government Services, Incorporated. It operates cafeterias in all but a few government buildings in Washington.

We now turn to individual developments that seem worthy of special mention.

A. GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE

Industrial management has long been concerned with the health of the workers, not alone while at the place of work and during the work period, but also in a general way and as an overall and long-run proposition. Most prepayment medical care plans are maintained either jointly by company and workers or by the latter alone. Policies for insurance against

[25] Margaret E. Barron, "Welfare Programs for Federal Employees," *Personnel Administration*, June, 1940, pp. 1–12.

[26] Articles of Incorporation and By-laws.

the incapacities arising out of sickness and nonoccupational accidents are written by regular insurance companies.

There has been a growing interest in public circles to provide benefits comparable to such prepayment plans. One reason for slow development has doubtless been the rather generous provisions for sick leave with pay. However, the incomes of public employees do not on the average permit of such outlays for medical and hospital service as are called for in case of severe illness. The only protection against the heavy costs incidental to sickness and accident is logically through the spreading of the risks over a large number of people, all of whom share in the costs. This is an application of the principle of wholesale insurance.

The idea of having government as employer contribute to employee health insurance costs is rapidly taking hold, particularly among municipalities. Both New York City and San Francisco have comprehensive programs for their employees, that for San Francisco being compulsory. New York City bears half the cost under its plan. At this writing the United States Congress is giving consideration to a voluntary group health insurance plan for Federal workers, with the government bearing part of the cost, a program which has been recommended by the Eisenhower administration. Heretofore, only a few Federal agencies had the necessary statutory discretion to work out contributory health insurance programs. An example is the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Low-cost group hospitalization and surgical insurance through the nationally known Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans has been widely encouraged by government establishments through the use of public facilities and employees to collect premiums and promote sales. A unique institution in Washington is the Group Health Association, a coöperative prepayment clinic for full family medical care, started in 1937 by Federal employees but now embracing other groups. Similar prepayment plans for medical services have developed in other cities largely through the initiation of public employees. A notable example is the Ross-Loos Clinic in Los Angeles. Seventy percent of the major American cities report that hospital and surgical insurance is available to their employees.[27] These community prepayment plans and insurance programs for the most part do not involve contribution to the cost by the jurisdiction itself. Government sponsorship extends primarily to facilitating the formation of employee groups to get the benefit of group rates from the coöperative or the insurance company providing the service. In an increasing number of municipalities, however, contributory plans are now in effect.

The availability of medical attention in the early stages of disease at low

[27] *Municipal Year Book, 1955*, p. 141. The 70 percent applies to all cities over 25,000 and to the 548 of the 835 cities between 10,000 and 25,000 that reported on this item.

cost to the subscribers goes far toward preventing serious trouble, lost time, and accompanying worry. It can be categorically stated that there is no phase of a welfare program that so merits the attention of both employer and employee as this. As has been shown, the leadership may stem from any of several sources. But leadership there must be, as well as intelligent management. There is no reason why public employers should not supply this leadership just as private employers have done for their workers. It is incumbent upon public authorities to promote health conservation both in their own immediate interest and in that of the country as a whole.

B. FEDERAL GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

Following the lead provided by many private firms, the Federal Government in 1954 established a voluntary group life insurance program for its civilian employees.[28] This program, operated through a pool of private insurance companies, provides participating Federal employees with low-cost insurance coverage in amounts based upon their annual salaries. Employees under sixty-five years of age pay 25 cents per $1000 of insurance every biweekly pay period; the government contributes an amount equal to one-half of the employee's payment. The system also provides double indemnity payment in case of accidental death and payment to employees for accidental loss of sight or limb. If an insured employee retires on an immediate annuity, his insurance is continued without further cost to him. When either employees or annuitants become sixty-five years of age, however, their insurance is reduced by 2 percent for each month until a reduction of 75 percent is reached. The remaining 25 percent continues in effect. Departure from the service carries with it the privilege of converting insurance to a standard commercial policy without physical examination. Approximately two million employees, roughly 95 percent of all those eligible, were included under this coverage.

So far as can be ascertained, contributory life insurance programs are rarer among public employers in this country than those for health insurance. A steady increase in life insurance plans, as well as health insurance systems, can be expected among American municipalities, with employee premiums paid in part or entirely by the city.[29]

C. CREDIT UNIONS

Another feature of a broad welfare program is the credit union. To the low-salaried employee the problem of low-cost small loans is a very real one. Financial crises frequently arise in which it is necessary to make small borrowings, and if the employee is to be protected from the loan shark,

[28] P.L. 598, 83rd Cong., Chapter 752, 2nd sess., approved August 17, 1954.

[29] Edmond F. Ricketts, "Trends and Forecasts in Personnel," *Public Management*, January, 1955, p. 9.

a credit union of some sort is called for. The provision of this service can be justified not only on broad social grounds but equally from the standpoint of its effect upon morale. Financial worry is an important depressant and, if severe or long continued, may seriously affect efficiency. From several standpoints, then, the organization of credit unions among employee groups should be stimulated.

The credit union movement in the United States has had a steady growth since the first state (Massachusetts) passed a law providing for establishment of credit unions in 1909. Forty-one other states followed suit, and in 1934 the Federal Credit Union Act was adopted, giving considerable impetus to the movement. In 1955 there were over 15,000 credit unions in the country, of which 7677 were organized under the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a membership over 7,000,000. Of the charters issued to groups of public employees, 745 have been issued to Federal groups, 312 to local, 110 to state, and 358 to teacher groups.[30]

The credit union is basically a coöperative enterprise, the capital being supplied by the members, who buy one or more shares usually at $5. Loans are made only to subscribers at a rate not exceeding 1 percent per month, and dividends paid to shareholders do not exceed 6 percent a year. The rapid spread of the credit union movement bears witness to its economic advantages.

V. COÖPERATIVE POSSIBILITIES

There is scarcely any limit to the possible development of coöperative activities among employees, and new services can be added constantly under the guidance of alert administrators. The advantages of coöperative buying, housing, and the like have scarcely been tapped in this country, although such activities are common throughout Europe, and particularly in the civil services. It needs to be recognized as a basic principle that anything which improves the way of life of the staff may also improve morale and efficiency, if properly handled. The scope for group action by civil servants is broad, requiring in most instances only guidance from the personnel agency.

Personnel administrators in private industry discovered some time ago not only that organized social and recreational activities were valuable from the standpoint of employee health and welfare but also that they contributed greatly to the development of group solidarity. The latter advantage is especially likely to develop out of a social and recreational program in the public service, where there is usually a more stable personnel than in industry. Moreover, a rather extensive program can be operated at little or no cost and with already existing facilities. In spite

[30] Data supplied by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, as of June 30, 1955.

of the obvious character of this method of building morale, there are limited general programs in American public jurisdictions. Here, again, what is most needed is stimulation, guidance, and encouragement, both by the personnel agency and by operating executives.

SUMMARY

A survey of physical working conditions, safety, and health and welfare activities in a number of the larger and more progressive public jurisdictions in the United States reveals encouraging signs of official interest in these matters. Hundreds of the more progressive private business concerns, however, have devoted far more attention to the problems involved than has the most progressive governmental unit. This fact is particularly striking in view of the social character of governmental enterprise.

The slowness in providing a satisfactory working environment is further aggravated by the general failure to develop adequate health or safety programs. This situation must be charged to insufficient appropriations, inadequate legislation, and various other factors. But such conditions do not excuse personnel administrators themselves from attempting to assume the initiative in seeking to overcome them.

An encouraging sign is the growing adoption of group life and health insurance programs for civil servants by public jurisdictions. The day is not far off when private and public employees will be indistinguishable so far as their enjoyment of health and welfare programs is concerned.

16

Hours and Leaves

This chapter has to do with the factor of time, beginning with the hours per day and per week and rest periods, turning then to various policies governing leave privileges, and concluding with the problems associated with tardiness and absenteeism.

Years ago, these phases of personnel management were subject to the control of operating officials, with the inevitable result that practices varied more or less widely among the several units within a given jurisdiction. Recent times have seen a growing tendency to give the central personnel agency or the departmental personnel office responsibility for supervision of these matters, in the interest of uniform standards and fair administration. As might be expected, recognition of personnel administration as a function of management has directed attention to the problems of hours and leaves. The Rhode Island law was one of the early examples of this tendency. Here the personnel director is authorized to administer "the rules providing for the hours and conditions of service, for the length and periods of vacations and holidays, and for the regulation of sick or other leaves."[1] Many civil service laws now include provisions regarding these matters. Table 8 summarizes the current provisions in twenty states.

If legal provisions are to mean anything, provision must be made for reporting hours worked and absences to a central point for analysis and checkup on abuses and irregularities. Control of this type is surely called for if like treatment is to be accorded all employees, if abuses and privileges are to be avoided, and if norms are to be established and maintained through analysis of deviations and adoption of remedial measures suggested by such analysis.

I. WORKING HOURS

In the public services generally the hours of labor today compare favorably with those in private industry. Although during World War II a

[1] *Rhode Island Public Laws, 1939*, Chap. 661, sec. 17(3).

forty-eight-hour week was standard in the Federal Government and in many states, counties, and cities, since the end of the war there has been a general reduction to a week of about forty hours. A "basic administrative workweek" of forty hours, to be worked in not more than six of seven consecutive days, is prescribed by law for most Federal employees.[2] Heads of agencies, in establishing work weeks as required by this law, have set a five-day week for most Federal employees. Work hours range from thirty-five to forty-four among state governments, the most common being forty. This also seems to be the tendency in city governments.

TABLE 8. Standardization of Attendance and Absence Requirements by State Statutes, 1955[a]

State	Statutory Authorization	State	Statutory Authorization
California	LM	Missouri	LM
Colorado	G	Nevada	G
Connecticut	LM	New Hampshire	G
Illinois	G	New York	LM
Kansas	G	Ohio	L
Louisiana	LP	Oregon	LM
Maine	G	Pennsylvania	LM
Maryland	L	Tennessee	LM
Michigan	G	Vermont	LM
Minnesota	G	Wisconsin	LM

L—Prescribed in law.
LM—Mandatory duty imposed on civil service agency in law.
LP—Permissive power to personnel agency in law.
G—No specific provision on attendance and absence in law; civil service commission has general rule-making powers and duties in law.

[a] The state laws cited have been checked for any changes up to 1955.

There is a lack of factual studies of the effect of different lengths of workdays and work weeks on efficiency in nonindustrial types of work, or in many types of public service that lend themselves less well to regular tours of duty because they must be rendered round the clock, such as police and fire protection, hospital care, detention and custody of prisoners, and customs and quarantine inspection. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in reporting seventy-eight case studies of effects of changing hours during and after the war, for 3505 industrial workers, concluded: "Generally speaking, the study indicates that, everything else being equal, the 8-hour day and 40-hour week are best in terms of efficiency and absenteeism, and that higher levels of hours are less satisfactory."[3] The need, however, for studies of particular situations is emphasized by the diversity of findings

[2] Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, P.L. 390, 79th Cong., sec. 604(a), 5 *U.S. Code* 944. See also *Municipal Year Book, 1955*, for hours of city employees.

[3] Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, *Hours of Work and Output*, Bulletin No. 917 (Washington: 1947), p. 1.

in the thirty-four different plants surveyed. The Bureau of Labor Statistics cautioned: "There is no such thing as an optimum workweek. Workers perform differently under the same hours because of a variety of factors: the incentive to produce; the physical demands which the job makes upon them; the degree to which they control the work pace; the conditions under which they work; whether they work on day, evening, or night shift; whether or not, and how frequently, shifts are rotated; and—less tangibly —whether their relations with management are cordial or otherwise."

Another factor that affects the will to work any given number of hours in a week arises from workers' expectations. As the social product has increased, workers' expectations of sharing its gains have heightened not only with respect to material goods but also with respect to leisure. The public employee, no less than the employee of private industry, expects his job to leave him time and energy to enjoy his family, participate in the life of his community, and, as a citizen, keep himself informed on civic and national issues. This may lead to advocacy of still shorter work weeks. That there is an optimum limit on such reduction goes without question. The determination of this will probably be based on investigations of private employment, since measurement of output under scientifically controlled conditions is still uncommon in the public service.

A. OVERTIME WORK

Although the normal working week for public employees is about forty hours, or at most forty-eight hours, overtime is occasionally required. Most governmental units, including the Federal service, provide for premium pay for overtime hours, which establishes uniformity and serves to check excessive demands by the employer on the employee's energies. Where, as is still the case in some jurisdictions, there is no legal authority for overtime payment or compensatory time off, there is a danger that actual employment conditions will vary considerably from one work unit to another, and that the principle of equal pay for equal work will therefore be violated. A further danger is fatigue, to which too little consideration is given in the public services. Fatigue may, of course, accompany various types of work involving strenuous effort, monotony, or close attention, quite apart from the matter of overtime.

Although careful planning and organization of work can reduce the amount of overtime, it can ordinarily not be eliminated entirely from the public service. It should, however, be carefully controlled so that it will be restricted to occasional instances of a strictly emergency character. Such control may require the reporting of all overtime to a central point so that situations involving chronic overtime can be diagnosed and remedial measures devised.

B. REST PERIODS

A rest period is a "cessation of work for a definite length of time within the working period" and is designed to "increase production by reducing temporary fatigue and preventing the onset of cumulative or pathological fatigue."[4] In private employment, a large number of investigations have been made of the effect of rest pauses upon production, physiological states, health, and so forth, for various occupational groups.

Although the evidence secured from these investigations has been somewhat conflicting, the weight of it favors rest periods, particularly when the work is of a monotonous character or requires considerable concentration, for three primary reasons: (1) because the investigations have shown that workers will take "unauthorized" rest periods if no regular ones are provided; (2) because the institution of such periods ordinarily appears to result in increased production and greatly improved morale; (3) because the probability of absenteeism is decreased by a reduction of fatigue. At least the evidence has been sufficiently conclusive so that there is widespread acceptance of the rest period in the larger industrial establishments in the United States.

We have suggested at other points in this book that public agencies have lagged far behind private industry in the matter of personnel research and the application of its results. One reason for the lag, so far as experimentation with rest periods is concerned, is the lack of clear legislative authority to include rest periods in the workday without a corresponding extension of working hours, and fear of lack of public understanding. Rest periods are, nevertheless, fairly common in governmental agencies. In view of their wide acceptance in private enterprise, legislators are less likely now to seek to make political capital out of public employees' visits to refreshment stands. The case for rest periods was well stated in 1948 by the former Federal Personnel Council: "In considering the value of rest pauses to Government, their importance can hardly be exaggerated. The loyalty, responsibility, and readiness of Government workers to respond coöperatively to unusual or rush demands are essential to effective public service. Anything which contributes to worker enthusiasm without decreasing production is an asset both to administrators and to the service as a whole. . . . For heavy, light heavy, monotonous, repetitive, or other operations, pauses should be adjusted to assure physical recovery before fatigue threatens to reduce production or increase error and spoilage of materials."[5]

[4] J. D. Hackett, *Health Maintenance in Industry* (New York: 1925), pp. 395 f.

[5] Unpublished report, "Rest Periods as an Aid to Production," (Federal Personnel Council: 1948).

II. ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

A. ANNUAL LEAVE

Annual vacations have been accepted as desirable in both public and private circles, not only from the standpoint of increasing efficiency by allowing for physical and mental recuperation, but for social reasons as well. Two weeks' vacation with pay, formerly standard practice in large office organizations, banks, insurance companies, publishing houses, and similar establishments, has become increasingly common among both salaried and wage-earning employees of industrial concerns. Successive reports of the National Industrial Conference Board show this trend.[6]

In the public services a common provision has been one day of annual leave with pay for each month of service during the year, although this is practically a minimum for all but the most backward jurisdictions. At least twenty-four states not only exceed this minimum but provide fifteen or more days' vacation leave. A similar trend is found among municipalities. Connecticut, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, and Virginia have sliding-scale leave allowances, increasing for length of service. A few states provide as high as four weeks' leave, at least for long-service employees. Most of the laws making these provisions or authorizing the civil service commission to do so were enacted after 1939. Before that time, the major decision in many states rested with department heads, as it still does in jurisdictions where uniform provisions are not made by law or regulations. Obviously, these officials should determine the times at which leaves may be taken, but the amount should be uniform and the leave awarded as a matter of right.

In the Federal service, before 1936, annual leave of thirty days, exclusive of Sundays and holidays, was permissive, going back to a statute of March 15, 1898. From 1932 to 1936 this period was curtailed through executive orders. A new statute was passed in 1936 which gave permanent employees the right to twenty-six days' annual leave, exclusive of nonworkdays, and temporary employees the right to leave at the rate of two and a half days per month. Unused leave could accumulate up to sixty days. (During World War II accumulation was permitted up to ninety days.) The current leave law,[7] covering both postal and general civil service employees, provides that the amount of annual leave earned shall be based on length of service. Employees with less than three years of service earn thirteen days, those with three but less than fifteen years of service earn twenty days, and those with fifteen or more years of service earn twenty-six days of leave

[6] Studies in Personnel Policy (New York): No. 21, *Trends in Company Vacation Policy* (1940); No. 34, *Vacation Policy and the National Defense* (1941); No. 56, *Wartime Influences on Vacation Policies* (1943); No. 75, *Vacation and Holiday Practices* (1946).

[7] The Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, P.L. 233, 82nd Cong. 65 *Stat.* 679, effective January 6, 1952, as amended by P.L. 102, 83rd Cong., of July 2, 1953.

each year.[8] Employees are not entitled to take leave until after ninety days of current unbroken service. Not more than thirty days of leave may be accumulated for use in succeeding years, except that those employees who had accumulated more than thirty days of leave prior to January, 1953, may continue to carry forward the amount accumulated as of that date.

The leave provisions of the Federal Government are among the most generous in the country. However, it should be noted that Federal regulations provide that all absences from the office, except for sickness, treatment by doctor or dentist, and certain other specified purposes such as jury duty and military training, shall be charged to annual leave. So absences often excused in private employment—those caused by death in the family, attendance on the sick, and necessary personal business such as cashing a check or making a purchase—are all charged to annual leave. So also are brief periods at the beginning or end of the day, ordinarily considered in private employment as "tardiness" or "out early."

It goes without saying that if vacation leave is to serve its purpose supervisory officials must plan their work to permit employees to take it when needed. Control must be exercised so that too many are not away at the same time, but within the bounds of reason this can be done with a minimum of inconvenience to individual employees. Some employees need positive encouragement to take leave. The typical Federal agency asks its supervisors to insist that employees take a minimum vacation period each year (usually two weeks or more) for rest and recreation, recognizing that such a policy is to the long-range advantage of both the worker and the employer. Fairly uniform practices have been fostered through collaboration among Federal personnel directors. This is a frequent pattern of operation in the Federal service, and is a more practical method than central control for large jurisdictions to obtain uniformity in granting of leave. In smaller jurisdictions it may prove feasible to require the approval of the personnel agency for withholding annual leave; but, in any event, control over scheduling vacations within the year should be a responsibility of operating officials, since it is an important aspect of production management.

A liberal policy is dictated not only by humane and social considerations but even more forcefully by considerations of the good of the service. It is a bulwark against stagnation and dissatisfaction, and also, during the leave of superiors, affords an opportunity for putting subordinate officers in more responsible positions on temporary assignments, as part of their development for advancement.

[8] Annual leave for regular employees is actually computed on the basis of biweekly pay periods. For the employee not paid biweekly, the leave accrues on the same basis as it would if he were paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods.

B. SICK LEAVE

Since ill health is among the normal expectancies of adult life,[9] definite provisions for sick leave are essential to intelligent employment management. Failure to provide for such leave-with-pay results in many jurisdictions in motivating employees who are "under the weather" to report for work, thereby endangering their health and possibly, through contagion, that of their fellow workers. Employees coming to work while ill constitute a greater problem than abuse of sick leave.[10] This fact has been recognized by progressive agencies in both public and private fields.

Until about 1938, in most jurisdictions, sick leave was a matter of determination by each separate agency, as it still is where sick leave has not been standardized. This may result in extremely inequitable and unsatisfactory employment conditions. Since that time most states and cities have adopted uniform sick leave plans. Twelve to fifteen days a year are the usual allowances provided in the states; when not used, sick leave may be accumulated against future exigencies usually up to ninety days, although a few provide sixty and some as high as 150.

Between 1936 and 1951 the Federal Government granted all employees except postal workers sick leave at the rate of fifteen days per year, cumulative up to ninety days. Under the current law previously cited, postal and other employees are all allowed thirteen days a year with no limit on accumulation.

That there is danger of abuse unless sick leave provisions are carefully and conscientiously supervised cannot be doubted. Employees who are generally well selected, well motivated, and well disciplined are not likely, however, to claim sick leave for unauthorized absences when they are not ill. As in other matters of personal integrity, a great deal depends upon the moral climate of the agency and the character of the supervision. For one thing, employees can be made to appreciate that sick leave is a form of insurance to be safeguarded when really needed, not a free-time privilege to be exploited to the hilt. As a matter of fact, no formal studies brought to this author's attention have shown that public employees do abuse sick leave to any appreciable extent.[11] There will always be a few who try it, but these can usually be dealt with individually.

[9] A survey of absences in 246 manufacturing plants during 1947 showed an average loss of 6.5 days per worker (5.6 days per male worker and 8.8 days per female worker) for sickness or nonindustrial accident; see *Monthly Labor Review*, September, 1948, p. 238.

[10] This view was supported years ago by Lewis Meriam in *Public Personnel Problems from the Standpoint of the Operating Officer* (Washington: 1938), p. 167.

[11] For example, a study by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in 1948 showed that 26.4 percent of employees then subject to the Federal leave laws actually took no sick leave during the period studied (first nine months of 1947), and that the average sick leave for all employees during this period was only 5.9 days. These figures compare very favorably with industrial experience and certainly scotch any notion that there is widespread abuse of sick

To summarize, great progress has been made toward standardizing conditions of work in the public service as far as annual leave and sick leave are concerned. Leave policies in the public service in general compare favorably with those in private industry but require safeguarding through careful supervision.

III. ATTENDANCE

The problem of employee attendance, which has received extensive treatment at the hands of the advocates of scientific management, arises from the highly developed use of machinery and the division of labor. The whole process of production has become a coöperative venture. Economic losses from tardiness and absenteeism do not end with the lost time of individuals who are tardy or absent but are increased many times by the more or less extensive repercussions on the work of others, involving delays in work processes, idle machines, and possibly lowered morale. As an organization is elaborated, such losses become ever more extensive.

Although the extreme regimentation of line production has not affected the public services to such an extent as private industry, these developments have not been without effect in this sphere. Any person examining a modern classification plan cannot but be impressed by the minuteness of the division of labor in the government services. With the increase in specialization, teamwork becomes an increasingly important characteristic of efficient management. Teamwork requires good attendance.

There are few available data on the extent of tardiness or absenteeism in the public services, perhaps because the seriousness of the problem has not been generally recognized and the matter has been left to individual departments or establishments. This has led to a variety of practices in certain units and to a chronic laxity in others. In the private sphere, considerable attention has been devoted to the extent of tardiness and absenteeism, as well as to means of decreasing poor attendance. There is no reason to believe that such problems are absent in the public service.

Although the causes of irregular attendance are as varied as the ills and frailties to which man is heir, some of the more significant ones may be recognized. These can be grouped conveniently into three classes: (1) conditions arising out of the personal life of the employee, (2) general conditions external to the service, and (3) conditions within the service itself.

---

leave. See also a briefer analysis showing a "generally good record of leave administration" in *Leave Administration in the Departments and Agencies*, Report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House Report No. 1744, 84th Congress, 2nd Session (1956).

Under the current leave law many thousands of employees use so little sick leave that they belong to what is known as the "Thousand-Hour Club"—an informal term covering those who have the equivalent of 125 days of unused sick leave to their credit.

For further discussion see Raymond Krah, *Administrative Control of Sick Leave*, Civil Service Assembly Personnel Report No. 544 (Chicago: 1955).

From the standpoint of reduction and control, each group requires separate treatment.

Among the factors in the personal life of the employee which bear most directly upon attendance are sickness and disability, family complications, worry, fatigue, and the pressure of personal business. Some of these may originate in the work life of the employee, while others are entirely due to personal situations. Some are avoidable through enlightened personnel procedure; some are not.

Among the general conditions external to the service which influence the regularity of attendance may be listed inadequate transportation facilities and unsatisfactory housing conditions. Another factor of no little significance is the prevailing attitude toward the public service. If the public assumes and expects inefficiency, if it regards public employment as a sinecure rather than as an opportunity for service, if, as in many jurisdictions, the prestige of the public service is low, then the problem of securing regular attendance is aggravated. Such attitudes undermine morale in a subtle and pernicious way, but an enlightened personnel program will go far toward retarding and counteracting them.

Many conditions within the service itself may contribute to attendance irregularities. Only by careful study of particular situations can the personnel administrator determine which factors are of significance. Thus, tardiness and absenteeism may arise out of the relations between the employee and an influential politician. Such backing may make him feel free to let his convenience dictate his working hours and to ignore the departmental rules and regulations. Then again, the relations between supervisor and employee may be so unsatisfactory that the latter is quite lacking in a sense of loyalty toward his job and on this account becomes a poor "timekeeper." Failure to appreciate the coöperative character of the enterprise or the absence of a feeling of personal identification with it, both caused by the neglect of proper induction, training, and the like, may be an important contributing factor. Unsatisfactory working conditions, such as inadequate or inequitable compensation schemes, excessive hours, monotony, and poor ventilation are almost certain to give rise to poor attendance records. Indeed, the solution to the attendance problem is more likely than not to be found in the conditions of service. Although in a broad sense this entire book may be said to deal with service conditions, certain of these, such as hour and leave policies, are so intimately connected with attendance as to warrant primary consideration in this connection.

The problem of controlling attendance in the interest of good timekeeping has three general aspects: (1) the formulation and publicizing of rules and regulations governing attendance, (2) the installation of records and the measurement and evaluation of attendance irregularities as a basis for further control, (3) the adoption and administration of a program aiming

at reduction of poor attendance. Attention to each of these aspects is essential to control. The third concerns assistance to operating officials in providing a physical and psychological setting in which employees' zest for the work of the organization is fostered and causes of absence are reduced. The factors that are significant for an employee's morale—his attitudes toward the specific features of his job, toward management, toward his immediate supervisors, toward his fellow employees, and toward outside influences, discussed in all of Part IV of this book, "Motivation and Productivity"—also militate for or against tardiness and absenteeism. If the conditions that determine these attitudes build a feeling that each employee is an important part of the organization and that his work contributes significantly to the goals of the organization, problems of absenteeism and tardiness tend to disappear. Where there are excessive absenteeism and tardiness, a frontal attack on these specific evidences of low morale may be less effective than a broad program for improvement in the selection and training of supervisors, increased participation of employees in work improvement, the development of employee counseling and group activities, and the prompt adjustment of grievances.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, the point should be emphasized that in general the hours of work and provisions for leave in the public service compare favorably with those in private employment. Whether the public service benefits in increased morale and production from those favorable conditions, however, depends to a great extent on whether other conditions contribute to worker enthusiasm. This conclusion does not imply that hours of work or provisions for leave are unimportant. Certainly employees should have adequate vacations for rest and recreation and generous provisions for bona-fide cases of illness, and the policies with respect to vacation and sick leave should be reasonably uniform within a particular jurisdiction. Major safeguards against abuse of these privileges and against excessive absence and tardiness are discussed throughout Part IV, "Motivation and Productivity."

PART V

Conduct

Constitute government how you please, infinitely the greater part of it must depend upon the exercise of the powers which are left at large to the prudence and uprightness of ministers of state.

—Edmund Burke, "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents," 1770. *The Works of Edmund Burke*, Vol. I (George Bell & Sons, London, 1902), p. 332

There is no kind of dishonesty into which otherwise good people more easily and frequently fall than that of defrauding the government.

—Benjamin Franklin

17

Public Service Ethics in a Democracy

Those holding public office, as servants of the public, are not owners of authority but agents of public purpose.[1]

The theme of this chapter is well summarized in the above quotation. As "agents of public purpose," government employees are not only bound to loyal and efficient performance but obligated to carry out a *public* objective—which in its true sense can mean only such purposes as are democratically arrived at. Those persons who look upon public employment as an opportunity for self-aggrandizement and for exercise of authority to favor themselves or their friends obstruct this interest of the commonweal and exemplify the contrary concept of "owners of authority." The most pervasive aspect of the ethical environment of government employment is the need to observe the inherent democratic foundation for all governmental action.[2]

In comparing the ethical problems of government employees and of those in private enterprise, writers commonly refer to the public service as if it were an occupation—on a par, for example, with law, medicine, business management, engineering, or teaching. As a matter of fact, of course, it is a composite of *all* occupations, not one for which a separate discipline, a distinctive technical preparation, and a special code of conduct exist. It is a composite of occupations many of which themselves embrace definite ethical standards, in whatever context they may operate. Practically every occupation known to man is represented in the American public service.

Within public employment the group on which the greatest attention centers as to moral behavior is that comprising the professions, the man-

[1] From Section 13 of a proposed Code of Ethics for officials and employees of Arlington County, Virginia, as published in *Public Administration Review*, Spring, 1953, p. 120.

[2] This chapter draws heavily on the author's paper "Democracy and Public Employee Morality," in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, January, 1955, pp. 90–97, for the use of which permission has been granted by the Academy.

agerial specialties, and the executive class in general—occupations in which some degree of judgment or discretion is exercised in the execution of public policy. For many routine occupations it would be difficult to distinguish between the standards to be expected of those engaged in private employment and of those working in government. The same obligations of care and integrity prevail for clerical, skilled, and technical personnel in the public service as exist for these groups in the business world. The bookkeeper is under the same moral compulsions in one place as in the other. The laboratory technician's processing of blood samples in a hospital must be viewed in the same ethical light regardless of whether the institution is publicly or privately owned. But when we think of the bureau chief, the sanitary engineer, the tax assessor, the park ranger, the police officer, the personnel examiner, the public-school teacher, we see immediately categories of workers on whom special ethical obligations rest that have little counterpart in private enterprise. For it is in the hands of such persons that discretion lies in the application of publicly (democratically) adopted laws and rules—however minor they may be—which constitute governance. Thus, while this is not the place for a disquisition on morality in general, it is worth while to give some attention to the special characteristics of it in the public service.[3]

I. THE PLACE OF PUBLIC SERVICE IN COMMUNITY ETHICS

Any fair-minded student of the subject will concede that, by and large, the public expects higher standards of conduct from its public servants than it does from its members engaged in private enterprise. The very surprise and indignation occasioned by the 1950–1951 internal revenue scandals is evidence in point. "We are shocked," says Herbert Emmerich, "not because we have a low regard for public officials, but because we expect them to have so high a standard of integrity."[4] The same point is stressed by Senator Paul H. Douglas in his book *Ethics in Government*,[5] as well as by many other observers.

We must learn to see the actual behavior of government employees in perspective. The Senate subcommittee which reported in 1951 on ethical standards pointed out: "The moral standards of the country, indeed, pro-

[3] For a number of thoughtful discussions see the various papers, particularly those by Kefauver, Clark, McCardle, and Douglas, in "Ethical Standards in American Public Life," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March, 1952. Also, for a penetrating treatise of great insight, see Wayne A. R. Leys, *Ethics for Policy Decisions* (New York: 1952). This book offers the best perspective of ethics in public office that has been written; it is founded on the thinking of the great philosophers but also includes many practical modern "cases." Highly useful thinking and factual information are also found in the several books, reports, and articles referred to throughout this chapter.

[4] "A Scandal in Utopia," *Public Administration Review*, Winter, 1952, p. 3.

[5] (Cambridge: 1952), especially pp. 22–26.

vide the ethical environment which in turn conditions the standards of behavior of public officials."[6]

This subcommittee went on to observe:

> We also believe that the ethical standards of public officials are probably higher than those prevailing in business and other walks of life. On this point, also, there was persuasive testimony from men of experience in both Government and business and from observers of both. Public officials apparently are more conscious of the problem of moral standards. The resentment which public officials sometimes show when subjected to public criticism may be explained in part by their awareness of the fact that some of their critics would be even more vulnerable to criticism if the same standards were applied.[7]

There is a kind of public schizophrenia that pervades this subject. On the one hand articulate citizens demand extraordinarily high moral standards of public servants, and on the other they seek special action from officials favoring themselves against the larger public interest.[8] George A. Graham, who served as staff director of the second Hoover Commission Task Force on Personnel, has pointed up the necessity for all branches of society to bear the responsibility for ethical conduct in public affairs:

> The business executive who thinks only in terms of his corporation, the labor leader who thinks only in terms of his union, the leader of organized agriculture who thinks only in terms of his farm organization are all a menace to the basic integrity of the nation. . . . In a free society the responsibilities of the statesman fall on everyone, and upon each person in accordance with his power and ability.[9]

The ultimate standard of conduct for the public servant, therefore, is the public interest as opposed to group or private interests. And so must be the standard for our society as a whole.

Whenever doctors look upon their own prosperity as synonymous with the status of the public health, whenever associations of manufacturers oppose legislation for the general welfare, whenever labor leaders mistake the interests of their union structures for the interests of all citizens, whenever veterans' organizations exploit patriotism for class legislation, when-

[6] U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Ethical Standards, *Ethical Standards in Government*, Report, 82nd Cong., 1st sess., 1951, p. 1.

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 11–12. See also the thought-provoking discussion by Walter Lippman in his *The Public Philosophy* (Boston: 1955).

[8] Former governor of Nebraska Val Peterson, now Federal Civil Defense Administrator, stressed this point in an address in Washington. See "The Public's Split Personality," *Personnel Administration*, May, 1954, pp. 1–5, 11.

[9] *Morality in American Politics* (New York: 1952), p. 305. Senator Estes Kefauver has also observed: "Until the citizen's own moral code prevents him from debasing himself by procuring corruption of public servants, the problem of corruption and morality in public life will remain very real and earnest."—*Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March, 1952, p. 7.

ever voters view their Congressmen merely as tools to get favors and specia consideration, we fall short of our goal of the highest possible public ethics What we need are more and more people who are dedicated to the publi interest itself—rather than to special economic or social or sectiona interests.

We already have the largest representation of this kind of dedication *i the public service.* Except for the "stepping stone" artists and the clerica and laboring levels where public employment may represent just a "job," most people are attracted to the public service because of their zeal fo identification with a larger good than some narrow group interest. It is fo this reason, as well as the demands of office itself, that we find the highes moral standards in public employment. Corruption is actually rare amon career civil servants. This is not to condemn inferentially those politica appointees who spend a transitory period in the public service. But th proportion among them—regardless of party—who are really imbued wit the public interest is often less than that among the career people.

II. DEMOCRATIC CHARACTER OF PUBLIC SERVICE IDEALS

If the ultimate standard, the basic ethic, for the government employe is pursuance of the *public interest,* then the meaning of democracy—au thority derived from consent of the governed—is implicit in our considera tion of the subject. For the sake of convenience, this democratic base fo the moral standards of civil servants may be analyzed first in its externa aspects, vis-à-vis the public, and then in its internal, administrative aspects.

A. EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

Public administration in a democracy must serve the public in a manne that strengthens the processes and integrity of democratic society. One o the tests of a public servant is his earnestness in recognizing, as Gordon R Clapp has phrased it, "the utmost importance" of letting "the peopl decide for themselves what policies and objectives the public service shal have."[10]

The responsibilities of employees to the public, to the law, and to thei current executive leaders are tied together by the common bond of demo cratic consent. Paul H. Appleby has observed: "In nearly all administrativ decisions the sense of virtuous performance is to be pursued by attempting to inject some increased allowance for the more public interest and some increased concern for those citizens not immediately present or heard."[11]

It is at this point that potential conflict looms between the credo of the professional specialist and the democratic exigencies surrounding the servant of the public. As Appleby admonishes: "In this pursuit there must

[10] "A Credo for the Public Servant," *Public Personnel Review,* January, 1951, p. 14.
[11] *Morality and Administration in Democratic Government* (Baton Rouge: 1952), p. 176.

be care not to confuse one's professional viewpoint, functional preoccupation, or personal prejudices with the public interest."[12] Indeed, the reconciliation of our continuing dependence upon experts in government with the realities of democratic needs and behavior is a central problem of statesmanship and, therefore, at the heart of the civil servant's moral climate.

No one has warned against the limitations of the specialist more eloquently than Harold J. Laski over a quarter of a century ago. A political system which fails to keep the expert under control, he says, "will lack insight into the movement and temper of the public mind. It will push its private nostrums in disregard of public wants. . . . It will mistake its technical results for social wisdom, and it will fail to see the limits within which its measures are capable of effective application. For the expert, by definition, lacks contact with the plain man."[13]

In further definition, Laski states:

> The expert, in fact, simply by reason of his immersion in a routine, tends to lack flexibility of mind once he approaches the margins of his special subject. . . .[14]
>
> *Expertise*, it may be argued, sacrifices the insight of common sense to intensity of experience. It breeds an inability to accept new views from the very depth of its preoccupation with its own conclusions. It too often fails to see round its subject.[15]

The public servant who does not see round his subject may, however unwittingly, violate the moral law of sensitivity to the public will. Specialization, in the operating programs of government and in pressure groups on the outside, is probably more often the source of unethical behavior in relation to the maintenance of the integrity of democratic institutions than is outright corruption.

Government must be thoroughly grounded on a healthy respect for and intelligent understanding of the democratic environment. As one commentator puts it: "We are forced to the conclusion that in the last analysis much of our success in the quest for a responsible bureaucracy will depend upon our ability to foster among the citizenry as a whole, and therefore among the bureaucracy, a respect and devotion to representative institutions."[16] Herein lies the basic democratic character of the ethical standards found or sought in the external relations of the public employee.

B. INTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

A cardinal tenet of our democratic faith is respect for human personality, for individual dignity and worth. Not only does this foundation undergird

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] "The Limitations of the Expert," *Harpers' Magazine*, December 1930, p. 106.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

[16] David M. Levitan, "Administrative Responsibility," *Political Science Quarterly* (Academy of Political Science, Columbia University), December, 1946, p. 598.

our political system and our civil liberties as a whole; it is also a basic assumption upon which administration must rest.

The success—and therefore the moral behavior—of an administrative undertaking depends ultimately upon the capacity, the integrity, and the motivation of people. Social science research is rapidly confirming our instinctive belief that favorable human relations in an organization are promoted by a democratic environment with high employee participation. Furthermore, we find that the existence of good human relations is not an isolated feature of management but is a quality and attitude woven throughout the entire fabric of administration.

Here we approach common ethical ground with the management of private enterprise. But there is a peculiar necessity for the democratic spirit of administration in the public service, because it is difficult to motivate employees to achieve the high consciousness of their democratic role vis-à-vis the public if there is little democratic practice and recognition of the dignity of man in internal administration.

Hurst R. Anderson has put the ethical necessities in their broadest sense by stating that administrators must commit themselves to "a philosophy of personal and group living which allows everyone to live, work, and contribute to the general good."[17] This permissive philosophy, tempered by necessary coördination and control of the specialist, is essentially the democratic spirit in administration—the spirit of respect for subordinates, colleagues, and chiefs that makes for mutual dependence and trust, maximum productivity, and minimum friction. No code of ethics can be effective unless it is exemplified in the acts of top management. It can set no higher standard than that followed by "those who by their action are able to affect in significant ways the careers of their associates and subordinates."[18]

The positive nature of a democratic administrative environment is well stated by Gordon R. Clapp:

> . . . We will get the most out of the talents we have in the service if we build on the strengths of individuals instead of emphasizing their weaknesses. The systems of administration we organize in our agencies, the methods of selection, the techniques of placement, the ideas of appraisal, the delegations of authority, the teamwork arrangements, all these must rest on the assumption that public employees will do their job well. Watchdog systems that assume weaknesses and try to forestall them will never get top-notch performance from employees.[19]

Conduct in the service is determined by a great many factors other than the formal requirements surrounding the performance of duties. Indeed, the

[17] "Ethical Values in Administration," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1954, p. 8. This article, based on an address by President Anderson, of The American University, is a brilliant statement of special value to the public administrator.

[18] Phillip Monypenny, "A Code of Ethics as a Means of Controlling Administrative Conduct," *Public Administration Review*, Summer, 1953, p. 187.

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 15.

type of punitive action which is usually associated with the term "discipline" is the least important and the least used means of obtaining the desired behavior on the job in well-run establishments, whether governmental or private. It is true that in all large-scale organizations attention must be given to conformity and appropriate subordination. Even in the army, however, where disciplined conduct is vital, it has long been a cardinal doctrine that the object is to achieve not merely obedience but "cheerful and willing obedience." In private business the "straw boss" and the office tyrant, who were often idols for small-minded and unresourceful bureaucratic supervisors, are steadily disappearing. In place of the old praise of toughness we find more and more frequently such statements as this: "The highest type of control is that which originates within the individual worker. It is a reflection of a healthy state of mind and body. It develops from a man's belief in the personal integrity, in the fairness, and in the understanding of his superiors. Self-discipline in the employee group is the goal of enlightened leadership."[20]

Thus, again, we see that the framework for moral standards of the public employee has a democratic base and that the maintenance of this basis for internal management is more critical in the public service than in any other environment.

One writer argues, however, that administrators also need a strengthening of investigative facilities to ferret out the cruder forms of unethical behavior.[21] This approach is serviceable as far as it goes, but it overlooks the subtleties of conduct which mark the more elusive aspects of administrative ethics—all of which leads to our next point.

III. SOME PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR

Ethical problems in the public service are considerably more complex than is implied by a simple analysis of corruption or bribery. For example, some of the more perplexing problems of ethics in the area of administrative responsibility are suggested by these questions: How far can individual initiative be permitted and fostered within the hierarchy and still leave a proper role for "institutional (or collective) responsibility"? Where does "zeal for the right" end and insubordination begin? When does loyalty to a profession become disloyalty to the hierarchy?

Such questions clearly occur when the individual employee finds himself in disagreement with a supervisor. If an issue as to the morality of a prospective action is involved, they are simply facets of a larger question that the employee must put to himself: Is it my judgment or my superior's

[20] Frances Spodick, *Constructive Discipline in Industry*, American Management Association, Special Report No. 3, (New York: 1943), p. 5.

[21] Robert C. Wood, "Ethics in Government as a Problem in Executive Management," *Public Administration Review*, Winter, 1955, pp. 1–8.

judgment that must be followed? Only if he feels that he is so right and his superior is so wrong that most reasonable men will accept his judgment, dare he risk insubordination. Short of that, if he cannot live with the conclusion, his only recourse is to resign.

Examples of the intricate and difficult issues that arise in individual cases are found in the fascinating casebook *Public Administration and Policy Development.*[22] In these, as in other instances, institutional responsibility helps to resolve the impact of ethical considerations on consciences. As Harold Stein says: "Large-scale organization, with its complex division of labor, would seem to dilute the sense of immediacy and direct responsibility involved in an ethical decision. The ethical difficulty is shared, and the individual's responsibility is fulfilled by seeking to obtain appropriate group judgment."[23]

In some American jurisdictions the rights and duties of employees are stated definitively in a set of rules of conduct, although such formal standards are more characteristic of European governments. Lists of offenses which warrant removal or other disciplinary action are typified by the comprehensive list governing employees in the city of Milwaukee, by the State Ethics Code in New York, and by the various provisions applying to workers in the national government. In addition to the usual prohibitions against political activity, strikes, or subversion, the Federal rules spell out various kinds of misconduct relating to misuse of transportation, mails, documents, personnel procedures, gifts to superiors, and criminal or immoral behavior.[24]

On the more positive side, an effort was made in 1951 to give widespread support to a "Federal Creed of Service," which career personnel directors prepared and distributed:

> We as members of the civil service accept our obligation and our opportunity to serve the American people well and in full measure, doing our best to further the free and democratic institutions of our country
>
> We believe it is our duty to
>
> Carry out loyally the will of the people as expressed in our laws
>
> Serve the public with fairness, courtesy, integrity, and understanding
>
> Help improve the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of our work
>
> . . . and thus do our part in performing the great services of the Government

In these tightly drawn phrases we find all that American citizens could hope for in public employment.

[22] Particularly those under the heading "Responsibility," pp. 53–88. Edited by Harold Stein (New York: 1952). See also Leys' analysis of some interesting policy cases, *op. cit., passim.*

[23] *Op. cit.*, pp. 60–61.

[24] See "Table of Miscellaneous Offenses," *Federal Personnel Manual*, Chap. C2–27 (January, 1955). Milwaukee's provisions are contained in its Civil Service Rule XIII, sec. 5, and New York State's Code is found in *Laws*, 1954, Chap. 696, effective January 1, 1955.

An interesting and constructive approach is taken by the British in their *Handbook for the New Civil Servant.* Here we find a broad challenge to the public employee, illuminating his role with an inspiring but realistic discussion that should enable him to see his actions in perspective. Its flavor is suggested by the following passages:

As a civil servant, you must never forget that, however well qualified and expert you may become in your job, you have not been elected to it by any vote;

. . . In other words, as a civil servant you are not entitled to do things according to your personal taste just because it is your personal taste. You must do what Parliament wants you to do. . . .

This is perhaps the most fundamental thing of all that you have to remember—that as a civil servant you are the servant of the public as a whole and not of any sectional interest. . . .

In dealing with a member of the public, or with another civil servant, try to put yourself in the place of the other person, and think whether your answer (whether it is by letter, minute, telephone or interview) is going to satisfy him. . . .

[Quoting from the Board of Enquiry of 1928 appointed by the Prime Minister to investigate conduct] ". . . Practical rules for the guidance of special conduct depend also as much upon the instinct and perception of the individual as upon cast-iron formulas; and the surest guide will, we hope, always be found in the nice and jealous honour of civil servants themselves. The public expects from them a standard of integrity and conduct not only inflexible but fastidious, and has not been disappointed in the past. . . ."

Although it embraces very specific information about working conditions, the personnel system, and rules of conduct, these are cast in the above framework. Of particular interest to Americans is the fact that the *Handbook* encourages civil servants to join a "staff association" (government union) as a means for representation of employees' points of view on conditions of work. But, while stating their right to contact Members of Parliament on "a general problem," the booklet admonishes:

What you must not do is to attempt, by writing to a Member of Parliament or anyone else, to pull strings so that you may get a personal advantage over other members of the Civil Service—for example, so that you may be promoted in preference to someone else. Your Department will be prejudiced against you, rather than in your favour, by such an attempt: the conclusion will be drawn that your claim cannot stand on its own feet and needs outside influence to support it, and in serious cases the attempt to introduce outside influence will be treated as a disciplinary offence.[25]

This is a standard of expected conduct yet to be fully achieved in the American public service.

[25] H. M. Treasury, *A Handbook for the New Civil Servant* (London: 1947). For a good discussion of the utility of official codes of conduct in American government, see Phillip Monypenny, "The Control of Ethical Standards in the Public Service," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* January, 1955, pp. 98–104.

IV. THE FUTURE

If the desirable moral standards of public workers require a high regard for our democratic processes and institutions, then all citizens must be concerned with the conditions that contribute to or detract from that regard. A vital condition is the attitude of the general public itself. The issue has been so well stated by David M. Levitan as not to permit paraphrasing:

> If administrative officials are to appreciate the high role of the citizen and to accord him the dignity becoming free men, they must themselves experience the blessings of free men. Harassed employees—themselves deprived of the privileges and immunities of citizenship—will be ill prepared to accord to others that which is denied to them. A dual interpretation—one applicable to government employees and another to others—of the due process and other liberty guaranteeing clauses of the Constitution is repugnant to the philosophy of the Constitution. Nor is there room in America for two classes of citizens—those who work for the government, and those who do not.[26]

The government employee's democratic impulses can hardly be strengthened if undemocratic practices govern his life—whether through internal administrative restrictions or through abuse and arbitrariness heaped upon him by the general public, legislative bodies, or demagogues. Senator Douglas would undoubtedly be supported by thoughtful leaders in both political parties in the following statement:

> It is fortunate that there are in government large numbers of men and women who lead devoted lives of public service. They work extremely hard for far less pay than they could get in private industry. They never sell out the public interest but instead defend it under great difficulties. They do all this, moreover, without receiving appreciable praise. They are generally either little known or actually ignored by the public. Sometimes they are bitterly attacked by interests which are seeking to obtain unfair privileges or which are swayed by unfounded prejudices. These men and women are indeed unsung heroes, who deserve far more recognition than they receive.[27]

If this caliber of public servant is to be maintained and increased in number, action must be taken for development of the kind of *esprit de corps*, employee selection and training, working conditions, and incentives that will make this condition possible, and for avoiding "open season" on bureaucrats. Many constructive proposals have been made, largely in the nature of institutional arrangements or personnel reforms making the government working atmosphere more conducive to the highest ethical con-

[26] *Op. cit.*, p. 587.
[27] *Op. cit.*, p. 27.

duct, such as those recommended by the Senate Subcommittee on Ethical Standards.[28]

Unfortunately there is too little opportunity outside of government for practice in the rigorous objectivity and impartiality demanded of public servants. In practically all but a few businesses and professions, the principals can buy and sell where they wish, they can play favorites without fear of punishment, they can disclose or conceal information on their operations largely as they please, they can accept gifts without question of propriety, and they need seldom worry about conflict of interest.

A continuing strengthening of the moral base for public administration is not likely to come through reliance solely on fringe actions such as periodic entry into the service of persons from private activity, the adoption of codes of conduct, or the inquiries of legislative committees—however essential all these may be. More fundamental and durable progress will be found, in this writer's opinion, in such long-range emphases and actions as the following:

1. More conscious attention in our secondary and higher educational systems to the public service, to the role of the citizen as well as of the public employee in governmental action, and to the ethical implications of public employment. Such education should reflect part of our cultural heritage, worthy of passing on to *all* students, not just those specializing in the social sciences.
2. Continuous emphasis within state, local, and Federal Government service on moral standards, primarily by the long shadow of behavior of our leading officials and by such special devices as an administrative staff college[29] in the Federal service that would afford greater opportunity for mutual respect, understanding, and example among higher-ranking personnel.
3. More communication to the people by public agencies on their achievements, their plans, their organization, and their employees—not so much in the form of news releases as by a continuous policy of reporting and

[28] "Other proposals in the field of personnel policy are: (1) better salaries in the higher brackets; (2) the protection of judicial procedures for Federal employees accused on loyalty charges; (3) simplified dismissal procedures for all employees (protection is needed against the stigma of disloyalty which is a severe extra-legal penalty, not against dismissal); (4) continued delegation to the departments of large responsibilities for recruiting, training, and developing civil servants according to standards fixed by the Civil Service Commission and subject to its supervision and audit; (5) greater diligence in discovering and rewarding outstanding performance and dedicated service among civil servants; (6) more systematic and intensive professional training particularly for officials and employees who will serve in posts abroad. The nature and number of these suggestions emphasize the widely held view that high standards of conduct for the Federal Government are dependent upon maintaining a high quality of personnel in the service." —*Op. cit.*, p. 60.

[29] See *Proposal for a Federal Administrative Staff College*, Society for Personnel Administration, General Series, Pamphlet No. 5 (Washington: 1953).

an attitude that recognizes the public servant's role as a broker and interpreter for the commonweal.

4. More positive recognition by the public—through citizen organizations, universities, and foundations—in the form of honors and privileges given to public workers who perform distinguished service or who exemplify the best in exercise of public responsibility.

SUMMARY

In this chapter we have explored in a general way the democratic thread that ties together the ethical elements inherent in serving the public interest. Both in relationships outside the service and in internal administration this democratization of the role of the modern public servant is of basic importance. That we are achieving a relatively high standard of public moral conduct in the United States within a system of public service tenure and competence—and without the cruder efforts at democratization which characterized the Jacksonian era—is to the credit of our political leadership, the public consciousness of our citizens, and the quality of our civil servants.

But much more needs to be done, through our educational system and through improved understanding of the nature and achievements of the public service, to insure continued strengthening of morality in government employment. Where codes of conduct are appropriate, they should be of a positive character, stressing the ideal to be achieved, not just the offense to be punished.

In succeeding chapters in this part of the book we shall examine some special aspects of conduct and of dealing with conduct that characterize the American public service.

18

Employee Conduct in the Community

> Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it.
>
> —*Thomas Paine*

The profound and special obligations which rest upon public servants as the instruments of government *of* the people and *for* the people have long been close to the heart of political and administrative developments in every democracy. The dramatic events which began with the onset of the great depression in the thirties, however, have brought to the fore the issues associated with the healthy participation of public workers in government *by* the people. Indeed, today even in the United States they are a very significant portion of the people. Whatever one's views of the merits of the expanded role of government, he must face the fact that at present public personnel constitute one-ninth of the labor force of this country, and there is little indication that the proportion will diminish appreciably in the near future. Together with the adult members of their families they represent a much larger percentage of the voters of the nation. By qualitative standards, the significance of their outlook and behavior, both on duty and off, is still greater because of their strategic position and because of the extent to which they represent the government in the everyday life of their fellow countrymen.

It is beyond the scope of this book to deal with the fundamental social issues which are the causes of this situation. However, it is necessary to discuss these subjects within a broader frame of reference than that provided by previous attempts to balance the civil rights of persons who are also public servants against the need for official impartiality; the private life of the official against the public interest in the quality of his character; the authority of political bodies and officers against the bars set up to block the spoilsmen.

I. LOYALTY AND SECURITY

A. THE PROBLEM

The basic characteristic of totalitarianism which distinguishes it most strikingly from democracy is its complete subordination of the individual and his rights to the interests of the state. In contrast, the governments of the United States, Canada, and the western European democracies are founded on the precept that the dignity and worth of the individual are supreme. Personal liberty, civil rights, and government by the consent of the governed are rooted in this fundamental philosophy. Likewise, the principles of the leading religions in these democracies are based on this same respect for the person, for the individuality of man, and on the belief that each individual has a self-determining will of his own.

To be sure, in all governments—totalitarian or democratic—laws and rules are set which govern the individual's conduct in his relation to others and to society as a whole. But the methods by which these controls are arrived at and the protection which a citizen enjoys against arbitrary or presumptive action affecting his person and his possessions comprise the major area of distinction between totalitarian and democratic government. In democracies *means* are as important as *ends;* in other governmental systems they are not.

In a democracy this business of means—evidenced in the supremacy of the individual and the institutionalization of consent—becomes a special problem when the life of the State itself is threatened from without or by subversion from within. Subversion is a process of infiltration into a society of treasonable intentions and acts under the guise of other aims. One who subverts seeks to overthrow a whole system of government, not just certain leaders or policies, but pretends to work within the framework of the system. Under our constitutional provisions this process constitutes treason when, for example, it embraces the transmission of secret information or assistance to an enemy state or to any power threatening the security of the home state.

Although by no means new to history, subversion has become a particular problem of the twentieth century because its potentiality is strengthened by modern communication and transportation, by the very complexity of civilization, by the size and impersonality of governments, and by the critical importance of key facilities such as military bases and weapons, industrial concentrations, and natural resources. The periodic upsurges of fascism and the alarming spread of communism have already destroyed several democratic systems and are threatening others. At the same time, a democracy by its own precepts is under compulsion to deal with subversion in a manner that does not do violence to civil rights and to democratic

processes—lest the very treasure it seeks to protect be lost. It is often difficult to distinguish ordinary political dissenters from subversive individuals who mask their treasonable aims with just such harmless cloaks. This is a situation that plagues the United States today.

Unfortunately European history abounds with instances in which an established government punished political dissenters at least as vigorously as felons. Autocracies in the past and totalitarian governments today have survived, in part, on the outright suppression of all opposition. Democracies, in order to remain democracies, must confine application of any suppression to actual enemies of the State, to those who seek to destroy the democratic system itself. Safeguards against extension of such restriction in the United States are found in our traditions and laws guaranteeing freedom of speech and assembly, confrontation of witnesses, habeas corpus and jury trial, the presumption of innocence, and the outlawing of bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, and self-incrimination.

Of particular difficulty in this regard is the matter of controlling those who work for the State—the employees of government. The United States has been alert to this problem especially during and since World War II. Throughout the throes of wrestling with subversion in the Federal Government or the threat of it, the Congress and the executive branch have had to be conscious that under our traditions of liberty we have in the past based punishment for treason on *acts*, not *beliefs*. Our laws have not sought to mold social behavior but to penalize overt antisocial action. When this tradition is brought to bear on government employment, it runs up against another truism, namely, that no citizen has a *right* to hold a government job. Yet dismissal or disbarment from a government job on any grounds short of treasonable acts, while consistent with an employer's privilege to determine who shall work for him, can so brand the denied individual that his opportunity for livelihood and normal social behavior is jeopardized. This, in turn, raises the question whether he has not suffered the equivalent of criminal punishment without the benefit of constitutional safeguards.

Here lies the heart of the issue now occupying so much attention in discussions of the loyalty-security problem in the United States government: To what extent should the government as an employer apply the Bill of Rights to the acceptance or retention of accused persons in its employ? Must it protect its informants in loyalty investigations or should it allow employees or applicants to learn who their accusers are and to cross-examine those accusers? Is the employee innocent until proved guilty, or must any doubt be resolved in favor of the government as employer? Who has the burden of proof? Are Congressional investigating committees the proper vehicles for uncovering and adjudicating charges against employees? Is the risk of subversion such that an exhaustive inquiry into every aspect of the life of every applicant selected for work is essential for safe public

employment? Is the case of a fired public employee essentially different from indictment and conviction of a private citizen or alien on "security" grounds?[1]

B. PREVIOUS FEDERAL PROGRAMS

At this point it may be well to look at the facts of recent history on this issue. The constitutional loyalty of public employees has been of concern primarily in the Federal Government, although in the past decade a number of states have passed laws requiring loyalty oaths or other checks on their employees. It should be understood that the U.S. Civil Service Commission had, ever since its establishment, been checking applicants and new appointees for "suitability," based on searches of police records, character references, and the like. To a certain extent, particularly in times of war, these investigations took into account evidence casting doubt on the loyalty of the individual to the American form of government. Validation through meager published sources is almost impossible, but the impression exists that summary treatment of suspected German sympathizers in government employment during World War I went as far as elimination of many with German names and ancestry.

Current interest in the subject centers around the period of World War II and after. Under various Federal appropriation act provisions and under the 1939 Hatch Act restricting political activities of Federal employees, removal of any person was required who advocated or belonged to any organization which advocated overthrow of the government of the United States by force or violence.[2] The Secretaries of War and the Navy in 1940, and in 1950[3] other department heads, were given authority to remove any employee summarily in the interest of national security without regard to civil service removal procedures.

In 1947, in face of a threat of more drastic Congressional action, President Truman inaugurated by executive order the first comprehensive Federal loyalty program.[4] Under this program investigations (inquiries among anonymous as well as identified informants) by the Federal Bureau of In-

[1] Discussion of these and related issues are effectively treated in the following: Eleanor Bontecou, *The Federal Loyalty-Security Program* (Ithaca, N.Y.: 1953); Francis Biddle, *The Fear of Freedom* (New York: 1952), especially pp. 182–245; Alan Barth, *The Loyalty of Free Men* (New York: 1951), especially Chaps. 5 and 6; and Thomas I. Emerson and David M. Helfield, "Loyalty Among Government Employees," *Yale Law Journal*, December, 1948, pp. 1–144. See also the briefer pieces by Francis Biddle and Marie Jahoda in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, July, 1955, pp. 51–61 and 110–118 respectively; and Richard and Gladys Harkness, "How About Those Security Cases?" *Reader's Digest*, September (pp. 202–214) and November (pp. 136–142), 1955.

[2] 53 *Stat.* 1148, August 2, 1939.

[3] P.L. 733, 81st Cong., 2nd sess., approved August 26, 1950, covered State, Commerce, Treasury, Justice, Atomic Energy Commission, and others, as well as Defense.

[4] Executive Order 9835, March 21, 1947. For a history of the loyalty program up to 1953 see *Internal Security Manual*, Sen. Doc. No. 47, 83rd Cong., 1st sess., 1953.

vestigation built up the factual dossiers on which agency heads based charges and dismissed employees wherever there was a reasonable doubt as to their loyalty. All incumbents were fingerprinted and checked against membership lists of suspected organizations. Where names showed up, "full field investigations" were conducted. Regional appellate boards were established, and accused employees had an ultimate right of appeal to a central Loyalty Review Board, manned by an impressive group of outstanding private citizens. By 1949 all incumbent employees had been checked and by 1953 the following results were recorded: over 2,600,000 forms had been processed; full field investigations had been completed in over 23,400 cases; during this process, 16,503 persons whose backgrounds raised questions had been "cleared" or rated eligible on loyalty by loyalty boards; 3634 had left the service voluntarily some time during the period their cases were up for adjudication (not necessarily meaning that they would otherwise have been found wanting); only 557 had been dismissed during the four-year period; and 1776 cases were pending settlement when the Truman loyalty program came to an end in April, 1953.[5]

C. CURRENT FEDERAL PROGRAM

In the meantime the special authority that had been developing in defense and other sensitive agencies under Public Law 733 became known, separately, as a "security program." In effect, it was "designed to eliminate unintentionally as well as intentionally dangerous employees—the indiscreet as well as the disloyal."[6] In 1953, under President Eisenhower, another executive order combined both loyalty and security factors into one system of standards and adjudication.[7] Although investigative procedures were essentially unchanged, a substantial share of this task had been transferred earlier to the Civil Service Commission, a function now constituting nearly one-fourth of that agency's annual budget for personal services. Heads of departments and agencies are still responsible for all individual determinations under the executive order, and a few major agencies conduct their own investigations. The Attorney General interprets the order and sets the standards. The commission conducts purely factual, unevaluative investigations, referring to the FBI all cases involving allegations of actual disloyalty. Otherwise, the commission can only gather statistics and advise agency heads on deficiencies or inequities in their security operations, with at least a semiannual report to the National Security Council. Under this combined program, full field investigations, instead of being confined to

[5] U.S. Civil Service Commission, *1953 Annual Report*, p. 27; and U.S. Civil Service Commission Loyalty Review Board, "Report on the Loyalty Program," June 30, 1953 (mimeographed).

[6] Barth, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

[7] Executive Order 10,450, "Security Requirements for Government Employment," April 27, 1953.

loyalty cases or to sensitive jobs, are now conducted for all employees or nominees, regardless of job, whose names appear on lists maintained by any of the national investigative agencies.

No appeal is provided beyond the head of the agency. The earlier Loyalty Review Board was abolished. This is one feature that has been widely criticized. For example, in its broadly conceived report of October, 1954, the American Assembly recommended: "Although the administration of the loyalty-security program should, in the first instance, be a responsibility of the department heads, an employee discharged on security or loyalty grounds should have a right of appeal to a central board of review. This board of review should also have the duty to examine loyalty-security procedures in the several departments for the purpose of securing fairness and consistency of practice."[8] However, security hearing boards are established in each agency to provide a hearing for any accused employee desiring it.

The security order of 1953 embraces many standards for dismissal or disbarment which are indistinguishable from those which have guided such action in the United States civil service for many years, as well as in all other progressive jurisdictions. Thus, drunkenness, criminal records, or other immoral behavior have long been factors in keeping or taking a person out of the civil service on grounds of not meeting "suitability" requirements. Although 3586 employees had been removed under this order by June 30, 1955,[9] the majority of these cases probably would have occurred under normal civil service suitability procedures if no security order had been on the books.

It is important to note that the intent of the 1953 order was to simplify and consolidate the previous systems, to place everything under the concept of "security," and to remove the stigma of disloyalty on employees who were removed for simple defects in character. Now that the program has been in operation for several years, the question is raised whether the stigma of "security risk" is not associated with disloyalty as much as if the latter term were used. In fact, numerous politicians appear to have been rather unscrupulous in trying to lead the general public into believing that "security risk" is synonymous with disloyalty, when as a matter of fact even under the present program suspicions of disloyalty constitute only a small minority of security cases, and some critics allege that, so far as specific discovery of communists is concerned, there have been extremely few or none found in the government since 1949.

Various individual Federal agencies, such as the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Atomic Energy Commission, have

[8] Sixth American Assembly, Columbia University, *The Federal Government Service: Its Character, Prestige, and Problems*, final ed. (New York: 1954), p. 184.

[9] U.S. Civil Service Commission, Public Information Office releases.

their own investigative and security systems. It is an unverifiable assumption that in these places the criteria for clearance of an individual for employment are even more stringent than those applying generally. One interesting point is that the Atomic Energy Commission, whose work is surely as vital to the national security as any agency's, is the only one which permits a rejected *applicant* for employment, as well as employees, to have a hearing before an administratively established committee.

D. THE BRITISH APPROACH

For one criterion as to the wisdom and reasonableness of the American approach to the loyalty-security problem, the British experience and practice offers an interesting and instructive comparison.[10] Great Britain does not start from basic premises essentially different from those in the United States. Security of the State is recognized as a necessary goal; government employment is considered a privilege, not a right; the standards for determining "security risk" are comparable; and communists are prohibited from work on secret matters. Beyond these elementary principles, the British approach is quite different from the American.

The major distinction is that in the United Kingdom communists or fascists may hold appointive office but are excluded only from carefully selected positions in which they would have access to State secrets.[11] They may be employed in nonsensitive positions and suffer no loss of retirement benefits when separated. Canada follows a very similar plan.

Of course, overt acts of disloyalty by civil servants, as by anyone else, are severely punished. Instead of emphasis on keeping communists out of all units of government, the British lay greater store by intensive counter-espionage. They reason that the most dangerous enemy agents would not be so foolish as to associate themselves with an organization that would inspire suspicion, such as the Communist party. This is not to say that communists are numerous in the British service. Even in elective office, which they are free to seek, they are practically nonexistent. No seat in Parliament or principal county office has been held by a communist in recent years.

It may be argued that the British are able to tolerate this more liberal

[10] Information for this section was heavily dependent upon the unpublished paper "A Comparison of the Employee Loyalty-Security Policies of Great Britain and the United States," by John E. Sauerhoff, Jr., at the American University, June, 1954. See also Leon D. Epstein, "Political Sterilization of Civil Servants: United States and Great Britain," *Public Administration Review*, Autumn, 1950; and "British Civil Service Security Regulations," *Public Administration Review*, Summer, 1952. The fullest and most up-to-date treatment is found in Chap. 2 of H. H. Wilson and Harvey Glickman, *The Problem of Internal Security in Great Britain 1948–1953* (New York: 1954).

[11] About 17,000 posts out of one million. Sir Hartley Shawcross, "Civil Liberties," address delivered at the Bicentennial Celebration of Columbia University, January 15, 1954, reported in *New York Times*, January 16, 1954.

approach to communism in government because there is less movement in and out of their civil service—that is, there are more lifetime careers—than in the United States. Infiltration dangers may be less serious. Also, it is alleged that the more immediate responsiveness of the executive branch to the legislative under the parliamentary system, so that the ferreting out of executive errors or injustices is implicit in daily governmental processes, makes for less need for wholesale exclusion of communists in the various ministries.

On the other hand, the British have felt the effects of war on their home soil in recent decades in a manner which we have so far happily been spared. It is a wonder that they are not more emotional in the prevention of subversion or other steps that might lead to war than we are. One can hardly escape the conclusion that the British approach the communist problem, and subversion in general, with more reason than hysteria. The issue rarely becomes a contest between politicians to see who can outdo the other in winning popular favor by thinking up restrictive measures aimed at the communists. It is a pretty quiet, though serious, affair in the United Kingdom. The movement of an employee from a sensitive to a nonsensitive assignment is accomplished unobtrusively, usually without colleagues' realizing what has happened. There is no boasting about the number of "security risks" or communists eliminated.

In short, there are some lessons for us here that deserve our respectful attention. So far, there is little evidence that subversion is being any more effectively countered in this country than it is in the land of our brethren and allies across the sea. It is possible, of course, that some notable defections in the British Foreign Service in recent years could be attributed to laxity in their security system, but some defections have occurred in both countries.

E. EVALUATION

The Federal Government's efforts to insure the loyalty and security of its work force may have overlooked the effectiveness of counterespionage and the utility of psychiatric-psychological examination in critical spots as means for discovering or preventing disloyal acts. None of the handful of convictions widely publicized in the late forties and early fifties were the result of findings under the loyalty-security programs; nor would the names of these few individuals found guilty of giving secret documents to foreign agents be likely to have shown up on any subversive membership lists. The fact is that they were uncovered by good detective work, following up leads on serious cases. Perhaps some of these unfortunate betrayals could have been forestalled by careful testing and psychoanalysis of all assignees to jobs involving access to State secrets. Some highly successful experience in gauging the emotional maturity of individuals and predicting

their character, fitness, and integrity under stress was gained by the Office of Strategic Services in selecting candidates for overseas intelligence positions during World War II.[12] An exhaustive program of testing and creation of "stress situations," covering periods of days and weeks, typified this plan. Although the information is not available, it can only be speculated (or hoped) that the current Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency today are benefiting from and making use of this experience in selection of personnel for their supersensitive activities. One cannot help wondering whether scientific testing would not be a more rational approach to ferreting out subversive persons or "security risks" than overreliance on decisions by laymen based on interviews of neighbors, colleagues, and anonymous informants.

In fairness, it must be acknowledged that the program of checking on all employees at least to some degree, with the rule of thumb of suspicious membership determining the degree of further inquiry, probably has had a deterrent effect on subversive entrants into the service. Many voluntary resignations also may have reflected guilty consciences.

The expensiveness of psychological methods, however, is not a critical factor, because they could not be more expensive than the process of full field investigations on all names showing up on certain lists, made regardless of the sensitivity of the job to which each person is to be assigned. Memberships or lists of names often represent innocent contributors to seemingly worthy causes; others have been compiled by ignorant and irresponsible demagogues, or their hirelings, who do not understand the difference between liberals and totalitarians or who seek only to discredit as many "bureaucrats" as they possibly can. Even more important is that many thousands of innocent employees and applicants have been subjected to full field investigations[13] and, in hundreds of cases, to suspension and formal hearings, events which could not be kept completely confidential. The results of these steps, which more often than not reveal no cause for alarm, are not as widely known as their frequency. "Clearance" in such cases has a hard time sticking. Cases are "reopened" every time the branded individual moves to another agency. For many innocent and "cleared" persons the aura of suspicion lingers on or crops up periodically in the minds of overcautious appointing officers.

It should be acknowledged that many highly placed individuals in the

[12] See Office of Strategic Services, *Assessment of Man: Selection of Personnel for OSS* (New York: 1948), a detailed report by a group of eminent scientists and scholars under Dr. Harry Murray, Harvard Medical School. See also William J. Donovan and Mary Gardiner Jones, "Program for a Democratic Counterattack on Communist Penetration of Government Service," *Yale Law Journal*, July, 1949.

[13] The general public, now more familiar with the fact that many government workers are investigated routinely, is probably getting away from the earlier impression that there "must be something wrong" with a person about whom investigators make inquiries.

Federal service have bent every effort to assure fairness in adjudication of cases that raise doubts about a person's past or current associations. Present practice requires department heads to review adverse action cases personally and to weigh carefully the probable dependability of the sources of derogatory information. A loyalty-security program dependent on final responsibility reposed in department heads is nevertheless fraught with the hazard that there will be some unevenness in justice.[14]

In the comprehensive sense of the term, this entire book is concerned with the furthering of loyalty. Forward-looking private employers and governmental administrators alike have long understood that active loyalty among virtually all employees is directly related to the degree of sublimation in and self-identification with the goals of their work and to the conditions of their employment. Loyalty is even more dependent on these positive considerations than it is on the effectiveness of specific measures against the disloyal. General progress in personnel administration will always be the most effective administrative means of reducing the area of potential recruitment for subversive movements. This section, therefore, is restricted to consideration of the principal questions posed by the necessity of excluding from the public service by democratic means those who are the agents or tools of organizations which, in order to achieve their ends, commit their members to the use of unconstitutional and violent means, now or in the future, or which place allegiance to a foreign power above allegiance to the United States.

That the necessity for such exclusion is imperative was demonstrated by the destruction of the Weimar Republic by the Nazis, with the passive and, less frequently, active support of officials; the fact that throughout Europe World War II was a civil war as well as an international war; the seizure of various governments (such as Czechoslovakia and China) by the extreme left in recent decades; and the persistence in America of totalitarian groups at both ends of the political scale. It has been well said that freedom is never safe, and these are among its most dangerous decades. The completely disciplined, systematically organized, and well-trained instruments of totalitarian imperialism and those who have deliberately chosen to follow parallel courses have nothing in common with the warm-hearted, individualistic, and independent rebels who have often enriched American development at the price of their own careers and popularity. Nor can the adherents of groups dedicated to the destruction of the government or of the constitutional rights of others by violent means be dealt with by the same means which have been used to prevent the abuse of

[14] The Fund for the Republic, established by the Ford Foundation, has made possible an objective analysis of a number of security cases in governmental, military, and industrial employment. A preliminary collection of fifty of these is presented in Adam Yarmolinsky (ed.), *Case Studies in Personnel Security*, Bureau of National Affairs (Washington: August, 1955).

power by supporters of either of the two great political parties, both of which, regardless of their differences or faults, are agreed on the broad outlines of our political and economic structure. How, then, shall we proceed to combat extraordinary threats within the framework of our traditional freedoms and limited government?

The object of a loyalty program should be *loyalty*, not *orthodoxy*. "If there is any fixed star in our Constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."[15]

A loyalty program should be concerned with the substance of disloyalty, not the shadow, with the fact, not with appearance. It should, therefore, always take into consideration the fact that subversive movements are often able to enlist through various subterfuges the support of completely patriotic Americans. Moreover, there must be an awareness that the "boring from within" technique has resulted in the taking over from the inside of organizations which originally had no subversive characteristics. Under such circumstances, guilt by association is not only an un-American criterion to apply; it is misleading. Membership in an organization should be no more than one piece of evidence which may or may not be helpful in arriving at a conclusion in a particular case.

On the other hand, certain organizations have so clearly identified themselves with the advocacy of violence, with the destruction of constitutional government, and with subservience to foreign powers that it would seem that any civil servant who now joins them manifests a degree of irresponsibility, to say the least, which would justify the most searching inquiry.A policy which does not discourage employees or applicants from joining or supporting loyal organizations, liberal or conservative, should rule out the sort of witch-hunting which would reduce American men and women to the soulless, unthinking cogs which are the very type of bureaucrats desired by dictatorial governments and which are the worst possible citizens of a free country.

The question is frequently raised as so why this difficult and involved attempt must be made at all to reach a balance between guilt by association and recognition of organized disloyalty. Why not follow the centuries-old traditions of the common law and the American constitutional provisions governing treason and exclude from the service only those who have been proved guilty of an overt act criminal in character? The answer lies in the nature of twentieth-century totalitarian and other extremist movements. Their plans contemplate a variety of tactics over a period of years, and the leaderships assign to selected disciples and followers roles which require

[15] Opinion of the Supreme Court in the Barnette case, *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943).

abstinence from overt acts until the crucial moment comes. At that time such men must throw aside the camouflage of being servants of the duly constituted government and must attack whatever sector of democracy has been assigned to them. A government which kept such sworn enemies on its pay roll until the hour of danger would be inviting the fate which befell the democracies of Germany and Czechoslovakia, to give but two examples.

The formulation of standards for, and the designation of, organizations as subversive has implications which transcend the field of personnel administration and are not discussed here. Much of the criticism which has been leveled at the actions of the Federal Government has been aimed at the use of such labels by the executive branch, based upon the very general wording of the Hatch Act,[16] various appropriation and defense measures, and the constitutional clauses relating to the executive powers of the President. Even those critics who believe in the need for categorical indictments include a number who urge that such determinations should be a judicial rather than a legislative or an administrative process.

Both the standards set forth and certain decisions made by Federal authorities have been further criticized because people are discharged under the stigma of disloyalty without their status having been proved beyond question. The legality of this policy apparently was upheld in the decision in the *Friedman* v. *Schwellenbach* case:

> The United States has the right to employ such persons as it deems necessary to aid in carrying on the public business. It has the right to prescribe the qualifications of its employees and to attach conditions to their employment. The War Service Regulation which permits the removal from federal service of one concerning whose loyalty to the government the Civil Service Commission entertains a reasonable doubt undoubtedly was reasonable and proper and the making of it was well within the scope of the authority conferred on the Commission by the Act and the two executive orders. We are not concerned here with the question as to whether Friedman was in fact disloyal. Under the regulation he could be removed from service if the Commission had a reasonable doubt as to his loyalty.[17]

The dangers to morale and to individual freedom which misuse of such a policy, however legal, can produce are too obvious to require comment.

Additional fire has been directed at the fact that such findings of doubt can be arrived at by an administrative process which, although it provides for appeals and hearings, does not establish standards of evidence equal to those observed by other administrative tribunals, not to mention courts, and denies to the accused sufficient opportunity to challenge such evidence or any opportunity to confront his accusers and to cross-examine witnesses against him. If it is incumbent upon employees to avoid even the appear-

[16] Sec. 9A, 18 *U.S. Code* 61h.

[17] 159 F. 2d 22, cert. denied 330 U.S. 838.

ance of disloyalty, it is likewise incumbent upon the government to avoid even the appearance of star-chamber proceedings. Determinations of disloyalty should be based on the statements of unidentified informants and on undisclosed evidence *only* when the national security would be directly and vitally compromised either by open proceedings or by retention of the accused in the service.

We have centered our attention on the issues arising out of a presumption of disloyalty based on association with subversive organizations, because it is organized disloyalty which is the most effective in modern society. Obviously, individuals may be disloyal who belong to no group or who are members of the most respected and trustworthy organizations. Acting as individuals, however, without central direction, they can accomplish little without resort to the type of overt act which can be dealt with under normal disciplinary rules and procedures.

By way of conclusion, two further points deserve special mention looking to constructive improvement of the public employee security system. The first has to do with the danger of character assassination by irresponsible and sometimes anonymous accusers. The author's observation is this: When measures to protect the national security are so operated that "bearing false witness" against employees by informants or other employees *is as sharply dealt with as a security suspect himself is treated*, then some of the major objections to a security system will be removed and we will have restored some measure of the traditional American ideal of assuming innocence until guilt is proved. As the American Assembly concluded: "Basic human values are at stake when an employee is charged with disloyalty. Security charges in today's climate of public opinion cast a stigma on the employee which may quite literally ruin him and his family."[18] This is a grave responsibility, not to be dismissed with the demagogues' cry: "Nothing is too rough for the dirty communists." Our system must make certain that a dismissal is clearly identified when it is for subversive action or threats as distinguished from when it is for reasons not vital to security in other employment. Even more important, the decision must be right and just.

Second, much attention has been drawn in recent years to the idea of a comprehensive review of governmental security policy as applied to public employees. The major proposal on this subject by the American Assembly was as follows: "We urge that a commission of outstanding citizens be appointed by the President to review the entire problem and to seek the development of new standards and new methods of loyalty-security determination." It suggested that questions to be explored should include: criteria for appraisal of individual records, organization for security, role of the security officer, provision of legal assistance to the accused, and

[18] *Op. cit.*, p. 184.

prevention of public misunderstanding and of political exploitation of the loyalty-security issue.[19] Such a review, perhaps periodically, commends itself to current and future leadership in our national government.

II. CIVIC AND POLITICAL STATUS

Even in periods of stability, when the fate of the nation is not thought to be in the balance, civil servants in every country have been subject to restrictions and obligations with regard to their behavior in the community as well as on the job beyond the general responsibilities of citizenship. Governments of every political complexion have realized that private as well as public misconduct of officials, and to a lesser extent of workers, could reflect on the prestige of the regime. Dictatorial and aristocratic governments have proceeded to a maximum of regulation of their subordinates around the clock, while in democracies emphasis has been given to finding the medium between the infringement of personal liberties and the maintenance of public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the service.

A. PERSONAL STANDING

The standards of personal behavior for civil servants as members of the community are usually expressed in very general prohibitions, such as those of "conduct unbecoming an officer," "disgraceful or notoriously immoral conduct," and "vicious habits." Almost universally, a civil servant is liable to discharge upon being convicted of a crime or serious misdemeanor even if there is no violation of official duties involved. Financial speculation, even when knowledge gained through government sources is not involved, is generally prohibited or strongly discouraged. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's declaration on this point is still expressed as Federal policy:

> I believe it to be a sound policy of the Government that no officer or employee shall participate directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds or of commodities for speculative purposes, as distinguished from bona fide investment purposes. Engagement in such speculative activities by any officer or employee, whether under the competitive civil service or not, should be among the matters considered by the heads of departments and establishments and by the Commission in passing upon questions concerning his qualifications for retention or advancement.[20]

[19] *Ibid.* A similar recommendation was made by the second Hoover Commission Task Force but was not mentioned by the commission itself. *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), p. 122. The 84th Congress in 1955 established a Commission on Government Security which is to report by December 31, 1956, on compliance of the security program with a policy that "will protect the national security and preserve basic American rights." —P.L. 304, approved August 9, 1955.

[20] Letter of the President to the Civil Service Commission, dated April 22, 1937; reprinted in *Federal Personnel Manual*, p. C2-26.

We shall not pause here to enumerate other specific subjects in declarations or rules, which cover a great variety of topics from one jurisdiction to another. The general attitude toward activities which are outside the scope of formal control is exemplified by another Federal statement of policy:

> Officers and employees of the Federal Government are servants of the people. Because of this, their conduct must, in many instances, be subject to more restrictions and to higher standards than may be the case in certain private employments.
>
> Officers and employees of the Federal Government are expected to conduct themselves in a manner which will reflect favorably upon their employer. Although the Government is not particularly interested in the private lives of its employees, it does expect them to be honest, reliable, trustworthy, and of good character and reputation. They are expected to be loyal to the Government, and to the department or agency in which they are employed.[21]

A memorandum of the United Kingdom once pointed out that "a Civil Servant is not so to order his affairs as to allow a suspicion that a trust has been abused, or a confidence betrayed." From civil servants the public has a right to demand "a standard of integrity and conduct not only inflexible but fastidious."[22]

B. RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE AND FREEDOM OF PRIVATE OPINIONS

Although disfranchisement of groups of government employees has taken place sporadically in the past, it is generally true today in democracies that they have the same freedom from interference in the exercise of suffrage as have other citizens. The voteless status of the permanent residents of the District of Columbia is a glaring example of the dead hand of that past. Although the disfranchisement applies to those in public, private, domestic, and retired status alike, it sprang originally from a fear that the seat of the national government would be dominated by blocs of officials interested primarily in their own welfare. With this exception, the trend in the twentieth century has been toward special protection of the civil servant against intimidation from above or outside. Even in jurisdictions which do not have highly developed merit systems there are frequently stringent provisions against attempts by persons within or outside the service to "swing" the votes of employees. Conversely, officials are usually under strict laws and rules against using their authority or the influence of their offices to exert pressure on other citizens. These prohibitions are often contained in corrupt practices legislation and may be regarded as steps to promote cleaner politics rather than as personnel policies in the usual sense of the term.

The right of a civil servant to express his opinion freely when off duty

[21] *Federal Personnel Manual*, p. C2-1.

[22] Cmd. 3037 (1928). Quoted in Leonard D. White, "The British Civil Service," in *Civil Service Abroad*, Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel (New York: 1935), p. 54.

is not usually challenged so long as he does it in his private capacity and does not represent a faction or party on the radio or in the papers, or does not in other ways engage in public controversy or propaganda.

In the Federal service the right to petition Congress, individually or collectively, or to furnish information is very specifically protected by the Lloyd-La Follette Act.[23] Civil servants enjoy the same constitutional right to communicate with their elected representatives as do other members of the community.

C. ACTIVITIES IN ASSOCIATION WITH OTHERS

Membership in religious, fraternal, social, and similar organizations, so long as they are nonpolitical in nature, are of no concern to the legislature or the executive, while participation in professional associations is actively encouraged in progressive jurisdictions. Governments generally do not abdicate the power to investigate in order to determine whether such organizations are bona fide or subversive and whether or not such affiliations are being used as a cloak for illegal activities.

Membership in unions has been discussed in the chapter "Employee Organization and Representation." It is important to recall here that whatever other restrictions may be imposed, employees in many jurisdictions are now able to exert very strong pressure on legislators, parties, and public opinion in support of improved conditions of employment. Although they are organized in order to further their own specialized interests, such self-interest has often been enlightened and coincidentally in the public interest. It remains, however, a rather narrow channel for political activity.

D. RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP AND RESPONSIBLE BUREAUCRACY

The working instruments of democratic politics as practiced today in the West are political parties. It is possible to draw up on paper types of democracies in which the various elements of the public would be able to express themselves and reach agreements through nonpartisan organization, pressure groups, and other nonparty techniques, but in the foreseeable future healthy democratic development must include the healthy growth and functioning of parties. Unfortunately, in many households "politics" is a dirty word. There is a widespread cynicism toward parties which results in a low degree of participation in public affairs and which promotes an irresponsible attitude toward mechanisms by which conflicts between special interest blocs are resolved by compromise or according to effective popular sentiment. Americans may have forgotten that the splitting into sectional factions of the great national parties before the Civil War made that conflict almost inevitable. They might more easily draw conclusions from the prostitution of parties in eastern Europe, which is a part

[23] Sec. 6, August 24, 1912, 5 U.S.C. 652.

of the standard technique for setting up a one-party dictatorship even while a façade of competitive representation is maintained.

Shall we, nevertheless, continue to encourage one-ninth of our working population to regard the most meaningful and effective function of a citizen —that of actively supporting a strong party system—as incompatible with being a servant of the State? It is not enough to say that there are voters' leagues, citizens' associations, reform drives, and nonpartisan types of local government in which they may participate. We must revert to our original point that the great issues of the day are settled or compromised and the leaders of the nation, of the states, of the larger cities and most localities, are chosen through parties. Nor is it enough to say that restrictions on seven million or so of the adult population do not appear fatal by a quantitative standard. The results are much more far-reaching. Their families need to be discreet lest they be suspected of acting as agents for the employee member. Still harder to measure but more serious is the fact that restrictive laws and orders appear to put the stamp of community and official approval on the attitude that politics is so inherently corrupting that most men and women are unable to be active party members and impartial public servants.

The time has come to distinguish between neutrality as a private person and impartiality as an employee. In the present grim age personal neutrality is not a virtue but is tantamount to civic immaturity. With regard to behavior while on duty, however, responsible government demands that permanent civil servants impartially serve alternating sets of superior officials representing different parties and different policies. Such a principle rests, however, on the assumption that the successive administrations will not differ from each other so widely as to make it impossible for the same corps of persons to serve each faithfully. The range is wide, as is indicated by the stability of bureaucracies in western Europe, which for decades now have served governments ranging from very conservative to socialist. The range has its limits, as indicated by the repeated purges in eastern Europe. Why is it, then, that in the United States, where the two leading parties are closer together in their basic philosophies than anywhere else in the Atlantic community, the restrictions on political activity by civil servants are more detailed instead of more liberal than in the other democracies?

The answer has been given by history rather than logic. As described in Chapter 2, American civil service reform started with battles against the spoils system. Purity rather than performance was at the center of the stage. The most vigorous defenders of spoils were the professional party henchmen, both those on the public pay roll and those off it. In addition, much of the inefficiency of the various bureaucracies was ascribed to the amount of time and energy devoted by employees to partisan activities

and to the selection, promotion, and retention of the incompetent at the behest of ward heelers and bosses. In the minds of the reformers, their opponents, and the public generally, the taking of politics out of the civil service became firmly identified with removing individual civil servants from politics. It must be admitted that in the Federal service, at least, the curbing of personal activities while off duty has proved to be a very effective technique. Our quarrel is with the present-day tendency to mistake the means for the ends. Moreover, such a negative approach becomes obsolete, even as a technique, as the modern philosophy and methods of personnel management and the new career services take firmer root.

The spoils system is still too much with us in many jurisdictions, and its revival is too strong a danger in others, to suggest the wholesale discarding of restrictions now. Evolution should be the route by which we reach the stage where merit is so strongly entrenched that it will be safe for all civil servants, except perhaps those in top policy-forming, regulatory, and quasi-judicial positions, to resume fully the responsibilities and rights of mature citizens and to hold any party or public offices which do not interfere with the impartial discharge of their duties or result in their wielding legislative or executive authority over their own conditions of employment or over their own service superiors. The abuse of these restored liberties can be prevented by the development of codes of official conduct and their enforcement along the lines suggested in the preceding chapter. The transitional stage must be a long one, however, and so it still is worth while to examine briefly the rules and practices which are now in force.[24]

[24] The major controversies in American history are described by H. Eliot Kaplan in "Political Neutrality of the Civil Service," *Public Personnel Review*, April, 1940, pp. 10–23.

That the famed impartiality of the British civil service thus far has been due to the fact that its middle-class composition and outlook have represented the structure and basic philosophy of both the Conservative and the Liberal party is a major thesis of Kingsley's *Representative Bureaucracy*. Although restrictions on political activities have existed in England, they have not in modern times approached in scope or severity those used in America, and yet neither patronage nor partisan misuse of authority has flourished in the United Kingdom as in the United States.

Some authorities attack the rule of political neutrality outright on the grounds that it is unwisely founded on a denial of basic constitutional safeguards to public servants, such safeguards as the protection against impairment of contract, the right of due process of law, and the furtherance of political views through free speech, peaceable assembly, and petition—rights available to all other members of the populace. This is part of the erroneous conception, they say, of public office as a privilege, a concept which leads to the specious conclusion "that since there is no right *to*, there can be no right *in* public employment." Under this theory government workers can have no constitutional protection against arbitrary dismissal, and no right to participate in determining the conditions of their retention in the service. Hence, among other conditions, public servants are restricted to silent voting, "with no means of participating in the debate of issues which so profoundly concern them." As the most forthright scholar on the subject, Arch Dotson, has said: "Other groups in society, perhaps equally identified with government through subsidies or regulated enterprises, have not similarly been confined in their opportunities for political expression. Moreover, the injustice of this situation as between private citizens and civil servants is supplemented by the wrong between civil servants [i.e., career employees and holders of politically appointive posts]. . . . Again, it is a

E. SPECIFIC RESTRICTIONS

At the outset it may be said that there appear to be no constitutional barriers to the limits generally placed on the political activities of civil servants. Frequent use is made of Justice Holmes' famous observation: "The petitioner may have a constitutional right to talk politics, but he has no constitutional right to be a policeman. . . . The servant cannot complain as he takes the employment on the terms offered him."[25]

Federal legislation and rules are too detailed to warrant description here. The main provisions are embodied in the Hatch Act and the policies and regulations set forth in the *Federal Personnel Manual*, particularly Chapter C2, "Conduct of Officers and Employees." State and local conditions are extremely diverse but have been strongly influenced by the Hatch Act, in particular by its extension to employees paid in whole or in part out of Federal grants-in-aid.[26] Professional opinion is exemplified by the provisions recommended in the following quotation from the *Model State Civil Service Law:*

Section 19. Political activities prohibited.

(a) No person shall be appointed or promoted to, or demoted or dismissed from, any position in the classified service, or in any way favored or discriminated against with respect to employment in the classified service because of his political or religious opinions or affiliations or race; but nothing herein shall be construed as precluding the dismissal of any employee who may be engaged in subversive activities or found disloyal to the nation.

---

violation of the rudiments of justice to punish for potential offenses and equally unfair to restrain all public employees because of the acts of some."—Dotson, "The Emerging Doctrine of Privilege in Public Employment," *Public Administration Review*, Spring, 1955, p. 84.

The plight of the civil servant in political expression is offset to some degree by the reality of power in his organizing for the welfare of his group and by the lobbying of such organizations directly with legislative bodies. Anyone familiar with the boldness and influence of the large postal unions hardly thinks of the mail carrier or clerk as a political nonentity. (See Chapter 12.) In fact, it may be argued that government employee unions take on the complexion of political groups dealing with the legislature rather than simply bargaining agents in the managerial arena partly because of restrictions on the political behavior of individual employees, the other reasons being the slowness of government executive direction to accept unions in the management process and the reluctance of legislatures to give the executive branch sufficient discretion in administrative matters to assure the success of unions in the employee-management relations sphere.

[25] *McAuliffe* v. *New Bedford*, 155 Mass. 216 (1892), 29 NE 517. In *Ex parte Curtis*, 106 U.S. 371 (1882), the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the power of Congress to prevent government employees from participating in political assessments or "contributions" within the service. Succeeding restrictive laws and orders, including the Hatch Act, have not been successfully challenged in the courts.

A survey of the legal foundations for Federal, state, and local rules is contained in Herbert W. Cornell, "Legal Restraints on Political Activity by Public Employees," *Public Management*, July, 1947, pp. 190–195.

[26] Comprehensive treatment is given to this development by Vernon O. Key, "The Hatch Act Extension and Federal-State Relations," *Public Personnel Review*, October, 1940, pp. 30–35.

(b) No person shall seek or attempt to use any political endorsement in connection with any appointment to a position in the classified service.

(c) No person shall use or promise to use, directly or indirectly, any official authority or influence, whether possessed or anticipated, to secure or attempt to secure for any person an appointment or advantage in appointment to a position in the classified service, or an increase in pay or other advantage in employment in any such position, for the purpose of influencing the vote or political action of any person, or for any consideration.

(d) No employee in the classified service or member of the Commission or the Director shall, directly or indirectly, pay or promise to pay any assessment, subscription or contribution, or perform any service for any political party, or solicit or take any part in soliciting any such assessment, subscription, contribution or service. No person shall solicit any such assessment, subscription, contribution or service of an employee in the classified service.

(e) No employee in the classified service shall be a member of any national, state or local committee of a political party, or an officer or member of a committee of a partisan political club, or a candidate for nomination or election to any public office, or shall take any part in the management or affairs of any political party or in any political campaign, except to exercise his right as a citizen privately to express his opinion and to cast his vote.

(f) Any officer or employee in the State service who violates any of the foregoing provisions of this section shall forfeit his office or position, and for one year shall be ineligible for any office or position in the State service.

Comment:

These prohibitions do not in any way deny the employee the privilege of voting and privately expressing his views as a citizen. They do prohibit such activity as would do violence to the official neutrality to which the employee must adhere in the discharge of his duties.

The most effective means of preventing political activity by civil service employees is to prohibit their making any political contribution. Such a prohibition is embodied in the New York City Charter and in some other laws.[27]

The principal limitations upon political activity fall into four groups: (1) those prohibiting the solicitation of campaign contributions or party funds and the holding of office in party organizations; (2) those prohibiting campaign activity; (3) those dealing with political candidature; and (4) limitations on the right to organize and the use of organized pressure to further the interests of the membership, particularly in association with a partisan group. There are some additional restrictions on political activity in certain jurisdictions, such as the provision in the Pennsylvania law which prohibits a civil servant from being within fifty feet of a polling place on election day, except on official duties, or for the purpose of expeditiously casting his own vote, or for "ordinary travel or residence

[27] National Civil Service League and National Municipal League, *A Model State Civil Service Law*, 1953, pp. 22–23.

during the period of time beginning with one hour preceding the opening of the polls for holding such election and ending with the time when the election officers shall have finished counting the votes and have left the polling places for the purpose of depositing the election material."[28] In general, however, the more usual provisions can be discussed under one or another of the above heads, and the more important are dealt with here.

1. Campaign Contributions. In many jurisdictions under a merit law civil servants are definitely prohibited from soliciting contributions for political purposes and are in turn legally protected from the necessity of contributing for such purposes. In this connection a section of the Wisconsin law may be quoted, although almost any other civil service law in the United States would serve as well for purposes of illustration. The Wisconsin law reads as follows: "No person holding a position in the classified civil service shall directly or indirectly solicit or receive or be in any manner concerned with soliciting or receiving any assistance or subscriptions or contributions for any political party or any political purpose whatsoever. No person shall orally or by letter solicit or be in any manner concerned in soliciting any assistance, subscription or support for any political party or purpose whatsoever from any person holding any position in the classified civil service."[29]

Such provisions as these are definitely aimed at maintaining the impartiality of the service and protecting the officials from exploitation at the hands of superior officers or party leaders. Unfortunately, they are often disregarded in the United States, particularly in the municipal services. Some years ago in a survey of a number of the larger cities of the country supposedly under the merit system, evidence was found of a firmly entrenched assessment system, under which a flat percentage of the employee's salary was assessed against him for the support of the party in power. So long as such conditions exist in municipal employment, the development of a civil service devoted to the highest ideals of community and public service is retarded. If limitations upon political activity are to be continued, they must be impartially enforced. A rule openly disregarded is worse than none at all.

2. Campaign Activity. The policy which governs the political activities of Federal civil servants in this respect has served as a model for most of the lesser jurisdictions. It provides: "No person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, shall use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. No person occupying a position in the competitive service shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, except as may be provided by or

[28] Civil Service Act, Art. IX, sec. 904.
[29] Wisconsin *Statutes* (1931), 16.30.

pursuant to statute. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on all political subjects and candidates."[30]

This policy received statutory embodiment in the Hatch acts of 1939 and 1940. The first of these extended the prohibition of political activity to all Federal employees, whether in the competitive service or not, except officers and employees of the legislative and judicial branches and policy-determining officers appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The second Hatch Act (1940) extended a similar rule to some 2,600,000 state and municipal employees compensated in part from Federal funds. Thus, the device of the grant-in-aid, successfully employed as a means of improving state personnel practices in the case of the Social Security Act, has also been directed to the curtailment of the political activities of many state and local employees.

Both the civil service rule and the Hatch Act cover a wide range of political activities, among which are: (a) candidacy or service as a delegate to any political convention; (b) service on any political party committee or as a party officer; (c) organization or conduct of political rallies; (d) delivery of political speeches; (e) solicitation of campaign contributions or getting out votes; (f) publication of any statement for or against any candidate, party, or faction; (g) organization of or leading participation in political parades; (h) distribution of political campaign literature; and (i) partisan candidacy for public office (discussed below).[31]

3. Political Candidature. In the United States political candidatures are regarded as incompatible with the status of civil servants. The laws in this respect are more stringent than those of almost any other country and represent, in part at least, a reaction from the excesses of the spoils system.

There are several arguments in favor of denying to the competitive civil servant the right to run for elective office. First and foremost, perhaps, is the objective of the impartiality of the public service. It is felt that the civil servant who strives for political office not only divests himself of the cloak of impartiality in the eyes of the public but will actually find it difficult to behave impartially when he later returns to the service. A second valid argument against the harmonization of civil service status and political officeholding lies in the difficulty of determining the status of the employee when he is reinstated at the expiration of his term of office. To these and similar arguments the answer is sometimes made that the civil servant is primarily a citizen and secondarily a governmental em-

[30] *Federal Personnel Manual*, Civil Service Rule IV, sec. 04.1, p. Z1-213. The detailed discussion of the application of this rule is contained in Chap. C2.

[31] See *ibid.*, Chap. C2. For a good general discussion consult H. Eliot Kaplan, "Political Privileges in Public Office," *Personnel Administration*, November, 1939, pp. 6–9. For a recent survey of political activity regulation in 102 cities and states, see Richard Christopherson, *Regulating Political Activities of Public Employees*, Civil Service Assembly Personnel Report No. 548 (Chicago: 1954).

ployee, and that he should have the right to take as active a part in shaping the policies of the nation as any other citizen. However, as in the Federal service, candidature is ordinarily limited to nonpartisan posts, as on school boards, where service in the post will not interfere with the employee's regular duties.

Restrictions upon political candidature exist also in Great Britain, France, Germany, and other nations. However, they are usually less sweeping than those found in the United States.

4. Political Activities of Organized Civil Servants. In addition to restrictions upon political activities, the civil rights of public employees also frequently differ from those of other citizens in respect to the right of association and collective action. Although this question was considered at some length earlier,[32] it is appropriately referred to at this point. The general rule in the United States is that "what a civil servant is not permitted to do as an individual, he may not do by indirection as a member of an association."[33] Thus, organizations of Federal employees or their representatives, even when such representatives are not themselves civil servants, are theoretically barred from political activity. In practice, however, it has proved much more difficult to control such organizational activity than that of individuals, and public employee organizations have in fact engaged in political activity to further the ends of their membership.

Beyond the general principle laid down above, there are frequently specific limitations bearing upon the right of associations of public employees to affiliate with other organizations, such as labor federations, and the right of such associations or their members to take certain types of collective action, such as mass resignations or strikes. These restrictions are discussed in detail at another point. Suffice it to say here that they arise out of the duality of the State as sovereign and as employer.

A recent surveyor concludes that among states and municipalities there is still great divergence in degrees of restrictiveness or liberality on political activities. He concludes that any model on this subject should draw distinctions especially among the following: between partisan and nonpartisan activities, between activity on the job and activity off the job, and between standards covering candidacies and those covering issues.[34] Here lies a fruitful field for research and experimentation.

SUMMARY

In these fateful days, it is dangerous for any significant group of citizens to stand aloof from the functioning of the party system through which our democracy works. It has, therefore, been the contention of the writer that

[32] See Chapter 12.

[33] Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., *Government by Merit*, Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel (New York: 1935), p. 238.

[34] Christopherson, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

while we keep partisan politics out of the civil service we must work toward the day when citizens who are also civil servants can return to limited political responsibilities after duty hours.

This restored freedom should not include the freedom to support totalitarian movements designed to destroy the Republic or to suppress constitutional liberties. It should, however, encompass the traditional right of any American to defend the *status quo* or to advocate far-reaching changes and unorthodox ideas as long as he does not advocate the use of unconstitutional means to achieve the ends. Pursuant to these principles, existing loyalty programs at various levels of government should insure that national security is safeguarded without causing civil servants to lose that confidence in the fairness of their government, that faith in justice, that courage of conviction, and that independence of spirit which set apart the servants of a free people from the servile tools of dictatorships.

19

Discipline, Removal, and Appeals

No organization is so perfect, no executive so ingenious, no personnel system so infallible that any of them can continuously avoid some measures of punishment for wrongful behavior or poor performance of employees. The purpose of this chapter is to lay down a few points of definition, give a brief assessment of practices, and outline a few precautions and principles.

A. THE FORMS OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION

The penalties meted out by the State-employer for the violation of duties by its employees cover a considerable range and vary widely in severity. The more usual forms of punishment are warning or reprimand, reassignment of duties, demerits or reductions in efficiency ratings, loss of seniority rights, suspension without pay, demotion, dismissal, and dismissal with continuing disability. Not all of these are customarily resorted to in a single jurisdiction, and only reprimand, suspension, and dismissal are extensively employed. However, on occasion, each of the other enumerated forms has been used.

The warning or reprimand is, of course, the least severe penalty. Moreover, in the majority of instances a reprimand may prove sufficient. In the handling of disciplinary cases of this type the department head or personnel manager has the opportunity to prove his insight. Cases which might otherwise become extreme may be "nipped in the bud" by proper handling of the warning or reprimand. Frequently the employee can be sent back to his work with a new perspective and a new feeling of loyalty toward the service if the disciplinary officer has struck the right note. The personal contact occasioned by the informal oral reprimand presents an opportunity for constructive, positive influence which the successful administrator does not overlook.[1]

A second mild form of punishment is reassignment to less desirable

[1] For some of the techniques involved consult Lewis Merian, *Public Personnel Problems from the Standpoint of the Operating Officer* (Washington: 1938), Chap. 9; and *Municipal Personnel Administration*, International City Managers' Association (Chicago: 1947), Chap. 10.

duties. This is frequently resorted to in the case of policemen, field workers, and others who can be moved about without disrupting the services concerned. It may be effective, though if continually employed in a single case it may break the spirit of the employee. Unless disciplinary action has a constructive effect, it is abortive from the standpoint of the employer and vicious from that of the employee. Moreover, assignments should be based on fitness, not unfitness.

A penalty which results in demerits or in reductions from the performance rating of the employee may be more severe, since it may seriously retard his progress toward a better position. As ratings are employed in the public service today, such disciplinary action is rare. In most cases, however, any breach of duty is recorded on the service record of the employee and taken into consideration at the time of possible promotion. Loss of seniority rights may constitute the penalty in certain instances. This is a lesser penalty, although in the case of an employee who has served a considerable period of time in a service where promotions are based largely upon seniority it may have serious consequences.

The practice of imposing fines has almost disappeared in the civil service of the United States for two principal reasons. In the first place, it has become generally recognized that a money penalty directly injures others than the employee himself—his family and dependents. In the second place, there is a general feeling that penalties of this sort are incompatible with the dignity of government service. Where the imposition of fines has been employed for disciplinary purposes, it has been customary to turn the money so collected into the general pension fund or some similar one accumulated for the benefit of the employees.

One of the most common forms of punishment is suspension without pay. In many jurisdictions this is the most extreme penalty that can be imposed by an administrative officer without the possibility of reversal by the commission or some other authority. Since an indefinite suspension might amount to a dismissal, it is customary to limit the length of the period for which an employee may be suspended.[2] In most state and local jurisdictions in the United States the limit is thirty days.[3] Since the average civil servant can ill afford to forgo his salary for even as much as a month, a shorter period would seem to be indicated, unless suspension without pay is imposed as a means of easing the offender out of the service. In that case, outright dismissal would be more honest.

[2] In the Federal service the right of the employee to appeal against a suspension rests upon the legality of the action rather than the length of time involved. In the case of those entitled to veteran preference, however, a distinction is made between suspensions for less than and for more than thirty days. In general, only the latter are appealable in the absence of *prima facie* evidence of illegal action by the appointing authority. See *Federal Personnel Manual*, Chap. Z1, Parts 9 and 22.

[3] E.g., Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Maryland.

Demotion with a reduction in pay is a more severe penalty than suspension and is infrequently resorted to for disciplinary purposes in this country. The employee who suffers a demotion is subjected to a continuing penalty, since his monthly earnings are permanently less than before action was taken. In addition, the stigma is greater, and the new duties to which he is assigned may be less agreeable. Demotion for disciplinary purposes is a penalty to be used with caution, as it almost invariably results in breaking the spirit and lowering the morale of the employee. Under such circumstances outright dismissal may be preferable as the penalty for serious breaches of duty.

Dismissal or removal from the service is the most extreme penalty.[4] It results not only in loss of income and status but usually in the loss of pension privileges as well. Removal may be made with or without continuing disability so far as reëntrance into the service is concerned. That is, an employee not only may be dismissed but may be prevented from seeking reëmployment in any branch of the service for a specified period of time or forever. This type of continuing penalty is, of course, more severe than simple removal.

Some idea of the relative frequency with which suspension, demotion, and dismissal are employed may be gathered from Table 9, which includes the figures for a number of representative jurisdictions. No statistics are

TABLE 9. Forms of Disciplinary Action (Calendar Year 1954 or Nearest Fiscal Year)

Jurisdiction	Employees	Suspensions	Demotions	Dismissals
Alabama	8,650	—	—	72
California	51,211	304	5	136
Los Angeles County	30,000	—	—	63
Fulton County, Ga.	1,200	4	5	3
Ramsey County, Minn.	1,387	1	—	5
Dayton, Ohio	2,375	103	13	102
Grand Rapids, Mich.	1,353	—	—	31
New Orleans, La.	7,050	—	—	62
Rockford, Ill.	590	4	4	0
Toledo, Ohio	2,237	17	13	5

SOURCE: *Annual Reports* of jurisdictions listed, by courtesy of Robert J. Batson of the Civil Service Assembly.

available, as a rule, on the less drastic disciplinary actions such as reprimand and reassignment of duties. As a result, it is impossible to compare the frequency of these penalties with that of the more severe varieties. A glance at Table 9, however, reveals that suspension, where reported, is

[4] The term "discharge" is often employed for involuntary separation from the service when no disciplinary element is involved. For example, removals for purposes of retrenchment would be termed discharges. In the Federal service they are called reductions in force.

resorted to somewhat more frequently than dismissal. Dismissal, however, is used more often than demotion. It is also apparent that reasonable use is made of these more severe disciplinary measures.

More extensive data are available with regard to the ultimate penalty, dismissal. As the result of a nation-wide study conducted by Barbara Brattin for the Civil Service Assembly, the pattern has been revealed for 111 state and local agencies for 1946.[5] An annual dismissal rate of 1.3 percent is indicated. Additional verification is produced for the oft-told story of failure to take advantage of the greater administrative discretion which is generally permitted during the probationary period.

B. SIGNIFICANCE OF REMOVALS

It is common to accuse public services in this country of pampering the civil servant with unwarranted protections against dismissal. In fact, in the minds of some uninformed persons a "civil service job" is tantamount to a lifetime guarantee of employment. Analysis in the next chapter of typical tenure provisions should leave no doubt that such assumptions are based on pure myth. Few jurisdictions do not have adequate provision for for forced separation when the work situation demands it. If not enough workers are fired, it is probably for reasons other than the merit system.

Dismissals for unsatisfactory performance or conduct constitute an element of the employment situation common to most enterprises. In practically all fields of work it is customary to expect summary action in the case of flagrant misconduct, such as drunkenness or theft. And this swift and definite action is just as likely in a governmental jurisdiction under a merit system as it is in private organizations or in public units not under a merit law.

The more usual phenomenon, however, is the similarity of action or inaction in cases where unsatisfactory performance is not dramatic or flagrant. There is a natural human reluctance to "fire" an employee, no matter what the enterprise or the degree of "tenure."

General statistics on "firings" in private business are not available, but there is every reason to believe that the 1.1 percent annual proportion of separations for adverse cause in the Federal service (21,626 in the fiscal year 1954 and 13,545 in 1955)[6] is probably exceeded only in certain categories of private employment such as manufacturing. Bear in mind, too, the more exacting methods of initial selection in public service, which should reduce expectancy for removal.

The popular notion that "civil service" rules mitigate seriously against

[5] Barbara Brattin, "The Dismissal Pattern in the Public Service," *Public Personnel Review*, October, 1947, pp. 211–215. The entire article will repay careful reading.

[6] It was slightly higher in the calendar year 1952, numbering 23,606; in fiscal year 1953 it was 20,299.

dismissals of the incompetent in the government is one of the political myths of our time. The fact is that, where removals that should take place do not occur, the cause is primarily the same as that in business—the natural reluctance of supervisors and executives to take positive and drastic action, especially when there may be some dispute over its justification.

Firing is a distasteful business in any organization. Even seasoned executives, with conspicuous exceptions to be sure, shrink from it and try every device possible to avoid it. It has been the author's experience that the public service has no monopoly on this reluctance. Such practices as "kicking a man upstairs," "palming off" a poor employee on another division, and overlooking the faults of a long-time worker are quite common in industry.

Reluctance to fire stems partially from unwillingness to hurt people severely for what may be easily rationalized as minor human failings, and partially from unwillingness to face up to the consequences of drastic action whether it be facing a protesting union official, an irate Congressman, or the requirements of a merit system.

C. EXECUTIVE RESPONSIBILITY

As we have already seen, the battle against spoils early became merged with hostility toward politics and politicians generally. Since executives are still selected or elected by political means in most jurisdictions, it has been an easy transition to confuse civil service reform with restrictions on the executive. This is one of the features of American administrations which astonish foreign students as they perceive that the division of powers is more than threefold. To an increasing extent, however, it is being realized that a mature citizenry should turn from the old, negative, mechanical safeguards to positive means of selecting a capable executive, giving him the necessary control over the agencies through which the people's will is to be carried out, and holding him accountable and his subordinates accountable *through him* for the administration of popular decisions. As the first Hoover Commission has well expressed it:

> The President, and under him his chief lieutenants, the department heads, must be held responsible and accountable to the people and the Congress for the conduct of the executive branch.
>
> Responsibility and accountability are impossible without authority—the power to direct. The exercise of authority is impossible without a clear line of command from the top to the bottom, and a return line of responsibility and accountability from the bottom to the top.[7]

The significance of this principle to location of disciplinary authority, along with other phases of personnel management, has been indicated by a state-

[7] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *General Management of the Executive Branch*, A Report to the Congress (Washington: February, 1949), p. 1.

ment of the Executive Director of the National Civil Service League: "It is time that we pass, if and when it is possible, to a new phase of political sophistication, with the realization that we may not be able to make permanent progress toward better personnel administration until we can learn to hold our political leaders responsible on exactly that issue."[8]

Nevertheless, debates still continue as to the agency which should be responsible for disciplinary action in the first instance. The authority may be placed in the appointing officer, the departmental personnel officer, the departmental personnel board where such exists, a special disciplinary tribunal, or the central personnel agency itself. The preferability of any one of these depends somewhat upon circumstances. However, a few general principles governing the choice of the agency merit consideration before we proceed to an analysis of the advantages or disadvantages of any particular one.

In the first place, disciplinary control is effective only if it is firmly, promptly, and consistently exercised. It has come to be widely recognized that from the standpoint of control the certainty of punishment for a breach of duty is more important than the severity of the punishment. In the choice of the agency, attention may be concentrated upon the objective of a firm and prompt exercise of power while the possibility of the abuse of such authority is minimized through a well-constituted disciplinary code including provision for appeals from the original action.

The weight of authoritative opinion is overwhelmingly in favor of the single individual as opposed to a board wherever vigorous and decisive action is desired. In most cases, therefore, it is desirable that original disciplinary authority be placed in the hands of one man, logically the department or bureau head. In large organizations, such as those of the Federal Government, it is desirable that the bureau or section chief should be the one vested with this authority, since it is he, rather than the department head, who is intimately and immediately acquainted with the work of the employees under him. At present, final responsibility for disciplinary action in the Federal service lies with the department head in Washington, but it may be delegated by him to other officials.[9]

Throughout the United States, original authority in disciplinary cases has been, with few exceptions, placed in the hands of the department head. Since in any satisfactory administrative setup he is responsible for the efficiency and conduct of his own department, this arrangement would appear to be the logical one. A notable exception is to be found in the city of Chicago, under which the appointing officer possesses no disciplinary authority beyond the power to suspend the employee and file charges

[8] James R. Watson, "The Hoover Commission Report on Personnel Management," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1949, p. 132.

[9] P.L. 600 (August 2, 1946), sec. 12.

against him with the civil service commission. The commission then sits as a trial board and determines the penalty.[10]

In many respects the Chicago arrangement is similar to the disciplinary councils set up under the Republic in France, as a protection against the exercise of disciplinary powers in an arbitrary manner. Under the French system, however, the tribunals were departmental or service boards, rather than being constituted from the personnel agency. Their membership consisted of representatives appointed by the minister, members selected by the various staff groups, and certain ex-officio members, including the administrative head of the office concerned.[11] The disciplinary council operated as a trial board, the accused usually appearing before it and both sides presenting witnesses and evidence. The penalty to be inflicted was determined by a unanimous vote of the board, which required also the approval of the minister. The latter was given as a matter of course.

Opinions vary as to the success of any of these board schemes. It is argued, on the one hand, that the designation of the commission or some special board as a disciplinary agency results in more rigorous exercise of authority, since it "relieves the administrative officer of the burden of ordering . . . removals, putting him merely in the position of a complainant, while the onus of the final decision rests upon the trial board." On the other hand, there can be little doubt that such a system is less certain and much slower than that in which responsibility is placed upon a single administrative official. A leading student of the French civil service has said, in regard to the *conseil de discipline:* ". . . when it comes to dealing with the more common human attributes of laziness, indifference, lack of courtesy, and so on, the system of bi-partite councils appears to be too cumbersome and difficult for effective application. Everywhere conscientious supervisory officials complain that the system does not meet the daily needs of office organization. Only after the gravest provocation is an employee ever dismissed; and the fact that he knows only too well how much trouble his chief will be put to in submitting his chronic sins of omission to a *conseil de discipline* is an invitation for him to make them increasingly chronic."[12]

If it is conceded that disciplinary action should be taken promptly and vigorously in the first instance, even at the risk of an arbitrary application

[10] Under the system employed in the Milwaukee County service, the final disciplinary authority of the appointing officer is limited to suspension. Beyond that, he files charges with the commission, which holds a hearing and determines the penalty. There has been some tendency in recent years toward the trial broad as a disciplinary agency, particularly in the case of police and firemen. See William C. Beyer, "Municipal Civil Service in the United States," in *Problems of the American Public Service,* Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel (New York: 1935), p. 132.

[11] Walter R. Sharp, *The French Civil Service* (New York: 1931), has an excellent discussion of the French *conseil de discipline.*

[12] *Ibid.,* pp. 293 f.

of power, there would appear to be little doubt that the weight of the argument favors vesting authority for discipline in the administrative officer who is responsible for the work of the employee involved. This feeling has generally characterized the development of American administrative practice. It has already been indicated that the usual American setup allows the department head to suspend an employee up to thirty days, more frequently than not without even the necessity of filing charges against him. When it comes to the question of removals, the law often affords the employee somewhat more protection against arbitrary action by providing that the department head shall file written charges against him with the civil service commission. In most cases the employee is given an opportunity to answer the charges in writing; occasionally he is not.[13]

Even where this provision is included, it does not operate to restrict the legitimate exercise of authority by the appointing officer in any way. The doctrine is firmly established in the United States that the power to appoint normally carries with it the power to remove.[14]

In the Federal competitive service removals are governed by the Lloyd–La Follette Act, which, in its general provisions, has served as a model for many jurisdictions. It provides:

> No person in the classified civil service of the United States shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him, and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally answering the same in writing; and affidavits in support thereof; but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer making the removal; and copies of charges, notice of hearing, answer, reasons for removal, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office, as shall also the reasons for reduction in rank or compensation; and copies of the same shall be furnished to the person affected upon request, and the Commission also shall, upon request, be furnished copies of the same.
>
> In making removals or reductions, and in other punishments, like penalties

[13] On the subject of procedural requirements of notice, hearing, and the like see Oliver P. Field, *Civil Service Law* (Minneapolis: 1939), Chap. 10.

[14] Ordinarily the courts have no jurisdiction to review the action of an appointing officer in removing an employee. An employee's fitness is a matter of judgment to be determined by the department head, so far as the Federal service is concerned; *Taylor* v. *Taft, Secretary of War*, 24 App., D.C., 95 (1904). Moreover, the power to appoint ordinarily carries with it the power to remove; *Myers* v. *U.S.*, 272 U.S. 52 (1926). The doctrine in the Myers case was somewhat modified, not to say confused, in the so-called Humphrey case, *Rathbun* v. *U.S.*, 295 U.S. 602 (1933). In this instance the court distinguished between purely administrative officials and those performing quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial duties. Congress may, apparently, impose restrictions upon the power of the chief executive to remove officials of the latter sort.

shall be imposed for like offenses, and no discrimination shall be exercised for political or religious reasons.[15]

This statute is the basis of Federal disciplinary action so far as the competitive service is concerned. It should be noted that, except in matters of procedure, it places no restrictions upon the exercise of disciplinary authority unless religious or political discrimination is involved.[16] This is in line with the conviction of early civil service reformers that the back door should be kept open.

D. APPEALS

We have discussed in Chapter 11 the need for grievance procedures in every modern organization. When grievances or objections by employees grow out of disciplinary measures initiated by management, the filing of a grievance is in effect an appeal.

Most jurisdictions provide employees an opportunity to have an appeal —or at least a hearing—particularly against such drastic action as removal. Where a service is politics ridden, the legal right to notice and hearing may offer the employee only the shadow of protection against arbitrary action. But in a well-run merit system appeal rights are generally meaningful and do act as a brake on hasty, ill-conceived decisions.

Unwillingness to resort to disciplinary action in the interest of raising standards is encountered in many jurisdictions. Sometimes this is the result of ignorance on the part of appointing officers of their powers in this respect. The author has encountered many officials, both in Washington and in other areas operating under a similar law, who believed their hands tied when they were in fact free. Moreover, there is widespread ignorance of the fact that, in general, appeals systems have resulted more often in the upholding than in the undermining of the authority of removing officers.

Appeals are customarily heard by a multiple body—often of three persons—which is established by statute or which is appointed *ad hoc* by the head of the department. Frequently, one member is elected by employees or, in the case of *ad hoc* boards or committees, is selected by the appellant. An *ad hoc* hearing panel may select its own chairman by joint agreement of the management representative and the employee representative. Occasionally, representation of the general public is required on appeal boards.

Whatever their constitution, these appellate bodies usually follow informal procedures—rather than the processes of a court of law—and their decisions are ordinarily advisory rather than binding on the department head. Where they are set up to make final determinations, they take on the

[15] Act of August 24, 1912, 37 *Stat.* 555.

[16] Special protection is given those enjoying veteran preference. See particularly *Federal Personnel Manual*, Chap. Z1, Part 22.

characteristics of an administrative court. However, true appeal boards are distinguished from the French-type "trial boards" in that the former are invoked only at the behest of the employee *after* disciplinary action, whereas the latter are the instrument by which the initial action itself is decided on and taken.

In some places a permanent general appeal committee is established in the central personnel agency to hear various kinds of appeals, including those growing out of disciplinary measures. For example, the permanent Board of Appeals and Review in the U.S. Civil Service Commission acts on appeals of applicants from examination ratings, hears special appeals alleging prejudicial action involving political or religious favoritism, and handles all the appeal cases involving adverse action against veterans, as provided by the Veteran Preference Act. Some of these cases can be appealed to the Civil Service Commissioners themselves. A completely separate enforcement system—outside the Civil Service Commission—is set up partly for the review of employee complaints of supervisory discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin.[17] This situation probably reflects the unusual sensitiveness of the Federal Government, and of its political heads at any one time, to the Negro rights issue in national politics.

SUMMARY

The conduct of a civil servant while on duty should be according to a generally accepted and clearly defined code of ethics and behavior. Adherence to high standards, however, is the result of all the forces which create morale, self-discipline, and efficiency rather than of the formal techniques of compulsion. In the well-developed public service, men and women are led—not driven.

Nevertheless, there will be occasion in even the best of administrative worlds when resort must be had to punitive measures. In the enforcement of discipline, the executive should enjoy authority commensurate with responsibility. His discretion should be limited only by a few basic legal provisions and policies which are safeguards against arbitrary procedure and punishment without just cause being duly shown. Although it is desirable to provide for administrative review of the actions of supervisors, the final decision of an appointing authority should be subject to reversal on appeal only where there has been a violation of fundamental principles and rights.

[17] Executive Order 10,590, approved January 18, 1955. A government-wide committee under this order seeks to prevent discriminatory employment practices and renders advice to agencies on cases.

PART VI

Separation

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

—Henry Wadsworth Longfellow

20

Tenure and Turnover

The desire to be sure, to be protected, to find equanimity, to fulfill one's desires—in short, to be secure—is not the peculiar malaise of those who work for public authorities and draw their income from tax revenues. It is a basic human instinct so to organize one's life as to reduce to a minimum the conflicts, the stresses, the risks, the uncertainties that create threats or do harm to our mental, spiritual, or physical welfare. Indeed, we continually strive to organize ourselves so that life contributes *positively* to these needs. The only difference between the civil servant and the businessman in this respect is his standard of values—the goals he sets for himself and therefore the method necessary to achieve them. Both seek security in one form or another.[1]

In fact, this inherent, pervasive meaning of security is universal; for the quest for security is found in all stages and walks of life. Is it not being sought by the primitive hunter, stalking game and storing provisions? By the entrepreneur, inaugurating and consolidating a new enterprise? By employee unions, seeking an annual wage or stability of employment? By big business, promoting diversity of markets and adequate volume to assure continuity? By a nation, legislating in behalf of the aged, war veterans, and the physically handicapped, or negotiating for international understanding and mutual aid, or training a military force? By the politician, "mending his fences"? By the worker, probing the work plans and intentions of his boss?

Security of tenure in the public service must be viewed in the context of this universal quest for security. If we narrow our application of the term to employment, the problem of security in the public service is seen to differ from that in private industry only in the need to deal with the peculiar threats to security in governmental organizations—principally the danger

[1] The first part of this chapter draws heavily on the author's paper "Security of Tenure—Career or Sinecure?" in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March, 1954. Permission has been granted by the Academy.

of making employment contingent upon factors other than the performance of the worker.

Meeting this danger was precisely the aim of the "security of tenure" espoused by the early civil service reformers and implied in the tradition of "merit system" laws. Its counterparts in private employment are such practices as an understanding between worker and owner in small organizations, closed-shop or union-shop clauses in union contracts, other negotiated agreements between management and labor, or even the social pressure on employers (especially in smaller communities) against capricious "firings." Its counterparts in general economic affairs are found in price supports on agricultural products, in the "fair rate of return" concept for public utility regulation, in various tax exemptions or adjustments geared to corporate health, and, anomalously, both in protective tariffs and in reciprocal trade agreements.

I. THE NATURE OF TENURE

Before discussing turnover and the effects of security of tenure in modern bureaucracy, it is well to review briefly what the so-called tenure provisions are like in the public service. A fair picture may be obtained by examining the Federal situation, some of the larger and older state merit systems, and the teacher tenure laws.

A. FEDERAL TENURE

The emphasis in the Federal merit system is much heavier on the selection process than on the dismissal process. The only provision of the Federal Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883 relating to removals is the injunction "that no person in the public service is . . . under any obligations to contribute to any political fund, or to render any political service, and that he will not be removed or otherwise prejudiced for refusing to do so."[2]

More detailed but still very broad is the basic removal provision of the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912,[3] which limits removals to causes that "promote the efficiency of the service" and requires reasons given in writing.

Civil Service Regulations stipulate a positive requirement that Federal agencies "shall remove, demote, or reassign to another position any employee in the competitive service whose conduct or capacity is such that his removal, demotion, or reassignment will promote the efficiency of the service."[4] The regulation on removals goes on to require special notice of reasons and consideration of the employee's reply, as well as the following:

"Discrimination shall not be exercised in removals, suspensions or demotions because of an employee's religious opinions or affiliations, or because

[2] *22 U.S. Stat.* 403, sec. 2.

[3] *5 U.S. Code* 652, August 24, 1912, as amended by P.L. 623, 80th Cong.

[4] *Civil Service Rules and Regulations*, sec. 9.101(a).

of his marital status or race, or (except as may be required by law) because of his political opinions or affiliations."[5]

The United States courts have, with minor exceptions, sustained the authority of the executive branch to remove career civil servants without judicial review.

Apart from the details of removal procedure and the stronger protection afforded veterans in the way of special appeal rights to the Civil Service Commission,[6] the foregoing constitute the essence of tenure provisions in the Federal civil service.

B. STATE CIVIL SERVICE TENURE

Although veterans alone enjoy statutory appeal rights in the Federal service, hearings are commonly provided by law for all merit system employees in state jurisdictions who are threatened with dismissal. For example, among five of the states that have had strong and well-administered merit laws for almost as long a time as the Federal Government—New York, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Illinois, and California—each one has in its basic statute a guarantee of a hearing before its civil service commission or board in the case of removals.

The basis for removal, however, is usually as broad in the states as it is in the Federal civil service. The Massachusetts law carries the usual limitation of no removal of a career employee "except for just cause and for reasons specifically given him in writing."[7] New York is somewhat more specific, defining the conditions of removal as "incompetency or misconduct."[8] Illinois has the most general provision, using only the phrase "except for cause" in its limitation on removal.[9] Wisconsin elaborates to the extent of requiring "just cause, which shall not be religious or political."[10] California's law simply provides: "The tenure of every permanent employee holding a position is during good behavior."[11] This statute and that of Massachusetts are the only ones among these five outstanding states that use the word "tenure." The Massachusetts and New York provisions on removal extend to counties and cities in those states as well as to the respective state services.

It is evident from this significant sampling that any difficulty in separating inefficient employees from civil service jurisdictions is not likely to be

[5] Secs. 9.102 and 9.101(b)(2).

[6] Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944, 58 *U.S. Stat.* 387. This act requires thirty days' advance notice of removal to any career veteran (except in criminal cases) and gives him the right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission, which has authority to compel corrective action by the agency if it sustains his appeal.

[7] General Laws of Massachusetts, c. 31, 43(a), as amended (1949).

[8] State of New York, Laws of 1909, c. 15, sec. 22(2), as amended (1950).

[9] Illinois Revised Statutes, c. 24½, sec. 12 (1951).

[10] State of Wisconsin, Civil Service Law, sec. 16.24 (1950).

[11] California, Statutes of 1945, c. 123, tit. 2, pt. 2, c. 8, art. 1, sec. 19500.

due to the basic statutes establishing the principle of security of tenure for employees selected on merit. It is difficult to conceive how the laws might have been worded more broadly or have left more discretion to administrative authorities and still have provided some reasonable assurance that dismissals could not take place arbitrarily or for prejudicial or capricious reasons.

C. TEACHER TENURE

An area of public service in which tenure has asserted itself strongly is in the public schools. Over the long road to recognition of their occupation as a profession, and as protection against favoritism and patronage, organized teachers have succeeded in promoting tenure laws in most states, many of them being very restrictive in the conditions under which termination of employment may occur.

In 1930 only five states had tenure laws of general application and seven had state or local laws in limited areas. By 1950 there were general statewide tenure laws in thirty-three states, five others having state or local laws of limited application.

Under most tenure laws a school board is required to consider the competence of teachers very carefully during a probationary period, usually three years in length, and to grant tenure status only where justified by their performance. The degree to which this probationary scrutiny is conscientiously handled by school administrators is the degree to which the restrictions on dismissals make sense. Loose entry via the probationary process makes a tight tenure law an anomaly by protecting the incompetent along with the competent.

Teacher tenure laws differ from general civil service laws principally in that their procedure on dismissal is more specific and usually more restrictive. The most common dismissal provision of civil service laws, as we have seen, is that the merit employee may not be removed without notice or for political or religious reasons, and that he is entitled to a hearing by the merit system agency. The National Education Association states as an *essential* of a good teacher tenure law not only sufficient notice and a right to a hearing (commonly provided by regulation where not by statute so far as general public servants are concerned) but also, as the really distinguishing feature, "the right to appeal from the decision of the school board to a tenure board, a higher educational authority, or the courts."[12]

This writer is well aware of the hazards of leaving final dismissal authority in the hands of local school boards. The caliber of school board members in many jurisdictions leaves much to be desired. However, appeal to a higher level in the state school system should provide adequate recourse for

[12] *Teacher Tenure*, National Education Association, Discussion Pamphlet No. 1 (Washington: May, 1950).

the aggrieved teacher. Appeal to the courts is out of place in the making of such essentially administrative decisions as those affecting personnel.

On the whole, there is more similarity than difference between civil service and teacher tenure laws.

II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF TURNOVER

Regardless of the degree of job security provided, turnover of personnel occurs in all large organizations. A continuous check on turnover constitutes one of the most valuable of all management tools. Turnover data often provide dependable leads to weaknesses in employment practices and policies, a fact long recognized by private employers. Although some public employment officers have manifested an interest in the problem, the majority publish no records and have taken no steps in the direction either of an analysis of separations and turnover or of their control.

Labor turnover is the "shift and replacement of personnel, incident to its maintenance."[13] Broadly speaking, it is of significance in two directions. On the one hand, it signifies those aspects of the mobility of personnel, previously discussed, which depend in the last analysis upon the rate at which employees move in and out of the organization. It is apparent, for example, that the possibilities of promotion depend ultimately upon the rate of separation from the service. Thus, the annual ratio of deaths, retirements, dismissals, and resignations to the total number of positions in a service is one factor which throws light upon the attractiveness of that service.

On the other hand, a high rate of turnover is not only a danger signal, indicating serious shortcomings in the employment situation, but also a source of considerable expense, much of which could be saved through proper management.[14] In times of normal industrial activity the cost of labor turnover to private industry in the United States runs into billions of dollars. The task of management, then, is to avoid the Scylla of a stagnant service while steering clear of the Charybdis of inordinate instability. This is not an easy task. It implies constant effort to improve methods of recruitment, selection, and placement, so that workers are well adjusted at the outset; it necessitates careful consideration of the policies in regard to compensation, promotion, transfer, and removal, and attention to working

[13] Paul F. Brissenden, "Labor Turnover in the Federal Service," *Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, Personnel Classification Board (Washington: 1929), p. 320. This is a generally accepted definition. Lloyd R. Miller says, "The condition involved in the hiring, loss, and replacement of a company's working force is known as labor turnover."—"Labor Turnover," in W. J. Donald (ed.), *Handbook of Business Administration* (New York: 1931), p. 1110.

[14] "High labor turnover is correlated with poor service, high accident rate, low morale, and and increased overhead costs. That commercial concerns everywhere have made active efforts to reduce labor turnover attests to its economic importance."—Herman Feldman, *A Personnel Program for the Federal Civil Service*, 71st Cong., 3rd sess., House Doc. No. 773 (Washington: 1931), p. 194.

conditions in general. But the initial steps in dealing with the turnover problem are to record the facts and analyze the factors leading to separations, whether of a voluntary or an involuntary sort.

At the outset, it should be remembered that employment is terminated by a number of means and that tenure depends upon a combination of their various rates. Thus, employment may end with death or with retirement. The latter, in turn, may be the result of disability or of the fact that the employee has reached either the permissive or the compulsory retirement age.[15] The rates of separation owing to death or superannuation will, of course, depend in great part upon the proportion of older employees in the establishment or service, a factor which depends in turn upon (1) the conditions of recruitment and (2) the age of the department or service concerned. Turnover from these causes may be expected to be slight in newly organized agencies. On the other hand, the rates of separation due to disability retirement may reflect unsatisfactory working conditions.

Employment also may be terminated by voluntary separation or resignation. In this instance the initiative is taken by the employee for any one of scores of reasons, some of the more common of which are discussed at other points in this chapter. The separation rate resulting from "quits" or resignations is especially significant as an index to the relative satisfactoriness of employment conditions in the particular service as compared with employment conditions generally for the type of employee involved.

Finally, employment may be terminated upon the initiative of the employer. In this case the separation is either a layoff or a discharge.[16] Layoffs may be made when, for reasons of economy or because of contraction in a particular function, a reduction in staff becomes necessary. It is difficult in the public field to distinguish clearly between a layoff and a discharge. Layoffs may be temporary or, so far as the immediate division or department is concerned, permanent. The definition of terms varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. Generally speaking, a laid-off employee has certain privileges in regard to reëmployment which a discharged employee forfeits.[17] The distinction is, of course, definite enough in the case of discipli-

[15] The whole question of retirement is treated in Chapter 21. The question is touched upon here only as it affects labor turnover.

[16] In some public jurisdictions in the United States a distinction is made between the terms "discharge" and "removal," the former being applied to nondisciplinary dismissals. This distinction is discussed in Chapter 19. For our purposes here, the single term "discharge" will be used to embrace all types of permanent separation in which the initiative is taken by the employer. For the standard terms used in private industry see U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Collective Bargaining Provisions: Discharge, Discipline, and Quits; Dismissal Pay Provisions*, Bulletin No. 908–5 (Washington: 1948).

[17] It is next to impossible to distinguish between a layoff and a nondisciplinary discharge. There is no uniformity of usage in the various public services, and standardization is sorely needed. "Layoff" should be restricted to the separation of an employee in good standing because of a necessary reduction in force. This is discussed in Chapter 22.

nary discharge. In this instance the initiative in the termination of employment is taken by the employer, but the blame is upon the employee.

Upon the basis of these general considerations, then, three broad classes of separations may be recognized: (1) those in which the employee takes the initiative; (2) those in which the employer takes the initiative; and (3) those resulting from acts of God (death, illness, and so forth) or from mandatory legal provisions, such as those providing compulsory retirement for age.

III. MEASURES OF LABOR TURNOVER

Labor turnover has already been defined as the "shift and replacement of personnel, incident to its maintenance." Thus, in a strict sense, it involves not only movements out of employment (separations) but movements into the service (accessions). The employee brought in as a replacement may be recruited from the outside or transferred from some other branch or departmental unit. There is no universally accepted formula for the measurement of turnover, and various studies have indicated wide divergencies in the methods employed by personnel managers.[18] Some have used the rate of accession, some the voluntary separation or quitting rate, others the rate of replacement. The latter leaves out of account those employees whose services have terminated but who have not been replaced.

Theoretically, the replacement rate is the most accurate general measure of turnover, but, as Paul F. Brissenden has pointed out, practical considerations justify "reliance upon the accession rate, the separation rate, or the voluntary separation rate, despite the fact that none of these three is, theoretically, as accurate as the replacement rate."[19] As a matter of fact, the separation rate is the most widely employed general measure of turnover and will suffice for most purposes in the public service. This rate is arrived at by dividing the total number of separations in a given time period (week, month, or year) by some measure of the average number of workers employed by the given agency or service for the period. Two denominators are widely employed: (1) the average number of employees on the pay roll; (2) the average number of employees at work. The first figure is always somewhat larger than the second, since it includes both those actually at work and those who are absent. Although the second has some theoretical advantages over the average on the pay roll, its calculation is more difficult and it is not widely employed. *Generally speaking, then, labor turnover as a whole may be measured by dividing the total number of separations over a given*

[18] See W. S. Woytinsky, *Three Aspects of Labor Dynamics* (Washington: 1942), Chap. 2. For an early study see *The Calculation of Labor Turnover*, Special Report of the Committee on Management Terminology, American Management Association (New York: 1923).

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 321. The author goes on to point out that "in most establishments there is usually a marked tendency for separation to equal accessions." This is true, however, only if temporary layoffs are excluded.

period by the average number on the pay roll. It is usual to multiply the result by 100, thus obtaining a percentage.

The question arises as to the place of transfers in turnover calculation. Obviously, from the standpoint of the calculation of departmental rates, transfers out must be considered as separations. On the other hand, transfers within the department do not enter into that department's turnover, although they would enter into the turnover rates of the bureaus within the department. Finally, in computing the rate for the service as a whole, transfers are not considered.

The total separation rate is useful as a general average but suffers because of its composite character; that is, it is valuable in the same way as a fever chart. Just as when a patient's temperature rises above or falls below a certain norm, need for a diagnosis is indicated, so the turnover rate should be continuously checked and resolved into its several constituents: death rate, retirement rate, voluntary quitting rate, layoff and discharge rates, and so forth. When this has been done, the personnel manager is in possession of a serviceable tool for analysis of the employment situation in relation to general economic and other pertinent conditions.

IV. THE VALUE OF TURNOVER FIGURES

We now turn to the specific uses to which turnover data may be put. Only a few of the more important will be considered.

In general, it may be stated that the separation rate supplies a gauge of the general attractiveness of the service as a whole, in comparison with other employment opportunities. It is also an aid in analyzing differences between various units within a given service and between various grades and classes of employees. Further, it throws light on the relations between employees of differing seniority, efficiency, and so forth. The turnover rates should provide a guide to the following:

1. Trouble areas in the organization.
2. The relation of the various types of separation to
   a. Types of employment.
   b. Salary classes.
   c. Length of service.
   d. Performance.
3. Comparability of employment conditions in the several establishments or in the departmental as compared with the field services.
4. Defects in the whole employment process, but particularly in the policies affecting recruitment, selection, placement, and compensation.

There are many other possibilities in the use of these rates, but the above suggestions serve to reveal the possible importance of such data. Turnover figures for public jurisdictions are difficult to get. No public personnel

agency in the United States known to the writer is fully exploiting the possibilities of an analysis of this aspect of management.

V. THE INCIDENCE OF TURNOVER

There is no single desirable rate of turnover for all establishments, except that it should be (1) sufficiently large to prevent the stagnation of the service and (2) sufficiently small to reflect healthy working conditions. Within the broad limits prescribed by these general principles, wide variations are possible, depending upon the character of the employees involved and other factors. For example, a turnover rate among office boys or junior clerks equal to that among technicians might be a symptom of an unsound employment situation: either that the establishment was losing its technicians at an inordinate rate or that those recruited into the lowest grades of the service lacked a stimulus to and opportunity for growth or a reasonable amount of ambition. Moreover, quite different rates of turnover may be expected among governmental employees as a whole and industrial workers as a whole.

Such considerations make it difficult to lay down any exact limits within which the turnover rates should fall. However, Sharp has concluded that in the governmental sphere "a turnover not exceeding 10 or 12 percent would by most be regarded as desirable for the purpose of bringing in fresh blood and preventing the hardening of caste; if, on the other hand, the annual turnover reaches 20 or 30 percent, one may fairly assume that employment conditions are bad."[20] After an extensive analysis of turnover in the Federal service, Brissenden suggests that annual separation rates below 4 percent and above 50 percent are open to question.[21] With these general limits in mind we may examine the incidence of turnover in several jurisdictions.

A. TURNOVER IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

Studies of turnover in the industrial sphere have been rather common,[22] and since July, 1929, the *Monthly Labor Review* has published turnover figures for a large number of industrial establishments, thus providing private management with norms against which conditions in one or another industrial concern may be matched. In the public sphere, however, no such figures are available, and many public personnel administrators not only are without knowledge of the rate of turnover in comparable

[20] Walter R. Sharp, *The French Civil Service* (New York: 1931), pp. 274 f.

[21] Brissenden, *op. cit.*, p. 343.

[22] See, for example, Elton Mayo and George F. F. Lombard, *Teamwork and Labor Turnover in the Aircraft Industry of Southern California*, Harvard University, Business Research Studies, No. 32 (Boston: 1944), and numerous articles in *Monthly Labor Review*, *Personnel Journal*, *Management Review*, and *Personnel*.

jurisdictions but have made no analysis of their own situation.[23] This generalization does not apply to the U.S. Civil Service Commission. Since 1903, with the exception of a short period during and following World War I, it has issued yearly reports on the numbers of separations from the service and since 1925 has reported both accessions and separations on a monthly basis. These figures are gross, as compared with those available in many private agencies, but are the most comprehensive available for any public jurisdiction in the United States.

In Tables 10–12 the rates of separation from the Federal service for various years since 1945 are presented. The inclusion in these figures of temporary employees tends to raise the rates as compared with industry. The data reveal that the Federal civil service employees constitute a relatively stable group, although there was clearly an unusual situation at the close of the war. Moreover, there is considerable variation in the rates of turnover from one agency to another.

TABLE 10. Separation Rate in Federal Employment, 1945–1954

Fiscal Year	Total Number of Separations	Monthly Separation Rate per 100 Employees
1945	1,674,397	5.1[a]
1948	623,970	3.3[a]
1950	494,755	2.2
1953	693,820	2.5
1954	557,864	2.1

[a] Does not include part-time employees.

SOURCE: Data from the U.S. Civil Service Commission, *65th Annual Report*, June 30, 1948, p. 75; *1954 Annual Report*, June 30, 1954, p. 84; and the commission's statistics staff. In the two most recent years listed, separations have included (1) 50 to 60 percent "quits"—including resignation, transfer to other Federal agencies, and abandonment of position; (2) 9 to 18 percent separated due to reductions in force; (3) 4 to 5 percent discharged for cause; and (4) 26 to 28 percent separated for other reasons.

Perhaps more significant than an overall comparison of government with industry is a comparison between identical operations in and out of government. The only available data bearing on this point concerns wartime shipyards. Illustrative of a general tendency was the experience in 1943 and 1944, on which figures are published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor

[23] A few studies have been made of turnover among clerical workers and among a few public and quasi-public employees. In addition to those cited at other points, mention may be made of Harold B. Bergen, "Stability of Men and Women Office Workers," *Journal of Personnel Research*, July, 1926, pp. 71 ff.; Willard S. Elsbree, *Teacher Turnover in the Cities and Villages of New York State* (New York: 1928); Sarah M. Sturtevant, Ruth Strang, and Mary Hooton, "Turnover Among Deans of Women," *Personnel Journal*, April, 1930, pp. 384–392; Wendell White, "Rate and Causes of Turnover of Iowa Teachers," *American School Board Journal*, December, 1925, p. 53; John W. Mitchell, "Personnel Turnover in the Federal Government," *Personnel Administration*, May, 1943, pp. 12–21, and September, 1949, pp. 10–12.

TABLE 11. Comparison of Turnover Rates, Federal Government and Manufacturing Industries

Period	Accession Rate (per 100 Employees)		Separation Rate (per 100 Employees)	
	Federal Government	Manufacturing Industries	Federal Government	Manufacturing Industries
1954:				
March	1.8	2.8	1.9	3.7
April	1.8	2.4	1.9	3.8
May	1.6	2.7	1.9	3.5
June	2.3	3.5	2.1	3.1
July	2.1	3.0	2.3	3.3
August	1.8	3.3	2.0	3.5
September	1.9	3.4	2.6	3.9
October	2.3	3.6	1.9	3.3
November	2.4	3.3	2.1	3.0
December	1.4	2.5	2.4	3.0
1955:				
January	1.8	3.3	1.7	2.9
February	1.7	3.3	1.4	2.5
March	1.8	3.6	1.5	3.0
April	1.9	3.5	1.7	3.1
May	2.1	3.8	1.9	3.2

SOURCE: Data for the Federal Government are from the U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Federal Employment Statistics Bulletin*, May, 1955, p. 2; data for manufacturing industries were compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TABLE 12. Turnover Rates of Wage-Board and Other Employees in Selected Agencies, January, 1954

Agency	Separation Rate (per 100 Employees)	
	Wage Board[a]	All Other
Total, all agencies	1.7	1.4
Army	2.2	2.2
Air Force	1.2	2.2
Navy	1.1	1.5
Treasury	2.7	1.1
Interior	8.3	1.9
Tennessee Valley Authority	4.1	1.2
Government Printing Office	1.0	1.2
All other agencies	6.6	1.1

[a] Wage-board employees are those whose basic compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority. Separate totals are shown for those agencies employing the larger wage-board groups.

SOURCE: U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Federal Employment Statistics Bulletin*, January, 1954, p. 6.

Statistics. This study showed that both accession (new employment) and separation rates in United States Navy yards were substantially lower than the rates in private shipyards.[24] Certainly in this respect the highly touted superior efficiency of private industry over public enterprise is not borne out by the facts.

In view of these turnover data, several generalizations may be made as to conditions in the Federal service. First, Federal employees as a whole are more stable than those of industry as a whole. This is even true in the one instance in which we can compare similar operations—shipbuilding. Second, there is extreme variability in turnover among the various agencies. Third, turnover among employees in blue-collar jobs paid prevailing wages is over twice as great as that among white-collar employees. Thus, the incidence of turnover is related to occupation and to compensation. The latest Federal rates fall safely in between Brissenden's limits but do not meet Sharp's standard. Considering the fact that temporary employees are included in the separation rate, the condition is on the whole satisfactory.

B. TURNOVER IN STATE AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES

Up-to-date turnover data or studies in state or municipal services are unfortunately very scarce. In 1955 the Civil Service Assembly was able to find published turnover figures in the annual reports of only six jurisdictions, and it was able to compute such information from other data in the reports of only eleven others. Among four states annual turnover for 1953 or 1953–1954 ranged from 27.5 percent for Missouri to 40 percent for Nebraska, so far as those agencies covered by the merit system are concerned. Among eight major cities—Philadelphia, Detroit, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Cincinnati, Louisville, Toledo, and Jacksonville—turnover for the same period ranged from lows of 11.7 percent and 15 percent in Toledo and Minneapolis to 28 percent and 32.3 percent in Cincinnati and Louisville.[25] In addition, the National Education Association reports that annually 9 percent of the nation's public-school teachers change jobs and 7½ percent of them leave the field of public-school teaching.

Clearly one is unwarranted in drawing any conclusions from such information. Many factors may affect figures of this kind—general labor conditions in the area, housing, economic advantages or disadvantages, to name only a few. It is not even possible to draw a direct comparison with the Federal service, because we cannot be sure of a common base and meaning for the data without more intensive research than time and space limitations for a general book permit.

[24] U.S. Department of Labor, *Wartime Employment, Production, and Conditions of Work in Shipyards*, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 824 (Washington: 1945), published as House Doc. No. 149, 79th Cong., 1st sess., p. 15.

[25] Information supplied by courtesy of Robert J. Batson of the staff of the Civil Service Assembly, under Kenneth O. Warner, Director, and J. J. Donovan, Associate Director.

We can be certain, however, of the need for more factual analysis and reporting on this subject on the part of state and local governments. Here again is evidence of the desirability of personnel research as a basis for continuous appraisal and development of personnel policy. Here likewise is an area in which university students and faculty members will find challenging opportunities for projects and dissertations. The raw data are usually obtainable, waiting only to be analyzed and interpreted. A sound analysis of causes and costs of turnover would be of inestimable value to states and cities which are not provided with the funds to conduct such research for themselves.

VI. THE COST OF TURNOVER

It is difficult to estimate accurately the cost of excessive turnover. Certainly it is considerable. For this reason one of the primary aims of private employment management is to prevent the losses and wastes resulting from avoidable instability. This aspect of the problem might be expected to receive greater attention in the private than in the public sphere, although economy drives in government should focus attention upon it.

The cost of hiring and training a new employee in private industry has been variously calculated from several hundred to one thousand dollars, depending upon the character of the job, the amount of training necessary, and similar factors. There can be no question but that replacements in the civil service are often more expensive than in private industry. Not only are the methods of recruitment, selection, and placement more complex and expensive than the corresponding processes in the private sphere, but in many cases the work to be performed is of a character which requires experience not obtainable outside, so that the training and experience charges are often higher.

To the knowledge of the writer, few attempts have been made to estimate the cost of turnover in the public service, owing to the frequent lack of a central agency in many jurisdictions whose responsibilities go beyond the function of recruitment. On the face of it, there should be no more difficulty in estimating turnover costs in the public service than elsewhere. Two groups of factors are to be analyzed. There are, first, the overhead costs, which include the costs of recruitment, selection, more rapid depreciation of equipment because of inexperienced operators, and so forth. To this must be added certain operating costs—lowered average output due to the presence of inexperienced workers, waste of materials, the time of trainers, and the general impairment of morale which is likely to accompany high turnover.

The Joint Congressional Commission on Reclassification attempted to secure some estimates on costs in individual cases. The superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey estimated, for example, that the cost of each replacement of employees in the professional and scientific services

of his organization exceeded $1000. Upon the basis of extensive records, the General Land Office estimated that each replacement in the stenographic force cost the government between $200 and $248. Such figures would have to be doubled or tripled in the present economy.

As compared with the estimated costs for replacing industrial workers, the above estimates will appear high. This may be due in part to the fact that earlier training and experience are not so likely to prepare a new employee for the public service as for private employment.

In spite of the absence of comprehensive figures, these estimates are sufficient to emphasize the point that costs resulting from high turnover in the public service are sufficiently great to warrant the thought and attention of alert administrators. In the light of the estimates, the annual loss to many taxpayers of the United States because of the policy of rotation in office on a spoils basis is overwhelming.

VII. THE CONTROL OF TURNOVER

From the standpoint of management, the problem of controlling turnover may be divided into two parts: first, the determination of the causes of the various types of separation; second, the adjustment and development of the personnel program in the light of these causes. The first involves a number of techniques and devices. The possible use of various types of statistical analysis has already been suggested.

But the causes of labor turnover are both numerous and complex, and many influences may be involved to which statistics can give only a lead. One of the most fruitful methods for uncovering the real factors involved in turnover is the exit interview. This has been developed and widely employed by industrial personnel agencies and in a few public organizations.[26] Moreover, there is fairly general agreement among those who have employed it concerning the value of this device. As the personnel manager of one company put it: "Interviews with employees before they quit or are discharged, or employees who quit without notice and come in for their final pay, are very important; they are the only way to discover department conditions, foremen's attitudes, misunderstandings, etc. Labor turnover can be greatly reduced by the proper analysis of all such cases and much benefit results, not only to the employer but also to the employees."[27]

The use of the exit interview is desirable if reliable records of labor turnover are to be kept. But it is more than a device for collecting informa-

[26] The exit interview is one given to all quitting or discharged employees before they receive their final pay. See "Control of Turnover Through Exit Interviews," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1944, pp. 13–17.

[27] Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, *The Exit Interview*, Labor Turnover Series No. 2, Policyholders' Service Bureau, 1927, p. 5. This pamphlet offers a comprehensive discussion of the technique of the exit interview as developed in industry. See also the later edition of 1946.

tion; it is also a means of smoothing out misunderstandings and preventing avoidable separations. Moreover, the exit interview may serve to build up good will toward the service, a factor which would be reflected in the recruitment program and in turnover in the long run. The function of the interview is "to obtain information, give information, and create good will." More specifically, the functions have been listed as follows:

1. To learn all pertinent facts about each employee and his reasons for seeking employment elsewhere.
2. To give information, whenever advisable, regarding opportunities in the company and how the employee may best take advantage of them.
3. To serve the employee, taking into consideration his own best interests and the interests of the company and, consequently, creating good will toward the company.

This same threefold function should also be performed by the exit interview in the public service. The first function, that of discovering the real reasons for quitting, is not always easily accomplished because of the reluctance of many workers to reveal the true state of affairs. It is the most important of the three functions listed, because it may throw light on employment conditions that affect others and should be remedied. In this connection, it is desirable to employ a standard classification of reasons for leaving and to require the officer making the exit interview to fill out a form which includes such a standard classification. By this means comparable data may be received from a number of officers. The second function of the exit interview is one of adjustment, where adjustment seems both desirable and possible. It is an adjunct of the placement process, a part of the whole process of fitting a man to his job. To be really effective it requires a flexible transfer policy. Finally, the third function aims at building up one of the most valuable assets of any organization—good will.

The technique of the employment interview has already been discussed in connection with the selection and placement policies. In general, that of the exit interview is similar, although the ends are different. The question may well arise, however, what agency or officer in the public service should be charged with the function of interviewing separating employees. In the private field this duty is ordinarily vested in the personnel department.

The central personnel agency in government, occupying a semi-isolated position, can seldom perform this function directly, particularly in the larger establishments and departments. Thus, the Federal Civil Service Commission could obviously not conduct exit interviews for the whole Federal service. In such cases the departmental or establishment personnel officers may be vested with the function, subject to general supervision and the provision of standard procedures and records by the central agency.

Whatever the agency, it is of basic importance that some office associated with the administration of personnel interview every employee before separation is effected.

The second phase in the process of controlling turnover consists in making those adjustments in employment conditions and policies which have been suggested by the analysis of the reasons for turnover. The particular adjustments which must be made will vary from service to service, just as specific reasons for separations vary. In general, employment dissatisfaction may be explained either by (1) failure to fit the man to the job, which implies unsatisfactory recruitment, selection, and placement procedures, or (2) undesirable employment conditions. As the causes vary, so will the appropriate remedial measures vary. To diagnose the former and to discover the latter are responsibilities of the first order of importance in the program of an adequate personnel division.[28]

SUMMARY

Many conditions of employment in the public service other than the tenure protection of civil service laws affect stability of the work force. The security for the workers sought after in these laws is common to all walks of life. Also, the tenure features implicit in public merit systems are actually not so overprotective and restrictive as is popularly assumed. Even teacher tenure can be viewed as overprotective only to the extent that it promotes judicial review of what should be purely administrative determinations. Turnover in the public service is affected more by the nature of the work and the fluctuations in appropriation, organization, and program than by the guarantees against arbitrary dismissal called "tenure."

In dealing with the question of labor turnover and the various problems associated with it, the guiding rule of the administrator must be to get the facts. Conditions vary widely from one jurisdiction to another and among various agencies and groups of employees in the same jurisdiction, as the data presented in this chapter demonstrate. Until the public personnel agency takes stock of the particular situation with which it is confronted, it is obviously in no position to develop an intelligent policy. A high turnover rate can be the result of a number of heterogeneous factors, so that constant analysis is called for in the interest of satisfactory control.

The seriousness of high turnover and its cost and deleterious effect upon morale have long since been recognized by private employment man-

[28] Many of the considerations discussed in Chapter 11, "Leadership and the Will to Work," have a profound effect on turnover. See also Elton Mayo, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization* (Boston: 1945), Chap. 5; U.S. Department of Labor, *The A-B-C of Absenteeism and Labor Turnover*, Special Bulletin No. 17 (Washington: 1944); U.S. Department of Labor, *Improvement of Labor-Utilization Procedures*, Bulletin No. 807, Bureau of Labor Statistics (Washington: 1945), pp. 8–12; and War Advertising Council, *A 4-Step Plan to Reduce Turnover* (Washington: 1945).

agers. Careful analysis, however, may reveal a situation of stagnation, of low turnover, in particular jurisdictions or in particular establishments or services. When the turnover figures show this to be the case, the function of the personnel agency is to break the jam and to create as much of an outward movement as is necessary to maintain a healthy working organization.

The policy of control must be discriminating, operating always to retain the best in the service and to speed up the exit of those least efficient and least valuable. To this end it must be a broad program integrating a number of aspects of personnel administration, particularly that of transfer. Positively, such a control program envisages a constant revamping of employment conditions in such a way as to provide the opportunities and rewards necessary to retain the best in the service and give them the stimulus of hope. Negatively, it implies the vigorous exercise of the power of rejection during probation and of the removal power in order to weed out the unfit.

21

Retirement and Disability

Until the 1930's the separation of employees from the public service by reason of age, disability, or death was handled in a haphazard, often in an unjust and unintelligent, manner. Those responsible for employment policies appeared to assume that human frailties of this sort were a matter of occasional and untoward misfortune rather than of normal human experience. To take an extreme example, many a fireman injured in the line of duty became an object of charity, dependent on the generosity of citizens who passed the hat or on a modicum of support during the period of his disability. So it was with respect to old age. Many a public employee was carried on the pay roll long after his period of usefulness had passed, because no provision was made for his retirement, and he lacked all other means of support. He, too, was an object of charity and one carried at a very high cost.

Not a few retirement systems have operated in an unjust manner because they were designed to provide for only one or another class of employees, such, for example, as the firemen, policemen, and teachers. These classes of workers are for the most part well organized and have successfully brought pressure to bear on appropriating bodies. Other classes working in the same jurisdiction have not enjoyed comparable advantages.

More recently, however, there has been widespread recognition of the employer's interest and responsibility in providing for superannuated employees and those otherwise incapacitated. It is in the interest of the employer to make definite provision for such workers. "Pay roll pensioners" represent high-cost labor. Furthermore, they obstruct the current of promotions and lessen the attractiveness of employment to young and ambitious candidates.

Consistent with the above conception, retirement allowances are now looked upon, not as acts of charity which stem from the generous and humanitarian motives of an enlightened employer, but as a *deferred wage*

to which the employee has a definite right. Indeed, the voters of New York State went so far as to pass a constitutional amendment, declaring that "membership in any pension or retirement system of the state or of a civil division thereof shall be a contractual relationship, the benefits of which shall not be diminished or impaired."[1]

A conclusively determining factor in the pension situation, from the point of view of those responsible for public employment policies, was the passage of the Social Security Act in 1936. The public employer soon had no choice but to provide for some sort of retirement program. If he failed to do so, he found himself at a great disadvantage in competing in the employment market with private employers, who under the law are compelled to contribute to the upbuilding of reserves for retirement and related purposes. Evidence of the consequences of social security legislation for public authorities may be found in the rapid adoption of new retirement programs in state and local governments, discussed below.

Retirement systems are now so widely accepted that they are almost taken for granted. The current problem facing public policy makers is not ordinarily whether public service retirement plans should exist or be liberalized to keep pace with changing living costs; rather it is this: How can plans be devised to facilitate, not obstruct, movement of personnel among public jurisdictions, and even between the public service and private fields of endeavor? In other words, retirement systems have become so much a part of public personnel programs that the "investment" in such a system by a civil servant deters him from moving in and out of his particular governmental jurisdiction even when considerations of public policy and efficiency suggest the desirability of such diversification of experience. The intimate relations among state, county, and Federal functions in the fields of agriculture, forestry, health, road building, and the like, point up some of the areas which call for statesmanlike solutions to this problem. Farsighted public administrators are thinking more in terms of the public service as a whole and of the general social security system than they are of the separate sanctity of a single retirement plan. The consolidation of retirement systems in state and local jurisdictions demonstrates this trend. Another indicator is the provision of national social security as a "floor" under public service retirement systems just as it has already served as a common tie among private business retirement plans. The renewal of interest in coördination of the Federal Civil Service Retirement system with the social security program is another sign of the times.

Before exploring such problems more fully, it is desirable that the status of retirement plans in public employment be briefly reviewed.

[1] Amendment to constitution, 1938, Art. V, sec. 7, effective in 1940. For an illuminating discussion of pensions as vested rights see Rowland A. Egger, *The Retirement of Public Employees in Virginia* (Charlottesville: 1933), pp. 24 ff.

A. THE SPREAD OF RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

1. Foreign Countries. The movement for public service retirement systems first took root in the soil of the older civilization of Europe. In Great Britain the first general pension act was passed by the government in 1810, although superannuation funds had existed in both customs and excise departments from a much earlier period.[2] In England, as in most of Europe, these early systems probably arose from the feudal custom under which the king rewarded his faithful supporters with grants of land or other bounties. France, too, had the beginnings of a pension system for some of the central government employees at an early date, although a basic general law was not adopted until 1853.[3] In many of the other European countries general pension systems have been in existence for a considerable length of time. Belgium adopted a plan in 1844, Italy in 1864, and Germany in 1873. Before the beginning of war in 1939, public service retirement systems were in effect in practically all the countries of Europe, including, in addition to those already mentioned, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland.[4]

2. The Federal Government. In the United States the Federal Government was much slower to recognize the desirability of a retirement plan. This fact possibly is explained in terms of a frontier civilization, with its accompanying doctrines of individualism and spoils. But this is not to say that the question of pensions received no early consideration in the United States. The problem of veterans' pensions has always been recognized, and various grants were made to members of Washington's army following the Revolution, as has been done following every other war in American history, but this is something different from the recognition of the rights of civil employees. The custom of rewarding soldiers has been observed in most countries since the time of the First Crusade, or even before.

The first official recognition of the desirability of a retirement policy for civil employees of the Federal Government came in 1845, when a House committee reported that under the system then existing "the list of officers becomes a pension roll."[5] Neither house of Congress was disturbed by this report, however, and the agitation for a retirement system continued but sporadically until about 1904, after which the demand from department officials became more and more insistent. This agitation culminated in 1912 with the excellent report of the Taft Efficiency and Economy Commission.

[2] Herbert D. Brown, *Civil-Service Retirement in Great Britain*, Sen. Doc. No. 290, 61st Cong., 2nd sess., p. 11.

[3] Walter R. Sharp, *The French Civil Service* (New York: 1931), p. 218.

[4] U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Public Service Retirement Systems*, Bulletin No. 477 (1929), Chap. 9.

[5] John T. Doyle, "The Federal Civil Service Retirement Law," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, May, 1924, pp. 330–338.

In one section of that report some of the effects of the absence of a system were graphically portrayed. It was pointed out that "pitiful cases of old employees who go to the office long after their days of usefulness have passed are numerous and well known, for one out of every fourteen government employees in the City of Washington is over sixty-five years of age. Many of them are past eighty, and nonagenarians have occasionally been on the government pay-roll. Paralytics are sometimes brought to the office in wheeled chairs."[6] Even such a graphic picture as this failed to result in any immediate action by Congress, and it was not until 1920 that a retirement system for employees of the national government was finally established.

The 1920 act was based largely on the conception of the service pension, such as had long been current in military and naval circles, although it provided for contributions from employees. It was not until the act of May 29, 1930,[7] that a true annuity system was established and based on sound actuarial principles. Contributions from employees are mandatory, while the government is obliged to make contributions under carefully prescribed conditions. The system was further amended in 1948 to provide, among other changes, for survivorship benefits. Various other liberalizing amendments have been made from time to time.

The Congress is now considering recommendations of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel to the effect that the Civil Service Retirement system, while retaining its independence, be coördinated with the national old-age and survivorship program (social security). Under this proposal, social security benefits would serve as a minimum while the additional advantages of the civil service plan would continue; certain benefits would be increased, particularly in respect to survivorship aspects; pay deductions would be divided between two systems but would be slightly decreased *in toto;* and, after age sixty-five, a retiree would draw from two sources an annuity approximating what he would have received under the civil service system alone.[8]

[6] Commission on Economy and Efficiency, *Report to the President on Retirement Allowances,* House Doc. No. 732, 63rd Cong., 2nd sess., p. 12.

[7] Herbert D. Brown, *Savings and Annuity Plan Proposed for Retirement of Superannuated Civil Service Employees,* Sen. Doc. No. 745, 61st Cong., 3rd sess.

[8] The committee's report is entitled *Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel,* Sen. Doc. No. 89, 83rd Cong., 2nd sess. Parts 1 and 3 refer to the above proposal. The committee had been created in accordance with P.L. 55, 82nd Cong., to report findings and recommendations on all the retirement systems for Federal Personnel, military and civilian. The committee is frequently referred to as the Kaplan Committee, named after its chairman, Eliot Kaplan of New York, who among other achievements has been director of the National Civil Service League and Comptroller for the State of New York. The U.S. Civil Service Commission endorsed its proposals as they related to civil service retirement.

Federal temporary and other special category employees now excluded from the Civil Service Retirement system are already covered under the social security program as the result of P.L. 734, 81st Cong., 2nd sess. (1950).

3. The States. The retirement movement was equally slow in developing in the states. Legislation is for the most part of comparatively recent date. Massachusetts was the first state to adopt general legislation, passing an act in 1911 covering all persons employed "in the direct service of the Commonwealth or in the service of the metropolitan district commission, whose sole or principal employment is in such service." Massachusetts stood alone until 1919, when Connecticut passed a general act and Maine revised her laws to extend the retirement system to all state employees. New York followed in 1920, New Jersey in 1921, and Pennsylvania in 1923.[9] Since that time thirty-one other states have taken action with respect to general state employees, bringing the total number of states with retirement programs for general employees to thirty-seven. Many of these plans also include employees of local governments on a permissive basis and one (Ohio's) on a compulsory basis. Some states still have separate plans for specialized personnel, such as highway police, conservation wardens, and forest rangers. Public-school teachers in the localities are usually covered by a state-wide retirement system.[10]

Between 1950 and 1954 the national social security program was available to state and local employees not already covered by retirement systems. By 1954 a total of forty-four states and three territories had made the necessary agreements with the Federal Government to provide such coverage. Since 1954 social security has been available also to state and local jurisdictions as a supplement to existing retirement systems, just as is now being proposed for the Federal service.[11] In 1955 ten states had bills pending to permit this social security coverage throughout their public jurisdictions. Under this plan a majority of members of a state retirement system must give their approval to coördination with social security.

4. Municipalities. The movement for municipal retirement systems has progressed sporadically, although today the overwhelming majority of cities in the United States have a retirement system for at least some of their employees. The first municipal pension plans applied to particular groups of employees only, generally to those groups which were the best organized and engaged in occupations of a hazardous character, such as policemen and firemen. The earliest municipal pension fund established by law was that for New York City policemen, created in 1857. By 1910 there were 219 municipal pension funds in existence, all applying to special groups of employees only.[12] Confusion was inevitable under such an arrangement, and the next forward step was the development of general municipal plans

[9] *Public Service Retirement Systems*, p. 25.

[10] For most of these data we are dependent on *The Book of the States, 1954–55*, pp. 194–195.

[11] State and local coördinated coverage was made possible by P.L. 761, 83rd Cong., 2nd sess., Title I (Amendments to Title II of the Social Security Act), sec. 101(h).

[12] *Pension Systems for Municipal Employees and Railroad Pension Systems in the United States*, Sen. Doc. No. 427, 61st Cong., 2nd sess.

covering all city employees. The first general system was created for Philadelphia and Pittsburgh in 1915, when the Pennsylvania legislature adopted a law providing retirement and disability benefits for all employees of the two cities not under some other departmental system. Since this small beginning, progress has been rapid. The legislature of the state of New York established a general system for New York City employees in 1920. City-wide plans were established during the next few years in Minneapolis, Chicago, San Francisco, Boston, Baltimore, and Cincinnati.

Since the early thirties the trend has been greatly accelerated. Of 1060 cities of over 10,000 population, 982 (92.6 percent) have retirement systems for some or all employees. Only fifty-three of these are less than city-wide, generally covering fire and police employees. The increase in city-wide plans has been marked even since 1950. Only three cities above 25,000 and 10.7 percent of those between 10,000 and 25,000 have failed to establish a retirement provision for at least some of their employees.[13]

Within recent years there has been a trend toward state-wide retirement systems covering municipal and other local employees, which is resulting in a gradual decrease of purely local plans. In addition to voluntary action on the part of a majority of the states, covering employees of political subdivisions usually on an optional basis, the extension of Federal social security coverage has given impulse to this development.

It is hardly necessary to note that systems of the state-wide type are virtually essential for small localities with a hundred or fewer workers, on the grounds that a broader base is necessary to spread the risk with any assurance and that large funds can be invested and administered more advantageously than small ones. Actuarial investigations and audits can also be carried on more economically. Finally, with the national social security program extended to cover public employees, state-wide systems can more readily be integrated with it than can a great spread of individual localities acting independently. State-wide systems are discussed further below under "The Scope of Retirement Provisions."

B. PURPOSES OF A RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Having briefly reviewed the historical development of governmental retirement systems in the United States, we may now turn to the question of the purposes of such systems and what they are designed to accomplish. There are, as Dr. Meriam long ago pointed out,[14] three distinct parties concerned in the establishment of a retirement plan for civil employees. On the one hand is the employing agency, the government, and on the other is the employee. Standing in a somewhat different relation to the system is the taxpayer. All three—the government, the employee, and the taxpayer—

[13] *Municipal Year Book, 1955* (Chicago: 1955), pp. 161–162.

[14] Lewis Meriam, *Principles Governing the Retirement of Public Employees* (New York: 1918).

are concerned in the establishment of a retirement system. Their interests are not always identical, though all may be fused in the right type of retirement plan.

There is one primary object sought by the governmental unit when it adopts a retirement system, namely, the improvement of its staff. All other objectives are subordinate, but not unrelated, to this. A proper retirement system is of value in improving the staff, first, because it facilitates the elimination of the superannuated and disabled. Department heads hesitate to remove them when such removal means that they are to be left without visible means of support. Second, the losses from superannuation are not confined to the retention of inefficient employees in the service. They spread throughout the whole system and are reflected in lowered morale and general inefficiency. The fact that a man may be kept at his desk until he dies means less opportunity for advancement. This in turn makes it more difficult to attract desirable men to the service. Consequently, a proper retirement plan not only results in the elimination of many inefficient employees but tends also to improve the morale of the whole force and to facilitate the process of recruitment.

From the standpoint of the employee the advantages of a retirement plan are obvious. It insures him against a penniless old age or against pauperism due to disability. It supplements an income which is ordinarily not adequate to permit the accumulation of any large amount of savings. The provision of the pension is not charity but a form of deferred compensation. The philosophy underlying modern retirement systems differs from that behind earlier pension schemes. The retirement benefits are not to be looked upon as gratuities offered as a reward for long and faithful service. Rather, the establishment of a retirement system is a business proposition in which the interests both of the service as a whole and of the employee are involved.

Whatever contributes to the quality and efficiency of the governmental service is also in the interest of the taxpayer. Where no retirement scheme is employed, the practical result may be a system of pensions at full pay. Such a condition will not appeal to the intelligent taxpayer.

The term "retirement" has come to be used in a generic sense. It refers not alone to retirement because of old age but also to other contingencies leading to temporary or permanent separation from the service: disability, incurred either in the line of duty or apart from it; removal for disciplinary purposes; discharge on account of abolition of positions; voluntary resignation at an early or more advanced age; superannuation, optional at a specified minimum age, compulsory at a maximum age, or variable compulsory at an age suitable to each individual case. In a sound system, particularly one in which employees have vested rights because of their own contributions, the law must provide for these contingencies and appropriate

for them in a clear-cut way. The possible variables that must be taken into account are almost legion. For example, it must be decided whether an employee may retire at a given minimum age after fifteen or twenty or twenty-five years of continuous service and still secure his maximum annuity. Questions of this sort are to be settled in the light of the financial condition of the locality, the relation between wage levels and the cost of living, the age levels of the staff to be covered, the experience of similar jurisdictions, and the like. There is no fixed pattern that can be applied. Every authority must make its decisions with reference to its own circumstances. It is the purpose of the following pages to outline the more common practices and the considerations underlying them.

C. TYPES OF SYSTEMS

1. Fund Provisions. In general, retirement systems may be classed as of either the cash disbursement or the actuarial reserve type. The Municipal Finance Officers Association describes these two types as follows:

> Under the "cash disbursement" method, revenues are provided each year sufficient to pay only the benefits due that year. Because the benefit burden rises as the plan continues operations, the cash disbursement method results in steadily rising costs. Contributions during the first few years may exceed the benefits paid, resulting in the accumulation of reserves. These reserves are often misleading, since they are temporary in character and are soon absorbed by the increasing benefit payments of each year. They give a false sense of security. Eventually deficits occur that may require increases in revenues or reductions in benefits.
>
> Under the "actuarial reserve" plan, frequently referred to as the "funded plan," a portion of the retirement benefit payable to each employee in the future is presumed to be earned or accrued during each year of active service. Contributions during the early years of the retirement plan exceed benefit payments; this excess forms a reserve. Ultimately interest earnings on the reserve, plus the periodic contributions, will be sufficient to meet the benefit obligations as they mature.
>
> The "actuarial reserve" plan is truly the pay-as-you-go plan since it requires the current provision for meeting definite liabilities which will mature in future years. This plan may be compared to a bond issue sinking fund in which current payments are made for the purpose of providing a fund to meet the maturing obligation of the principal amount of the bond issue.[15]

Practically all students of pension systems have condemned the cash disbursement plan, and its disadvantages are many. Such a system is a source of continually mounting expense. Since the pension obligations are to be met from current revenues in a piecemeal fashion, there is generally no attempt to calculate the obligations of the government at some distant date. At the outset, the immediate financial burden is relatively small be-

[15] Municipal Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada, *Retirement Plans for Public Employees* (Chicago: 1946), pp. 21–22.

cause only a limited number will be on the pension roll in the early period. This fact makes it easy to obligate the government to what inevitably becomes a major responsibility in the future. Thus, the cash disbursement plan is conducive to the "blind assumption of unrecognized obligations."

From the standpoint of the taxpayer this would seem to condemn the plan at once, but all too frequently it has been the cash disbursement plan which has appealed to the taxpayer at the time of the adoption of the system because he takes a short-sighted view of the situation. In the long run the cash disbursement plan costs much more than the actuarial reserve, because there is little or no accumulated interest. But for the generation of taxpayers at the time of its inception it is undoubtedly the cheaper of the two plans. The generation which establishes the scheme escapes much of the financial burden attendant upon the action of its representatives, while succeeding generations pay a constantly increasing amount as the years go on. It is a matter of only a few years until the apparently light obligations at the outset become overwhelming. Thus, a cash disbursement system affects adversely both taxpayers and employees, for in times of economic stress these appropriations for the annual pension bill may be attacked, and finally curtailed or eliminated, so that the employee who has counted on a pension may find himself left stranded.

Against these serious objections must be balanced two advantages. The cash disbursement system is much simpler in operation than the actuarial reserve plan. As Meriam has said, "it has all the pleasing simplicity of a charge account."[16] None of the complicated collecting and investing machinery which usually characterizes the actuarial reserve system is needed. The money is left in the hands of the taxpayers until it is actually required to pay the pensions. This fact leads to the second advantage for this system, namely, that it is safe. There is no large fund created, with its attendant possibility of mismanagement. These are undoubted advantages, but impartial students of pensions generally condemn this plan as uneconomical from the point of view of the taxpayers and uncertain from that of the workers.

Under the actuarial reserve system, a general fund is established into which the employer or the employee or both pay regular contributions. The rate of these contributions is determined in such a way that there is annually paid into the fund an amount which, with compound interest, will be sufficient to pay the employee upon retirement a substantial annuity allowance. The actuarial reserve plan has the following advantages: (a) it results in approximate leveling of annual cost and brings about a fairly uniform ratio between the amount of the annual pay roll and the contributions for retirement purposes; (b) it is in accord with the concept

[16] Meriam, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

of a retirement provision as a charge for depreciation of the employees' forces, for it places a proper portion of the charge on each year responsible for the depreciation; (c) the higher cost of this type of plan in the early years acts as a control against too liberal benefits; (d) the reserves, assuming they are invested wisely, give the employee reasonable assurance that benefits will be paid; (e) the annual cost is reduced by the fact that interest is earned on the investment.

The principal criticisms of the actuarial reserve plan are that it is complicated and dangerous. There is no doubt that the system is more complicated than that set up under the cash disbursement plan. Extensive records must be kept, periodic actuarial investigations made, and the fund invested. These administrative difficulties are more than outweighed by the many advantages of the plan. On the other hand, the criticism that it is dangerous is not necessarily true. It is based, of course, upon the fear that the fund will be improperly or dishonestly administered. Similar criticisms of insurance companies and their policies are heard occasionally, although most people readily purchase insurance in private companies, partly because protection is afforded by state supervision. Such supervision is certainly as possible in the case of civil service employees' retirement organizations as of private insurance companies. This objection may therefore be passed over as of little consequence. Most of the larger retirement systems for public employees are now on an actuarial reserve basis.

2. Contributory vs. Noncontributory Systems. Accepting the philosophy of the pension as deferred compensation and the principle of the mutuality of interest between the employer and the employee, it seems reasonable that the cost of retirement benefits should be shared by the two. In effect, this is what happens anyway. Even under the so-called noncontributory systems, although the employing agency presumably bears the entire burden, it is in part borne by the employees through lower salaries. It is much more desirable to recognize this fact by the adoption of a joint contributory system. As a matter of fact, the arguments for either the contributory or the noncontributory system are more largely psychological than economic. In so far as the cost of the retirement benefits is concerned, it makes little difference which of the two principles is adopted, although there does appear to be a greater tendency for contributory systems to be operated upon an actuarial reserve basis.

Among other advantages the following may be mentioned: (a) that it is sometimes easier to establish and maintain a system under the contributory principle because the apparent burden is divided; (b) that it may check extravagant demands on the part of employees, since it is clear that a part of the cost would be borne by themselves; and (c) that it is in accord "with the theory that the faculties of the employee are being used up by the industry or service in which he is employed as well as by his

own personal pursuits and enjoyments, and that, therefore, a joint responsibility rests upon the industry or service and upon the employee for the upbuilding of proper means that would sustain the employee during the time when these faculties shall have been destroyed."[17]

Generally speaking, the joint contributory principle appears to have found greater favor in both the United States and Europe than the noncontributory. In the United States the Federal system, all state systems except that of Delaware, and most municipal systems are contributory. The trend has been toward an increase in the proportion of contributory plans for public employees.

The two aspects of a retirement program just discussed—that it be founded on the "savings bank" principle in accordance with actuarial computations and that contributions be required of both employer and employees—are of essential importance and should be agreed upon in advance by the parties concerned. There is virtual agreement among authorities in this field concerning the desirability and logic of these guiding principles.

With an understanding on these matters, an actuary can then proceed to analyze pay rolls, employment service and age records, turnover, and the like, all of which, with the aid of standard mortality and interest tables, enable him to estimate with a considerable degree of certainty the costs of meeting the demands of the retirement program and to suggest alternate methods for sharing such costs. The actuary is like the architect of a new building, at once acquainted with the characteristics of materials and designs and alert to adjust himself to the desires of his clients. Incidentally, he is as necessary for designing a retirement plan as the architect is for designing a house. The job of the actuary, however, is not completed when the plans are drawn up. Changes in the factors that enter into his predictions require continuing adjustments. The accuracy of his estimates depends on the continuing study of trends in age distribution, turnover, and the like, as well as on the size of the group covered. Since actuarial tables are based on the law of averages, they cannot be reliably used for small groups.

D. BENEFIT FEATURES AND PROVISIONS

The determination of benefits and the circumstances whereby they may be provided and secured will be dealt with under (1) superannuation, (2) disability, (3) death, and (4) separation from the service. Benefits on each and all of these items should be anticipated, the conditions for enjoying

[17] Paul Studensky, "Pensions in Public Employment," *National Municipal Review*, April, 1922, p. 105.

them definitely stated, and the funds to provide for each of them built up in appropriate reserves.

1. Superannuation. a. *Age and Service Factors.* Retirement because of reduced efficiency on account of age is the primary justification of a retirement system according to prevailing thinking. There was a time when emphasis was placed on length of service, as for instance twenty-five years, as a proper basis for placing employees on an annuity. But this made retirement possible in many cases when a worker was at the height of his productivity. Age as the criterion may vary for different classes of workers, e.g., clerks, firemen, and policemen.[18] Retirement may also be made optional for employer and employee at sixty or sixty-two but compulsory at sixty-five or seventy, with the understanding that the employer may continue employment after the compulsory age limit, usually by action taken one year at a time. Generally the benefit is actuarially reduced when retirement takes place at the earlier optional age.

Length of service may well be a factor in that a worker having twenty-five or more years of service may retire at sixty, while one with less might be required to continue until sixty-five or until he has served twenty-five years, if he is to enjoy full annuity. Those entering the service in their later years would of course be prevented from receiving more than a partial annuity under the savings bank principle. Most systems combine age and service.

Most systems include both optional and compulsory retirement features. The most usual age at which optional retirement is provided is sixty, while retirement is usually compulsory at seventy.

A fairly high age for compulsory retirement is consistent with society's need to continue people in productive employment as long as possible. As life expectancy increases, the support of an increasing proportion of non-producing older citizens would heavily burden the relatively smaller group of younger citizens. Moreover, psychologists and geriatricians tell us

[18] In the Federal system, an employee of the Alaska Railroad in Alaska or a citizen employee of the Panama Canal or Panama Railroad Company on the Isthmus of Panama *must* retire at age sixty-two or as soon as he completes fifteen years of service, including at least five years of civilian service, whichever date is later. Any other employee subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act must retire at age seventy or as soon as he completes fifteen years of service, including at least five years of civilian service, whichever date is later. He *may* retire at any time after he reaches age fifty-five and has completed thirty years of service, including at least five years of civilian service, or at age sixty-two with fifteen years of service, including five years of civilian service. Employees engaged primarily in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States criminal laws may retire at age fifty if they have twenty years of service. An employee leaving Federal employment after at least five years of civilian service but before meeting the above requirements, if he does not withdraw his accumulated contributions, is entitled to an annuity beginning at age sixty-two, or at separation if he is already sixty-two. An employee who has twenty years of creditable civilian service may not withdraw his contributions upon separation. Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended through 1955, secs. 1 and 2.

that most people not only are able to continue effective activity well into the period we commonly call old age but are healthier and happier for doing so. Optional retirement, on the other hand, should be possible at a much earlier age, because of the wide individual differences in the rate of aging as well as the differences in the physical and mental demands of various types of employment.

As indicated earlier in this book,[19] an increasingly older population is having its impact on personnel policies, both in public and in private employment. This has brought to the fore a greater interest in variable retirement ages. In industry, where compulsory retirement ages have been generally lower than in the public service, we find a growing willingness to raise maximum retirement age limits or to defer normal retirement at employee request.[20] Some business executives suggest compulsory retirement only on the determination of a panel of company officials and experts, considering each individual's capability to remain on the job or to assume an alternate assignment before deciding to retire him against his will.[21]

A government report on the subject points out that "the consensus of informed opinion is that tapering off from lifetime employment is generally better for the employee than sudden cessation."[22] This being the case, the use of arbitrary chronological age as the point for thrusting a worker out of full-time employment into no employment is looked upon with less and less favor. A faculty committee of the Graduate School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, concluded in 1952: "We do not feel justified in drawing a firm conclusion that workers in general will be better or worse off if they are retired at an arbitrary age. However, it is believed that as more information becomes available a policy of arbitrary retirement by chronological age will be increasingly difficult to support."[23] It is also in management's interest to take into account individual differences and to think twice before dispensing with the services of an able employee just because of the number of his years. The purpose of eliminating the truly superannuated may be better served by depending on examination of individual health and aptitudes, the nature of the work, and the possibility of "tapering off" assignments than by sudden separation based on an arbitrary criterion.

[19] See the discussion under "Age Limits" in Chapter 4.

[20] See the following study of practices and attitudes in fourteen companies: Helen Baker, *Retirement Procedures Under Compulsory and Flexible Retirement Policies*, Princeton University Industrial Relations Section (Princeton: 1952).

[21] Such is the idea proposed by Dr. John J. Wittmer, Vice-President of Consolidated Edison Company of New York, in "Second Thoughts of Compulsory Retirement," National Industrial Conference Board, *Management Record*, February, 1951.

[22] Division of State Merit Systems, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Problems of Mandatory and Variable Retirement Ages in State Employment* (Washington: August, 1954), p. 9.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

b. *Basis for Annuity.* When the annuity is based on years of service, and in turn determines the contributions required, consideration must be given both to the amount of the annuity and to the cost. Ordinarily and preferably the annuity is related to salary, as are the contributions. In theory, the more a worker is paid the more he can afford to set aside for the inevitable day of retirement; the more, too, he will need, in order at least to approximate the standard of life to which he has been accustomed. On the matter of salary, the question arises as to what amount shall serve as the basis of the annuity. The alternatives are the terminal salary, the average over the whole period of service, and the average over a selected period.

The terminal salary is probably the least satisfactory of the three methods. It makes predictions difficult for the actuary; it may give rise to inequalities among employees; it opens the door to favoritism and its opposite, in that an employer might raise or reduce the salary of an employee about to be retired, having in mind the effect on the annuity.

The annual salary average throughout the period of service is not used in any of the larger jurisdictions in the country as a base for contributions and annuities. This would make for equality of treatment and would facilitate predictions but might lessen the effect of salary increases as an incentive to effort, particularly in the later period of employment.

The standard method of determining the base for computing contributions and annuities for public employees is the use of the average annual salary over a brief period of years, as, for example, the last five or ten years of service. The Federal Government uses the period of five consecutive years when the highest annual salary was earned.

The next question has to do with the relation between the salary base selected, the years of service, and the annuity. For the worker on an average salary with a long period of service to his credit, the annuity is likely to approximate 50 percent in most systems, increasing possibly to 75 percent for the low-paid workers, and decreasing in percentage terms as the earnings go up. A minimum annuity providing at least enough for subsistence may be assured to low-paid workers whose employment begins at a relatively advanced age. A large proportion of the earlier plans provided for employee contribution rates to increase with age at entrance, but few of the new plans do so. Only nine of the thirty-seven systems for state employees base contribution rate on age at entrance.

In order to give proper weight to years of service and salary earnings in the computation of annuities, it is customary to multiply a stipulated fraction of the salary selected as the base by the number of years the annuitant has been on the pay roll. The most usual proportion is one-seventieth, although other fractions are sometimes used. In percentage terms, $1\frac{1}{3}$–$1\frac{2}{3}$ percent is roughly comparable.

One of the common automatic retirement benefits is in the form of a life annuity, with a death benefit equal to the difference between the accumulated employee contributions and the total of payments already received. Optional benefits of equivalent actuarial value are generally provided. In plans with the automatic feature the retiring employee may elect a somewhat larger annuity by forgoing the death benefit. He may elect a somewhat smaller annuity with provision for continuation of benefits for life to a surviving beneficiary. The decrease is, of course, larger if he elects to have the same amount payable for the future lifetime of the surviving beneficiary than if the annuity is to be reduced by one-half upon his death.

2. The Disability Benefit. A disability benefit is payable under most systems because of accident or disease which so handicaps the worker that he cannot perform his duties. Disability may be of two types: service-connected and "ordinary" disability. Most of the state-administered systems for general employees of political subdivisions provide disability annuities whether or not the disability is incurred in line of duty. Disability benefits are also incorporated in the Federal plan and most of the plans for state employees.

Where public employees are covered under workmen's compensation, the retirement plan should provide for paying the difference between workmen's compensation and the usual benefits for service-connected disability. A minimum period of service is generally required before the responsibility for disability benefits is assumed by the employer. The amount of the disability benefit is estimated in terms of the annuity purchasable from the reserves already built up for retirement purposes by the employee concerned, plus payments from disability reserves that have accumulated from joint contributions for this purpose, or from contributions of the employer alone.

In the administration of the disability provisions the services of a physician are required. The benefit should never be granted except upon medical certification, and the system should provide for a periodic medical inspection to see whether the disability continues. If, at any time, the recipient of a total disability benefit recovers sufficiently to engage in remunerative work, his allowance should be immediately reduced to that for partial disability. All this is largely a matter of common sense, and the rules adopted should be sufficiently flexible to permit adaptation to unforeseen contingencies.

3. The Death Benefit. The interests of the government are not so immediately apparent in connection with a death benefit as in regard to some of the others. However, the employing agency can be said to have a definite interest, since this benefit tends to improve morale and make the service more attractive to prospective entrants. The contingencies to be covered here also may be considered in two classes—death due to ordinary natural causes and death due directly to the actual performance of duty.

Under a sound system, the minimum benefit upon ordinary death before retirement should be the return of the employee's contributions plus the accumulated interest. Probably this is all that is desirable if there is a group life insurance plan.

In the case of accidental death in the performance of duty, a certain amount of responsibility rests upon the government as employer if the employees are not covered under workmen's compensation. Probably the most satisfactory arrangement in such a case is to provide a benefit of two parts, one consisting of the accumulated contributions of the employee or the annuity which they are sufficient to purchase, and the other of a pension paid to the dependents by the government. This pension should be met from the fund that has been set up to cover disability benefits. In the case of a surviving widow and several dependent children, supplementary funds may have to be provided until the children attain the age of sixteen or eighteen. In the event of remarriage, the widow's pension allowance paid by the employer would cease. These principles have been followed in the establishment of many of the sound retirement systems in the United States. The most usual provision is to base the amount of the pension paid by the government upon the salary of the dead employee. Some plans provide for an offset if workmen's compensation benefits are also payable.

4. Benefits upon Withdrawal from the Service. Provisions should be made for disposition of the employee's accumulated contributions upon termination of his services, by either resignation or dismissal, before retirement age. The provision may be for return of the employee's contributions with accumulated interest or payment of an annuity based on contributions plus interest, deferred until the optional age for retirement, or preferably for the exercise of option by the employee as to whether he receives an immediate refund or a deferred annuity. The deferred annuity may include a pro rata share of the benefit that would have been provided by the employer if the employee had remained in service until the retirement date. Usually the right to receive such a benefit is conditioned upon the employee's meeting certain age and service requirements before termination.

The policy of providing a deferred annuity, or at least permitting the employee to elect it, serves the purpose for which the contributions were originally made, namely, to provide an income for old age. Without provision either for refund or for deferred annuity, many desirable employees might hesitate to enter the system for fear they would be bound to the service for the rest of their lives by the penalty attached to leaving it. Employees already in the service would also be better satisfied under such provisions.

This principle has been recognized in the establishment of the Federal system and in the majority of the state and general municipal systems.

5. Coördination Between Retirement Systems. Several states which have a state-wide system covering local government employees and a state employee system provide for transfer of credits upon transfer of position from one governmental unit to another. This plan facilitates transfers and promotes the idea of a career service. It might well be developed between states and the Federal Government, on a reciprocal basis.

The possible transfer from one public employer to another and the accompanying continuation of a worker's retirement account lead to a brief consideration of the relation between the national old-age security program and the retirement systems of public jurisdictions. As we have already seen, even state and local employees who have a retirement system may acquire social security coverage if their employer makes the necessary arrangements, and supplementary coverage is likewise being proposed for Federal workers. Such extension of coverage also provides protection for public employees still not covered by any retirement system and provides greater protection of survivors than is at present provided in most state and local systems. In addition, it provides continuity of protection for workers who shift from one job to another in public employment or between public and private employment. It does not weaken in any way existing retirement systems or affect their independence. As old-age and survivors' insurance is extended to cover public employment, retirement systems for public employees are usually revised to provide supplementary protection in such a way that the total protection furnished under the two systems is greater than could be provided under either alone. The retirement systems for public employees remain completely independent of the national program in both operation and financing.

6. Membership. The question may arise whether membership in a retirement system should be compulsory or optional for all eligible employees. So far as those employees already in the service are concerned, practical considerations may dictate an optional membership. But for new entrants into the service, membership is compulsory in most up-to-date systems. If this principle is not adhered to, many of the advantages normally accruing to the government from the establishment of a retirement system will be lost. It will still be difficult to eliminate all the inefficient employees from the service if some of them are not protected by a superannuation benefit.

Elective officers, those appointed for limited terms, and temporary employees are usually not covered by the system, but they may be covered by social security alone, as temporaries now are in the Federal service.

E. THE SCOPE OF RETIREMENT PROVISIONS

In the history of retirement legislation in the United States there has been a tendency toward a multiplicity of separate pension funds covering

particular departments or even a subdivision of the employees within a single department. It is still not unusual to find a general retirement system existing for municipal employees side by side with a system for policemen, one for firemen, one for teachers, one for employees of the library or the water department, and so forth. Not only are confusion and a heavy tax burden the inevitable outcome of this multiplication of systems, but many of the funds so established are too small to operate successfully upon an actuarial basis and can never be sound. Before the experience furnished upon the basis of mortality tables will apply, a sufficiently large number of persons have to be included under the system so that the laws of probability will operate. This is impossible under many of the departmental schemes.

Wherever possible these separate retirement funds should be consolidated along lines of either a service or a jurisdictional sort. As an example of the first, there are the various state retirement systems for teachers, many of which are well constituted. Probably the greatest advantage will accrue, however, from the establishment of systems which correspond with broad jurisdictional lines. Certainly there should be no retirement plans which contemplate the inclusion of fewer members than the total group of employees of the average municipality, and some advantages may result from the consolidation of all the systems in an entire state. There has been an increasing tendency to include both state and local employees in the same system. As noted above, New York made such a provision as early as 1922. At present, in six states the same system provides for state employees, general local employees, and teachers. In seventeen other states the same system covers state employees and general local employees, while in two additional states teachers and state employees are included in the same system.[24]

By way of conclusion, note should be taken of the fact that we still have some distance to go in covering all public employees under a retirement system. As recently as 1952, twenty-three percent of all state and local employees were without retirement or pension coverage.[25] This means that many public jurisdictions are still operating under an outmoded and benighted philosophy.

F. ADMINISTRATION

The best practice suggests that the plan should be administered by an executive director appointed by and responsible to a board of trustees. Membership on the latter body should be divided between the employees and the governmental agency wherever the joint contributory plan is in force. Employee representation on the board is desirable because the em-

[24] Information supplied by Weltha Van Eenam, Actuarial Mathematician, Social Security Administration.

[25] *The Book of the States, 1954–55*, p. 191.

ployees' money is involved and because it results in the stimulation of interest in the plan among the employees.

As is usually the case with such an organization, the board of trustees should be charged with the determination of matters of policy, while the actual execution of policy should be placed clearly in the hands of the executive director of the system. Some method has to be devised to cover the costs of administration, and here again they may be shared jointly by the employees and the government, or entirely by the latter. The plan usually encounters less resistance upon the part of the employees if such costs are borne by the governmental agency, and this method is commonly followed in the more outstanding systems. This is a relatively small burden in comparison with the total cost of the system.

The administrative setup should also make specific provision for actuarial assistance to the executive director, and the law establishing the system should be so drawn as to require periodic actuarial valuations. This is the only basis upon which the soundness of the pension scheme can be ascertained. Under the New York State law, for example, which may be taken as a model in this respect, it is required that an annual valuation be made of the system by an actuary.[26] Upon the basis of these valuations the overall rate of employer contribution will be varied from time to time to reflect variations of actual from assumed conditions. Consideration should be given the matter of adjusting annuities and contributions to changes in the purchasing power of money. To some extent this has been done in amending the benefit and contribution formulas of certain systems and in basing benefits upon average earnings of the last few years of service.

This is as good a place as any to take note of the obligation of the employer to prepare aging employees for retirement. More and more private businesses are concerning themselves with this responsibility.[27] For those whose retirement is in sight in the near future it is very helpful to prepare them for use of their increased leisure, for pleasant avocations, for travel, and for care of their health. Conference groups, movies, and distribution of periodical and other literature on the subject often contribute to such preparation of mental-set as well as to provision of knowledge and information that will be useful. Perhaps as we develop more and more flexible retirement policies this preparation will take the course of winning acceptance of a "tapering off" approach as well as preparing for full-scale retirement.

G. DISABILITY OF EMPLOYEES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS

Nearly all retirement systems have minimum service requirements for disability benefits. Yet employees may become disabled for the perform-

[26] New York State, *Laws* (1920), Chap. 741, sec. 54, p. 3.

[27] A bibliography on "Preparing Employees for Retirement" was issued by Princeton University's Industrial Relations Section in *Selected References, No. 39*, May, 1951.

ance of their duties before serving the minimum period, and even those who have served for the minimum period may not apply for retirement when they become disabled. Public agencies cannot continue such employees indefinitely on their rolls.

Instructions of the Federal Civil Service Commission may serve as a model for policy and procedure for protecting the rights of such employees while at the same time taking the action required for the good of the service.[28] Certain features of this policy might well be mandatory in all public jurisdictions: the retention in nonpay status of employees who have become temporarily disabled in the performance of duty during the period when they are receiving workmen's compensation; application on behalf of the employee for disability retirement, when the employee meets minimum service requirements; and retention on the rolls, in nonpay status if necessary, pending determination of retirement eligibility. In addition, if a permanent employee becomes physically unable to perform the duties of his current position, but is qualified and physically able to perform other work in the agency satisfactorily, he should be given the opportunity of reassignment to such work, if the reassignment will not require the displacement of another permanent employee.

SUMMARY

The characteristics of a sound retirement system may be summarized as follows:

1. The system should be established and maintained upon an actuarial basis. This requires the services of an actuary not only at the time the system is set up but throughout its existence. Periodic actuarial investigations and valuations should be required.

2. The actuarial deficit existing at the time the system is established should be met by the government alone, through regular annual appropriations extending over a period of years.

3. The liabilities on account of service rendered after the establishment of the system should be met under a joint contributory plan. The rate of the employee's contribution should be a certain proportion of his salary. This proportion may be graduated according to sex and age at the time of entrance into the system. The employer should probably pay about one-half the cost of future service benefits for the group as a whole. The exact share or amount either in dollars or as percentage of pay roll cannot be definitely determined in advance under the usual type of plan. Actual experience will determine the cost to the employer, who is always liable for the balance necessary to provide the stated benefits.

4. The system should provide benefits upon superannuation or long-

[28] *Federal Personnel Manual*, Chap. S1, p. 8, as revised February 8, 1951.

term disability, and also death benefits equaling at least the return of accumulated employee contributions.

5. The amount of the superannuation benefit should be based upon the average annual salary over a period of years and the length of service. This relationship cannot be absolute, however, and it is essential that a minimum benefit be established. The most satisfactory systems appear to be those under which the retired employee receives the actuarial equivalent of his contributions in the form of an annuity, which is more or less matched by a pension provided by the state and which is supplemented by the prior service benefit, if any. However, the attractiveness of the system is enhanced if the employee is allowed several options as to the form in which he will take his benefit. Retirement should be at least in part upon the basis of age, possibly in combination with length of service.

6. The plan should provide either for retirement at the option of the employer as well as the employee or for compulsory retirement at a specified age. Our earlier ideas as to compulsory retirement stem from a time when a youthful population was pulling at the bits, and the only way to give youth a chance to run was to push the old horses out of harness. As the ratios change, we are changing our ideas. Perhaps retirement at the option of the employer accomplishes the same result on a more individualized basis. At any rate, arbitrary retirement based solely on chronological age is losing favor.

7. If the retirement system covers benefits for disability incurred in performance of duty, because adequate benefits are not provided under an applicable workmen's compensation law, the entire cost of such benefits should be borne by the government. Any disability benefits in the retirement system, whether for ordinary or service-connected disability, should extend only to presumably permanent disability of either a partial or a total variety, and should be granted only after medical certification, with provision for periodic examinations.

8. The minimum benefit upon death of a member of the system should be the equivalent of his contributions, with accumulated interest. If death resulting from accident or occupational disease incurred in performance of duty is not adequately covered by applicable workmen's compensation legislation, an additional benefit should be paid. Survivor benefits for dependents may be included if not provided under group insurance.

9. Upon resignation or dismissal from the service, the employee might be allowed the option of receiving a refund of his contributions with accumulated interest or a deferred annuity payable at normal retirement age. In the latter case, the deferred benefit may well be a portion of the benefit that would have been payable if the employee had continued in service until retirement age, proportional to the length of service actually rendered. Under this provision a portion of the benefit is provided by the employer.

10. Both employees and the employing agency should be represented in the administration of the system. The plan should provide for an executive head in addition to the usual board of trustees.

11. The employer should consider it his responsibility to help prepare aging employees for retirement.

12. It has been recognized that employees may become disabled for performance of their duties before meeting minimum service requirements for disability retirement, or may refuse to apply for such retirement even when eligible. Where the employee is qualified for and physically able to perform other work, reassignment may be feasible; but where this is not the case, the employing agency should have administrative discretion to separate the employee. In such separations, however, the employee's rights should be carefully safeguarded.

13. Finally, as our aging population grows, retirement plans must be amended to assure adequate flexibility to meet changing conditions.

22

Staff Reductions

Along with disability or death, one of the factors affecting stability of any employment is the degree to which there are fluctuations or contractions in the activity concerned. Although employment in the public service is capable of greater stabilization than in many competitive industries, complete stabilization is impossible to achieve, even if desirable. Government, as well as industry, is confronted at times with the problem of cutting its pay rolls. In industry and in some local public services these cuts are referred to as "layoffs." In the Federal civil service they are known as "reductions in force."

The necessity for a reduction in staff arises not only when a certain piece of work has been completed or a contraction in governmental functioning occurs at some particular point but also when a cut in appropriations calls for a general reduction in the working force, with or without a reduction in the functions performed. In the first instance, the situation affects a particular agency or particular types of employment. In the second, the effect is general and is felt throughout the whole service. The problem should be handled differently in the two situations.

As a general principle, it should be the purpose of every employer to provide continuity of employment as long as the employee's services are satisfactory. In actual practice this is not always feasible, but the government, as a model employer, should be guided by the principle as far as practicable. Accordingly, if a reduction in the staff of a particular agency or group of employees is found necessary, every effort should be made to place those who are to be laid off in other positions through the transfer process. The spectacle of an agency dismissing efficient employees, on the one hand, and another one recruiting new ones for similar positions, on the other, betokens poor management and a lack of appreciation of the workers' welfare. Judicious use of the transfer machinery can do much to reduce this form of unnecessary and undesirable turnover.

When conditions demand a general reduction in force, affecting a number of departments and establishments, the situation becomes different. The problem now is that of selecting those employees who are to be laid off or dismissed. Two factors are generally employed as criteria for such purpose: (1) length of service and (2) performance. The former is more commonly adopted. Thus, in many jurisdictions in the United States, it is provided that, in case of a reduction of force, employees shall be laid off in inverse order to that in which they were hired. Under such provisions the most recently hired employees would be laid off first and those who had been longest in service retained. Similar procedures have been widely followed in industry.[1]

Such a criterion has the advantage of recognizing the responsibility of the employer to an employee who has a long record of service. It also has the advantage of simplicity in administration and can be applied without fear or favor. But, since the primary aims of personnel administration are to bring into and retain in the service the best-qualified persons, it is open to some objection. Seniority is not much better as a basis for retention in the service than it is for promotion. In both instances, due consideration should be given to the performance of the employees.

This fact has been recognized in the more progressive jurisdictions in this country. For example, some provide that "the least efficient permanent employee as shown by the most recent efficiency ratings" shall be laid off first, and so on in the order of efficiency. This rule makes no provision for the weighing of factors other than those measured by the performance rating scheme. It may work out well, but it presupposes more discriminating records than are maintained in most jurisdictions.

I. FEDERAL EXPERIENCE

The problem of layoffs in state and local jurisdictions is rarely as critical as it is in the United States civil service. In addition to the major contractions which took place in the Federal service following World War II and again following the Korean emergency, there have been continuing changes in program and organization which have led to reductions in particular agencies. On top of this, the critical review of budgets and appropriations each year, creating the threat of retrenchment almost annually, is responsible for a highly charged atmosphere each spring and summer particularly in the headquarters of agencies in Washington. More often than not, the threat of appropriation cuts is more serious than the final outcome. The morale-shattering effect of this annual effort to impress upon the bureaucracy that it is "swollen" and must retrench is rarely considered by some

[1] Cf. Princeton University, Industrial Relations Section, Report No. 58, *The Seniority Principle in Union-Management Relations* (Princeton: 1939). This is a broad treatment of seniority as applied both to reduction of staff and to promotion.

politicians bent upon making a showing to their constituents back home, who are eager to see the bureaucracy reduced in the mistaken belief that it would make a significant difference in their taxes.[2] The advantage of budgeting and appropriating, at least for most activities, on a three-year or five-year basis is not often assessed from the viewpoint of sound personnel management.

Layoffs in the manufacturing industry are at a higher rate than those in the Federal civil service, for example, only because there is a higher proportion of blue-collar workers in this branch of industry than there is in the government. These craftsmen and laborers bear the brunt of industrial production shifts and technological changes. There is a similar disparity in separations due to layoffs between the manufacturing industry and white-collar enterprises, such as insurance companies. Even within the government, there are as sharp contrasts between different agencies or different activities within an agency as between certain kinds of government activity and certain kinds of business.

In the Federal service the attempt has been made to combine the two criteria of length of service and performance. Thus, an executive order of October 24, 1921, provided for the use of "separation ratings" in cases where a reduction in force was ordered. This has since been modified various times by a series of executive orders, by the rules of the Civil Service Commission, and by certain statutes. The present provisions may be summarized as follows:

1. Whenever an agency must separate an employee from duty and pay status for more than thirty days in order to reduce personnel, it must consider all employees in the same agency and commuting area who occupy positions in which interchange of personnel is feasible. The highest retention preference is given to employees holding career appointments and the lowest to those holding appointments definitely limited to one year or less. An intermediate group is composed of career employees who are serving probationary periods and career-conditional employees—those who have not completed the three years of service required for career appointments.

2. Within each of these three groups there are two subgroups, veterans having higher retention preference than nonveterans. (Veterans who have been restored less than one year previously, under statutory provisions for restoration of permanent employees after military service, have the highest retention preference of all employees, regardless of length of service or performance.)

3. Within each of the subgroups, retention preference is based on credits composed of one point for each full year of service, with two points added for a performance rating between "satisfactory" and "outstanding," and four points for an

[2] A surprisingly small percentage of Federal expenditures (around 13 to 15 percent) goes to pay salaries of civilian employees. The bulk of Federal taxation pays for munitions, maintenance of the armed services, interest on the public debt, veterans' benefits, and state grants-in-aid for welfare, highways, etc.—in other words, mostly for past and future wars and for materials and equipment.

"outstanding" rating. An exception to the regular order of selection may be made only when the employee to be retained is engaged on necessary duties which cannot be taken over, without undue interruption to the activity, by any employee with higher standing on the retention register. Permanent employees reached for action in one group of positions must, under certain conditions, be assigned to other positions.

4. Any employee who believes that the regulations have not been correctly applied in his case may appeal to the Civil Service Commission. Any corrective action recommended by the commission is mandatory upon the agency.[3]

The first Hoover Commission recommended that the statutory basis of and regulations governing reductions in force be changed so that there would be more realistic ranking of employees from the standpoint of their overall usefulness to the agency in question and that such ranking be approached from the point of view of "which employees should be retained" rather than which should be eliminated.[4] The recommendation raises serious procedural difficulties when the competitive area includes positions under a number of supervisors. This was followed by the second Hoover Commission's interest in making a sharp curtailment of veteran preference in connection with staff reductions. In 1955 this body urged a reduction in veteran advantage in retention by placing nonveterans with fifteen or more years of service in the same category as all veterans except those who are disabled. It did not go as far as its Task Force, however, which recommended elimination of veteran preference as a retention factor during layoffs, even though continuing the counting of military service toward seniority.[5] This would be in line with the concept of preference as a readjustment aid in initial employment rather than as a continuing reward.[6] Once he is in the service, considerations of merit and seniority would be the guiding considerations for retention of the veteran as well as of the nonveteran.

II. REËMPLOYMENT

It is desirable that efficient employees separated from the service because of reduction in staff be given opportunity for reëmployment if an expansion in staff occurs within a reasonable time after their separation. Only by conferring upon this group a preferred status for a short time can the government's responsibility for the continuity of employment be expressed. However, it should be emphasized in this connection, as well as

[3] Summarized from "Retention Preference Regulations for Use in Reductions in Force," in *Federal Personnel Manual*, Chap. Z1, pp. 285–290, as amended through April 12, 1955. See also, U.S. Civil Service Commission Pamphlet No. 41, *Reductions in Force in Federal Agencies*, January, 1955.

[4] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel Management* (Washington: 1949), pp. 34–35.

[5] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), p. 73, and *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington: February, 1955), p. 104.

[6] See the discussion in Chapter 6.

in others, that the principle of merit is not wisely sacrificed to other considerations.

It becomes necessary, then, to surround the reëmployment procedure with such restrictions as will assure that it contributes to the good of the service. This is a particularly difficult task. If separations on account of reduction in force are based primarily upon the criterion of efficiency, as they should be, those laid off may be in fact "the halt and the lame" of the service. The question then arises whether they should have what amounts to a lien on employment or should be required to enter into open competition for any future vacancies.

In this instance, again, the dependence of one aspect of the personnel program upon other aspects appears. Assuming, first, recruitment and selection systems which bring the best available talent into the service and, second, a vigorous exercise of the removal power to rid the service of any misfits who do secure appointment, the advantages of according a limited preferred status to laid-off employees ought to be considered. Many factors enter into this point of view, among them the beneficial effect upon the morale of those still in the service of providing special opportunities for laid-off employees. The responsibility of the government toward employees separated through no fault of their own has been quite generally recognized, a recognition which has led to the adoption of special provisions governing reëmployment.

In the Federal service, for example, each agency is required to set up and maintain a reinstatement reserve list for each competitive area where career employees with fully satisfactory efficiency ratings are separated in reductions in force. The name of each such former employee is kept on the list for all positions for which he is qualified and available for one year or until such earlier date as he signs a written request to take his name off, accepts a Federal position (other than a temporary position), or declines reinstatement to a position in the competitive service equivalent in grade and salary to the position from which he was separated. As long as there is a person or an agency reinstatement list, it may not fill any position for which he is qualified and available by transfer from a different agency or by new appointment or reinstatement of any person except certain preference eligibles. Exceptions to these provisions may be made for reasons which promote the efficiency of the service, provided each person not selected as a result of the exception is notified of the reasons and of his right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission.[7]

The 1949 Hoover Commission recommended a government-wide program of preference for laid-off employees, as follows:

> Career employees who are laid off as a result of reduction in force should be given special consideration for other Federal jobs.

[7] *Federal Personnel Manual*, Chap. Z1, p. 289 (January 23, 1955).

i. They should be referred to the Civil Service Commission for a determination as as to where their services can be used most effectively.
ii. They should be given a top priority for consideration for any vacancy in the Government for which the Commission considers them qualified.
iii. Until such time as they are placed in a new job, or for a period not to exceed 3 months, they should be entitled to draw the same compensation they were drawing at the time the reduction in force took place. During the period it takes to find new jobs for these employees, they should be regarded as a "reserve," subject to assignment by the Civil Service Commission to temporary service in departments and agencies.[8]

The Hoover Commission report does not suggest limitation of preference for reëmployment to persons with satisfactory ratings. The present regulations are preferable in this respect. In some jurisdictions the names of employees who have been laid off are placed on the reëmployment list in the order of their ratings. The certification procedure is then the same as in the case of original appointment, those highest on the list being certified first, and so on. Some provision for taking account of efficiency is in harmony with the merit principle.

III. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The guarantee of some minimal income to workers for limited periods following a layoff has been a cornerstone of American social security since 1936. Administered through separate state systems, this plan of unemployment insurance has been available to state and local governments from the beginning. Although Federal financial assistance to the state systems on the basis of a tax offset plan does not apply to state or local government employees, a total of fifteen states (including Alaska and the District of Columbia) provide this insurance coverage to their public employees—usually including local as well as state workers. Unemployment insurance was not made applicable to Federal workers until January 1, 1955.[9] Considering the frequency of reductions in force in the national establishment, it is strange that nearly two decades elapsed before this extension of elementary justice to these public employees came to pass.

In the meantime Federal employees relied on payment for their accumulated annual leave as a "cushion" in event of layoff. Apart from the arbitrary limitations on such accumulations, these leave payments represent amounts already earned by the workers to which they would be entitled in one form or another regardless of whether or not they were laid off

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

[9] P.L. 767, 83rd Cong., 2nd sess., approved September 1, 1954, effective January 1, 1955. For the situation as to state and local employees see U.S. Department of Labor, *Extension of Coverage Under State Unemployment Insurance Laws: Employees of State and Local Governments* (Washington: October, 1954).

and can in no wise be viewed as a proper substitution for unemployment insurance.

Although the general plan is complex in administration, owing to the operation through forty-eight somewhat varying state systems, Federal agencies have worked out a standard procedure for compliance with individual state laws.[10] When a laid-off employee applies to a state employment agency, in the area where his last Federal establishment is located, his former employer certifies (on standard forms, used with all the states) as to his earnings and the reasons for separation. Until the state agency can find him another job reasonably appropriate to his skills or until the maximum period of insurance is reached, the state pays him weekly compensation bearing some relation to his previous earnings, within the particular minimum and maximum rates paid to other unemployed workers in that state. In the better-paying states and in the District of Columbia the ceiling on the weekly payment for workers without dependents is in the neighborhood of $30.

SUMMARY

This chapter has urged that merit be the primary basis for retention in service when the staff is being reduced and that a limited preferred status for reëmployment be given to laid-off employees who have rendered satisfactory service. Such a principle obviously excludes what has been termed the "eleemosynary concept of the public payroll" and preferments in retention and reëmployment that have little or no relationship to merit.

This chapter also has stressed the value of unemployment insurance to public workers, now that they are finally being recognized as deserving of the same protection and treatment as private employees.

[10] Under the leadership of the Department of Labor and the U.S. Civil Service Commission, this plan for administration of unemployment insurance under state laws was worked out in advance in 1953 through the machinery of the former Federal Personnel Council (the assembly of Federal personnel directors now known as the Interagency Advisory Group, operated by the U.S. Civil Service Commission). This was an exemplary instance of interdepartmental coöperation.

PART VII

Personnel Machinery

Personnel administration is the utilization of the best scientific knowledge of all kinds to the end that an organization as a whole and the individuals composing it shall find that corporate purpose and individual purposes are being reconciled to the fullest possible extent, while the working together of these purposes realizes also a genuine social benefit.

—Ordway Tead, *The Art of Administration* (New York: 1951), p. 145

23

The Central Personnel Agency

Under the impetus of the civil service reform wave which broke in the 1880's, central personnel agencies were created in the Federal Government and in several state and municipal jurisdictions. In this movement the lead of England and the British Dominions was followed rather than that of the continental countries, where, with few exceptions, personnel administration has been handled on an intradepartmental basis.

There are numerous reasons for the divergence between American and continental European treatment of the status and organization of the personnel agency. They are grounded, for one thing, in the different traditions of European monarchy and the newer democracy.[1] As was indicated in an earlier chapter, the development of democratic government, both in England and in the United States, seriously complicated the problems of the selection and status of the civil servant. In both cases it became necessary to re-create that "sphere of neutrality" destroyed when control of the bureaucracy passed completely into the hands of politicians. It was thus with the primary aim of freeing the public servant from allegiance to and dependence upon the politician that independent personnel agencies were created, first in England, then in the United States. The end determined the means employed, and from the start the civil service commission was merely a recruiting agency, designed to make certain that persons *entered* the service only through merit, regardless of what happened to them thereafter or to the service of which they became a part. The new agencies were designed as "politics eliminators" and little more. The system of civil service control which finally resulted was accordingly designed to prevent specific abuses, without special reference to other phases of the employment situation.

In order to insure the elimination of political abuses, the typical civil service commission, established prior to the economy and efficiency movement, was organized independent of and largely external to the adminis-

[1] Among the major continental countries, of course, only France has had any extended experience with democracy, and in France the character of the service has been greatly influenced by the administrative system created during the Napoleonic interlude.

trative hierarchy. Although the members of the commission are ordinarily appointed by the chief executive, that official is presumably prevented from packing the commission by the provision of overlapping terms. Under the standard scheme, only a single commissioner is appointed during a single term of the executive.

I. LIMITED SUCCESS OF THE COMMISSION FORM

It must be granted at the outset that the selection of personnel through competition under the auspices of a special agency established for the purpose has contributed materially toward checking the evils associated with the spoils system. In the three-quarters of a century since the enactment of the Pendleton Act, the Federal, state, and municipal jurisdictions have made noticeable progress in the direction of establishing a public service loyal to the State as a whole and ready to serve whatever party may come to power. To be sure, such progress has been far from uniform. In certain jurisdictions it has been negligible, and in others the commission has been little more than an irritating obstacle to be hurdled. Despite this unevenness, however, the generalization is valid that an advance has been made.

The selection of employees on the basis of qualifications, together with relative permanence of tenure, has led to savings that have not been and perhaps could not be computed.[2] In the absence of the protection afforded by a civil service law,[3] public administration is subjected to such disorganization and such a burden of expense, because of the costliness of continually training a great body of novices, as would bankrupt, if not wreck, a commercial enterprise that had to balance its accounts from year to year.

Yet it is not at all evident, in spite of the admitted advances since the eighties, that the civil service commission is the *sine qua non* of the merit system. Indeed, many factors other than the commission system have contributed to the gradual liberation of the civil servant from the political spoilsmen. Chief among these is the ever more technical nature of both the instruments and the objects of public administration, which, in many spheres of governmental enterprise, has made the old spoils system intolerable. Another contributing factor is to be found in the increasing costs of government, which have aroused the public to demand the elimination

[2] The National Civil Service League published in the early 1940's an undated pamphlet entitled *The Business Value of the Merit System*. Here are brought together a number of concrete and telling examples of the savings effected through the adoption of the merit system.

[3] Usage sanctions the term "civil service law" as denoting a statutory or constitutional provision requiring selection and appointment under the merit system. Similarly, "civil service" is commonly used to indicate this same requirement, although, strictly speaking, the *civil* service includes all public employees not in the military or naval branches. Because of some of the unfavorable connotations of the term "civil service," an effort is made here to use the term "merit system" in its stead. The usage has not, however, been overcome in the popular mind.

of waste and inefficiency. Such a demand has influenced administrators to give more heed to personnel matters.

Nor does the evidence show that the bipartisan civil service commission has been successful in the elimination of politics in dealing with personnel—that is, any more successful than any other agency functioning under a merit system law might have been. That the commission system has been a panacea against spoils, as was anticipated by some of the more ardent advocates of the reform movement, cannot be granted. In that excellent work *Fighting the Spoilsmen*, William Dudley Foulke expressed his convictions upon this point as follows: "The great purpose of it [this reform] is not so much to provide an efficient civil service (although it does this) as to remove the temptation to use the offices of the government for personal or party ends, in other words, to remove the incentive to that kind of political corruption which is nourished by the hope of office. It does this by something akin to a mechanical contrivance, making it automatically impossible for the politician seeking the control of patronage to appoint the particular man he wants."[4]

Any fair-minded critic will concede that this hope has not been realized. Foulke conceived of the civil service commission as a machine working automatically. But, like other governmental agencies, it is run by human beings and is subject to manipulation to serve the ends considered desirable by those in control. Here, as in other instances, the American people have placed undue confidence in the saving power of machinery, apparently little realizing that the manner of administration is of more importance than the system prescribed in the law. Indeed, there are not a few commissions which are so handled that they constitute a focal center of political influences and to which only those giving the political countersign have entry.

After these introductory remarks, we may now turn to a consideration of some specific shortcomings of the civil service commission, which, of course, are generalizations not applying to all situations. A number of commissions have been at some time in the past or are at present worthy exponents of the ideals and principles at which civil service reform aimed.[5] In the main, however, civil service reform has not realized the hopes of its advocates and has fallen far short of the anticipations of Foulke, as stated in the paragraph just quoted.

A. BIPARTISAN CHARACTER

One difficulty has grown out of the standard law providing for three commissioners, not more than two of whom may be members of the same political party. Furthermore, in order to prevent the executive who has

[4] (New York: 1919), pp. 9 f.

[5] The following may be cited, among others, as belonging to this group: Cincinnati, Detroit, Milwaukee, Los Angeles City and County, California, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York State and City, Wayne County, and Wisconsin.

the appointing power from "packing" the commission, it is usually provided that commission members shall serve six years each, one being named every two years. In other words, nonpartisanship with an eye to merit and fitness is to be achieved by a bipartisan body. The inherent contradictions in such a setup apparently escaped notice in the early days of the reform wave. Some commissions have been political-minded.

It is clear that the best law ever promulgated, whether in personnel or any other field, may be virtually annulled if it is not administered by men of training, independence, and character. This is, perhaps, more true in the case of the control of personnel than elsewhere, because the temptation and pressure are greater here, now that budgetary and accounting controls set rather effective limits on the earlier methods of grafting public funds.

Political pressure may, therefore, be actually concentrated upon the civil service commission. To withstand such pressure requires exceptional courage and independence in the members of the commission. For whether the law is upheld, evaded, or violated depends largely upon the commissioners themselves. It should be stated and heavily underscored that many straightforward and high-minded men and women have served as commissioners, to their own honor and the welfare of their communities. If it were not for such, some of the advances made by the merit system would not have occurred. It behooves those interested in better government through the aid of better personnel not to relax their efforts with the passage of a law, but to bring pressure to bear upon the appointing authority each time a new appointment is made to the commission, and more particularly to see to it that active politicians are not entrusted with this important office. The appointment of such is a kind of guarantee of sabotage.

The National Civil Service League has long considered some alternative method of selecting the members of a commission as a means of reducing the danger of poisoning the waters of merit and fitness at the source. The President's Committee on Administrative Management made the observation: "The plural character of the membership of the commission . . . appears to militate against the maintenance of a close and helpful administrative relationship to the Chief Executive."[6] The first Hoover Commission recommended that the Federal Civil Service Commission "should be reorganized to vest in its chairman the responsibility for the administrative direction of its work."[7] This proposal was carried out in the President's Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949.

B. RELATIVE ISOLATION

The second serious charge to be brought against the usual type of commission is that it both is and is not a part of the administrative machinery.

[6] Floyd W. Reeves and Paul T. David, *Personnel Administration in the Federal Service* (Washington: 1937), p. 4.

[7] *Personnel Management* (Washington: 1949), p. 9.

So far as prescribed functions are concerned, it is; in its practical operations, it generally is not. As has been pointed out, in any enterprise, large or small, private or public, one of the most important branches of management is personnel administration. The functions of selection, promotion, maintaining morale and efficiency, removal, and the like, in which the commission ordinarily has some share, are part and parcel of this administration. But when these functions are carried on by a kind of extra-administrative agency which is, all too frequently, looked upon askance by the department heads, a situation arises that runs counter to the principles of sound management.

In fairness it must be said that there are many public officials in administrative positions who find in the commission an accessory and an aid to their work, particularly in the matter of preliminary selection. Their number is increasing because of the progressive enlightenment of commissioners operating under the influence of qualified technicians, who are found on more and more staffs of civil service agencies. The tendency to bridge the gap between the commission as a service agency and the operating units being serviced is enhanced by the appointment of competent personnel officers within the operating units, who serve as a link between the commission and the unit concerned. Nevertheless, a large number of public executives protest against the independence of the commission and question whether it can ever serve as a coöperating and constructive agency in the administrative setup.

C. AMATEUR QUALITY

In part, at least, this hostile attitude of many administrative heads is traceable to the amateur character of the membership of the great majority of commissions. Not only is the civil service commission a semi-isolated agency, located outside the regular administrative hierarchy, but all too frequently its members know little or nothing about employment procedures. Perhaps in no other field has the democratic dogma of the amateur in administration been carried so far and with such disastrous results as in that of personnel. Farmers, lawyers, housewives, journalists, as well as professional politicians, characterize the range of occupations from which commissioners are drawn. Nor do the majority of these commissioners remain in office much longer than the time required to become thoroughly acquainted with their jobs. Analysis of turnover records from a number of jurisdictions indicates that the average commissioner, even in the more populous jurisdictions, serves less than four years, and this despite widespread provisions for a six-year term.

Not all amateurs, however, have been failures at civil service commission posts. Witness, for example, the militant leadership given to the Federal Civil Service Commission in its early days by Theodore Roosevelt.

D. PATRONAGE

Presumably the commission guards the entrance gate to public positions. It may use its vantage point to "keep the rascals out" by insisting upon competition in the interest of merit, but again it may guard in such a way that only those with the requisite amount of political merit may enter. The methods of evasion in the interest of such are almost too numerous to mention. Among the more important, the following may be noted: (1) favoritism in grading examination papers; (2) giving excessive weight to such intangibles as personality and character, thus permitting a wide range of discretion to be used in upgrading the approved candidates; (3) influencing those at the top of the list to waive their rights in the interest of the approved candidate; (4) declaring positions exempt or noncompetitive on one of a dozen or more meretricious pretexts; (5) failure to give adequate publicity to examinations, thus limiting competition to the favored candidates; (6) failure to have lists of three or more eligibles available, thereby giving the appointing authority a free hand to designate whom he pleases as a provisional appointee (such provisionals will then have an advantage over other competitors when the examination is later scheduled).

These are some of the usual and standard devices for evading the civil service law. Through evasions of this sort the law has become in some jurisdictions a form and a farce and the commission a mere adjunct of the party machine. By the exercise of the executive's removal power and with the aid of a subservient commission, it may be easy to substitute deserving Democrats for rascally Republicans or deserving Republicans for rascally Democrats up and down the classified list when the partisan complexion of the administration changes. Here again, an alert and interested citizenry in many localities has been the basis for gradual reduction of these baneful practices.

E. LEGISLATIVE INTERFERENCE

The scope of the commission's authority and its means of carrying on its functions are directly dependent on the attitude and good will of the legislative branch. It is within the power of the legislators to disrupt the civil service by the passage of laws such as those giving sweeping preference to veterans, exempting specific positions from the classified service, and placing restrictions on removals, or by bringing influence to bear in individual cases in the matter of promotions and disciplinary action.

A second major area subject to legislative interference is the matter of appropriations. By a niggardly policy any commission may be practically "hamstrung" through lack of funds. This was the main cause for the collapse of the merit system in several state governments. Legislative control also serves to keep the members of the commission in a docile state of mind. Whatever the purpose and whatever the consequences, the fact is that the

effectiveness of many commissions is seriously curtailed by insufficient appropriations. All too frequently what began as a good piece of personnel administration has had to modified because of a shortage of funds.

Understaffing is one of the most serious results of a policy of penury. Lack of staff means that there is no opportunity, even if there are the capacity and desire, to improve recruiting and management techniques. What is no less serious, it means that there will be relatively few contacts with the departments which the commission is aiming to serve. There is nothing that breeds lack of confidence and lack of coöperation so much as the absence of such contacts. If the staff of the commission is overwhelmed with the routine work of keeping eligible lists in shape, there will be little or no time to associate with the department and division heads as a means of improving the examinations, to say nothing of the handling of promotions, transfers, performance, and similar functions that can properly be carried out only through the coöperation of other administrative officials.

The trend for some time among progressive commissions has been in the direction of the professionalization of the staff of the personnel agency. This inevitably requires sufficient appropriations to provide salaries that will attract technically trained persons. As the functions of the personnel agency expand to meet the increasingly technical demands of employment management, the character of the staff must change accordingly, but within the limits imposed by present appropriations such changes have been necessarily restricted.

Among local jurisdictions a partial solution to the funds problem is found through provision of central examining and technical services by the state personnel agency, as found in California, New York, New Jersey, and to a lesser extent Massachusetts. Usually smaller cities are able to get high-caliber professional work done at a lower cost through such devices than is otherwise possible.

II. DESCRIPTION OF REPRESENTATIVE COMMISSIONS

This section is devoted to a brief analysis of the constitution of some of the more important public personnel agencies in Federal, state, municipal, and county jurisdictions, with special attention to those which have introduced innovations of one type or another. On the whole, a trend toward the extension of personnel functions beyond those ordinarily undertaken by the typical commission, as well as toward a closer tie between the personnel agency and other staff and operating divisions of government, appears to be well under way.

A. THE FEDERAL PERSONNEL SYSTEM

As the oldest, the largest, and the most highly organized commission, it is fitting to describe first the composition of the Federal agency in some detail. In organization and functional responsibilities it has long served as

the prototype of civil service commissions. The statutes under which it operates hove been widely copied by other jurisdictions. The commission is a bipartisan board whose three members are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and serve at the pleasure of the President.

In 1949, under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 5, which followed out the first Hoover Commission recommendations, day-to-day administration of the commission's work was separated from the regulatory and appellate functions. The executive responsibilities were vested in the Chairman, who supervises the examination, classification, enforcement, and other program activities of the commission and looks after all matters of internal operation. Assisting him and acting in his absence is an Executive Director. Issuance of rules, hearing of appeals provided by law or regulation, and preparation of legislative recommendations to the President are the principal functions reserved to the three-member commission itself. This is viewed as a major reform in the commission's organization, for it has unquestionably improved the speed and smoothness of many operations that were often impeded in the past by lack of cohesive direction.

Since 1953 the central officie of the commission has been organized after the logical sequence of the basic management steps—planning, execution, and control. This fits the highly decentralized personnel system of the Federal Government. Planning, policy development, standard-setting, and research are centered in a Bureau of Programs and Standards. Such "carrying-out" activities as centralized examining, investigations, and retirement administration are carried out through a Bureau of Departmental Operations and a Bureau of Field Operations. Control functions are directed by the Bureau of Inspections and Classification Audits. A Bureau of Management Services superintends the internal management activities of personnel, budget, and office services implied by its name. In addition, there are several small staff units: the Office of the General Counsel, reporting to the Chairman; and the Public Information Office, Security Appraisal Office, Incentive Awards staff, and Interagency Advisory Group staff, reporting to the Executive Director. Two multi-membered boards exist within the commission's structure, both reporting to the commission as a whole: the Board of Appeals and Review, and the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board.

Since the Federal service is recruited from the whole United States, and since Federal employees in the various field services are scattered throughout the entire country,[8] it has been necessary to supplement this central

[8] On June 30, 1955, civilian employees in the executive branch of the government were divided as follows: in the District of Columbia area, 211,310; outside that area, 2,160,063 (including 214,023 overseas and in the territories). See U.S. Civil Service Commission, *Monthly Report of Federal Employment*, June, 1955, Table 1.

office organization with field offices in eleven civil service regions. The regional offices are in charge of regional directors responsible to the Bureau of Field Operations.

The central and regional headquarters in turn have jurisdiction over some 3000 post-office boards of examiners and information centers located at as many post offices, as well as nearly 800 general examining boards at navy yards, veterans' facilities, national parks, reclamation projects, agricultural field stations, ordnance arsenals, Washington offices, and similar Federal establishments. These boards of examiners, made up of specialists from the various operating departments, are instructed by, and report to, commission representatives. Their major functions are in the establishment of requirements for, preparation of, and conduct and rating of, examinations. Those examinations which are common to many departments and agencies, whether field or departmental, are, of course, handled by the commission staff itself.

In addition to reform of the commission, the greatest strides in Federal personnel administration have been made by and within the various departments and agencies.[9] The Federal Personnel Council and its successor the Interagency Advisory Group have contributed toward a coördinated program and the adoption of progressive measures up and down the line. Of principal importance is the periodic association of staff members of the commission and the personnel officials of the major departments and independent establishments which this vehicle affords. Similar councils serve like purposes in major field centers throughout the country.

Under Executive Order 10,452 in 1953 the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission was also empowered to assist the President in his personnel management responsibilities (except as to presidential appointments), including efforts at increasing the effectiveness and coördination of personnel management systems in the departments and agencies. Although this has placed the Chairman in a more influential role—among other considerations, he sits in the Cabinet—and in turn has strengthened the influence of the Civil Service Commission, the existence of a separate White House staff for the Chairman still leaves some administrative lines unclear and throws into doubt the full assumption of a leadership role by the Civil Service Commission itself as the central personnel agency for all Federal personnel systems. On the other hand, there is good reason to support a strengthening of the President's hand in matters of personnel, as an essential prerogative of the chief executive function. This implies some immediate staff assistance in the White House. Here we have a difficult area in which a continuing search for the most effective arrangement will have to be pursued,

[9] Chapter 24 deals with the scope and problems of the department personnel office, as developed particularly in the Federal service.

for no "final solution" is likely to be achieved in as gigantic, complex, and fluid a personnel situation as that posed by the great Federal bureaucracy.

B. STATE PERSONNEL AGENCIES

Until recent years those states which authorized any agency to grapple with personnel problems pretty generally followed the lead of the Federal Government. The typical personnel agency in these jurisdictions was the bipartisan civil service commission, composed of an odd number of members, serving for overlapping terms. The merit system idea never appealed strongly to the states, however, and only eleven of the forty-eight had embraced it up to 1920.

After 1937 there was a resurgence of interest in the matter of personnel on the state level. But there are still only twenty-one states with state-wide merit systems, although all states have their health and welfare agencies covered by merit systems, as required by Federal laws on grants-in-aid. The chronological story of state merit system adoption is briefly related in Chapter 2.

Most of these plans call for a civil service commission. Some other title is used, however, for a number of the agencies established since 1937. The newer term "personnel board" suggests a different status and different functions from those ordinarily associated with "civil service commission." Also, in most units organized since 1937 the executive officer is designated as "director of personnel" or its equivalent. This term connotes something other than "secretary and chief examiner." When it comes to the appointing authority, the governor himself appoints the executive in most of the more recently established agencies. Finally, in most of these states, either selection of the executive officer is through competitive examination or the appointee must be skilled in personnel administration.

Such developments initiated a trend toward a broader conception of personnel functions and a more intimate association with the chief executive and his staff. This view is also supported by the more detailed considerations of the provisions of several of the state laws.

A few of the state setups deserve brief description. As early as 1913 California recognized the desirability of concentrating execution of policy in the hands of a full-time official. Following experiment with various forms of this basic idea, an amendment to the constitution, effective in 1935, created a State Personnel Board of five members. It is vested with administrative and semijudicial duties, while the execution of policies is assigned to an executive officer, appointed by the board under the state civil service rules.

In Massachusetts, since 1919, the Division of Personnel and Standardization of the Commission on Administration and Finance, an agency of general administration directly responsible to the governor, has charge of classi-

fication and compensation matters and also determines the maximum length of vacations, while the Division of Civil Service handles other aspects of personnel management. An act passed in 1939 established the organization of this latter division with a five-man bipartisan commission serving as a semilegislative and semijudicial body, which appoints the director of civil service, who must meet professional standards either through competitive tests or by vote of four-fifths of the commission.

In Wisconsin, the Civil Service Commission gave way in 1929 to a Bureau of Personnel within the executive department of the state government. The bureau is headed by a director of personnel appointed by the governor and includes a three-member personnel board. The latter is of the traditional bipartisan type and is restricted to quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial duties, except that it has the right to approve or disapprove classification, compensation, and other important recommendations of the director of personnel. The director is selected by competitive tests, given by a specially selected committee of experienced personnel officers.

New Jersey introduced a further variation when, in 1930, the secretary and chief examiner was endowed with such broad powers that he virtually became the executive head serving under the three-member commission. To the latter are assigned the duties of appointing the secretary and chief examiner and of performing the legislative and judicial functions.

Each of the above, while modifying the character of the personnel agency, has retained some of the features of the commission system. But in Maryland there was a more complete break with established tradition. In 1920 Maryland established a State Employment Commission, headed by a single commissioner on an equal footing with all the other state departments. A State Employees Standard Salary Board, of which the commissioner is a member, is responsible for the pay plan. This is still the only state that dispenses entirely with a multi-membered commission.

As recently as the 1950's Rhode Island, Kansas, and Illinois have established the personnel function in a staff division or department. Connecticut closely associates its personnel director with the governor as one of his principal administrative aides. Meanwhile, New York has made its commission chairman the executive personnel head for the state, leaving its other commissioners with policy and appellate functions, a pattern paralleling the Federal setup. Nevada, with one of the newer merit systems, has a single personnel executive, backed by a Personnel Advisory Council.

That the trend continues toward greater administrative integration so far as personnel affairs are concerned is attested to not only by the action of the foregoing states but also by recommendations in various others for staff personnel departments made by little "Hoover Commissions" or similar study groups.[10]

[10] See the discussion in recent issues of *The Book of the States*, e.g., 1953–54; 1954–55.

As practical advisers of those concerned with the merit system, the National Civil Service League and the National Municipal League drew up a state civil service law (1953) that bears witness to the evolution of public service reform in the direction of employment administration as opposed to the earlier, more negative emphasis. This "model" law will be found useful by those interested in revamping old or introducing new legislation, on both state and local levels.[11]

The progress that has been made in the states is marked not alone by legislative enactments but also by the way these broader powers are being utilized. As might be expected, complete advantage is not being taken of the authority vested in recently created personnel agencies, because of either inadequate appropriations or staffing policies that fall short of good standards. Nevertheless, some of the newer agencies are well staffed and fairly well financed, while some of the older ones are gaining in prestige and influence. The perspective of most commissions and their staffs has been markedly broadened in recent years.

C. THE PERSONNEL AGENCY IN THE CITIES AND COUNTIES

With few exceptions, those cities and counties in the United States which have adopted the merit system have established the civil service commission as the personnel agency. But here, too, are signs that, as the drive for efficiency makes more of a mark in the local government field, the whole question of the place of the personnel agency in the administrative process will be revised. Already certain significant changes have occurred in a few jurisdictions, particularly in those communities where the manager form of government has been instituted. In Table 13 some general characteristics of the personnel agencies in a few representative local jurisdictions are presented.

The bipartisan civil service commission or board is typical of the personnel agencies in the municipalities and counties. The few exceptions to this preponderant condition were created during the past twenty years. On the great majority of agencies it is unnecessary to comment at this point. Aside from some variations in the number of commissioners or their terms of office, they are closely similar. The setups in Cincinnati, Kansas City, St. Paul, and New York City, however, merit further description as variants of the general pattern.

Cincinnati operates under the laws of Ohio, which require each city to have a civil service commission. The Cincinnati charter provides for a civil service commission of three members, one of whom is appointed by the board of directors of the University of Cincinnati, one by the board of education of the Cincinnati School District, and one by the mayor. It further

[11] National Civil Service League and National Municipal League, *A Model State Civil Service Law* (New York: 1953).

TABLE 13. Character of Personnel Agency in Representative Cities

City	Personnel Agency	Composition of Board or Commission		Executive Officer of Agency	
		Number of Members	Appointed By	Title or Nature	Appointed By
Over 1,000,000 pop.					
Chicago	Commission[a]	3	Mayor	Personnel Officer	Commission
Detroit	Commission	4	Mayor	Personnel Officer	Commission
Los Angeles	Commission	5	Mayor	Personnel Officer	Commission
New York	Commission	3	Mayor	Personnel Officer	Mayor
Philadelphia	Commission	3	Council	Personnel Officer	Commission
500,000 to 1,000,000					
Boston	State	—	—	Personnel Officer	Joint action of several officials
Cleveland	Commission	3	Mayor	Personnel Officer	Mayor
Milwaukee	City selectman commission	5	Mayor	Personnel Officer	Commission
San Francisco	Commission	3	Mayor	Personnel Officer	Commission
Cincinnati	Commission	3	Joint action of several officials	Personnel Officer	City manager
Minneapolis	Commission	3	Mayor	Personnel Officer	Commission
250,000 to 500,000					
Dallas	Commission	3	Council	Personnel Officer	City manager
Kansas City, Mo.	Commission	3	Mayor	Personnel Officer	City manager
Rochester, N.Y.	Commission	3	City Manager	Personnel Officer	City manager
St. Paul	Commission	3	Joint action of several officials	Personnel Officer	Joint action of several officials

[a] Refers to civil service board or commission wherever used in this table.

SOURCE: Data are compiled for the most part from the *Municipal Year Book, 1954*, pp. 184–216.

provides that "the city manager shall appoint the secretary of the civil service commission, who shall act as the personnel officer of the city government, and must be a person experienced in personnel work."[12] The Administrative Code, adopted in May, 1927, reorganized the structure of the city government and created a Department of Personnel, of which the secretary of the civil service commission is ex-officio administrative officer.

The Kansas City charter, adopted a year earlier than that of Cincinnati but not put into effective operation until 1940, established a personnel department under the management and control of a personnel director appointed by the city manager. This department was set up as an integral part of the administration and on a footing of equality with the other departments. Manager government in Kansas City has made notable progress in recent years.

A unique system has existed in St. Paul since 1914. The civil service bureau is a branch of the comptroller's office and is presided over by the chief examiner. The comptroller, an elective official, is ex officio a civil service commissioner and is, in fact, the head of the personnel agency.

New York City in 1954 followed the lead of New York State, the Federal Government, and other jurisdictions which have established the so-called "strong chairman" form of personnel organization. It made its civil service commission chairman the city personnel director, giving him policy-initiating as well as administrative authority.

In summary, then, although the civil service commission is still the predominant type of personnel agency in the public jurisdictions of the United States, recent years have witnessed a significant tendency in the states and municipalities to experiment with new types. For the most part these are designed to integrate the personnel agency more closely with the administration and to constitute it so that it can adequately perform the functions appropriate to a staff agency.

III. FUNCTIONS OF CENTRAL AGENCIES

If one reviews the functions assigned to the personnel agency in the more recent laws, he will be impressed with the extent to which the standard duties, covering recruitment in its several aspects, personnel records, checking of pay rolls, and the like, have been extended. Compensation plans, service ratings, training, and welfare have come within the purview of the agency. Under the laws of Alabama, for example, "improvement of the methods of personnel administration" is specified as the overall goal of the agency. The elimination of the spoilsmen, the earlier and primary objective of the originators of the civil service movement, is dwarfed when

[12] Cincinnati Charter (1926), Art. V., sec. 2.

compared with the goal of increasing "the efficiency of government departments and agencies by the improvement of methods of personnel administration."[13]

Practically all the functions listed below have been or should be carried on by central personnel agencies. The civil service commission should either be revamped and authorized to undertake these tasks or be absorbed into or displaced by a general personnel agency qualified to do so.

1. *Determining jurisdiction.* One of the usual basic functions of the civil service commission is the determination of which positions subject to its control shall be filled by competitive examinations and which exempted therefrom.
2. *Recruiting:* developing sources of supply; establishing qualification requirements; coöperating with schools, colleges, and professional and trade associations; and attracting able candidates to the service.
3. *Examining applicants and developing lists of eligible candidates*—including direction of such operations by line departments.
4. *Administering system of certification and use of eligible lists, probation, and reinstatement procedures.*
5. *Establishing standards for the duties classification of positions.* In many jurisdictions this includes actual classification of every individual position, but the trend is toward standard-setting and postaudit of individual classifications.
6. *Administering pay schedules.* In larger jurisdictions within broad limitations set by the legislative body, this should embrace actual establishment of pay rates. At least it should include recommendation of pay scales.
7. *Establishing broad policies and standardized procedures* for such areas as probation, transfers and promotions, attendance and leave, conduct and discipline, separation, and appeals and grievances.
8. *Developing guides and information and stimulating the best practice* in supervision, suggestion plans, health and safety, performance evaluation, working environment, recreation, and in-service training. This may include operating central training programs in fields common to several departments.
9. *Conducting basic personnel research.* This applies to matters not peculiar to the work of individual departments.
10. *Recommending personnel management and policy improvements periodically to the chief executive and the legislative body.*
11. *Operating an employee retirement system.*
12. *Maintaining a constructive plan of public reporting and public relations.*

[13] Act. No. 58-S44-1939.

This is not the place to elaborate on this list of functions. Their nature, purpose, and scope are the meat of this entire book. Summary reference to the range and character of these functions is outlined here primarily to indicate the desirable scope of activities of a central personnel agency. Few such agencies actually fill this bill. Many do not stress more than the first four or five functions in this list. This list, sketchy though it is, might be viewed as a goal for central personnel agencies in all public jurisdictions. It will be noted that at least as much emphasis is laid on leadership and positive personnel programs as on control functions.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE CENTRAL PERSONNEL AGENCY

The primary question here is whether the standard multiheaded commission can be reorganized and endowed with the necessary authority to meet the requirements of effective management. In view of the constitutional or statutory mandate in most jurisdictions for a multiheaded commission, brief consideration will be given to certain of the reasons for a commission of this type, to suggestions made as to feasible methods of reorganization which would at once meet the legal requirements and make provision for the concentration of authority requisite for administrative efficiency and success, and to the advantages of a single-headed agency.

In conformity with the argument that for counsel and deliberation many heads are better than one, while for action a single head is better than many, the question arises as to the desirability of establishing a commission with several members rather than one, having regard to the overall breakdown of the commission's duties into legislative, judicial, and administrative areas. It is our belief that, if a time sheet were kept over the space of several years for one or another commission, it would appear that the amount of time devoted to legislative and judicial work would be dwarfed in comparison with that absorbed by administrative activities. The contrast would be even greater if partisan considerations could be consigned to the limbo of forgotten things, where they rightfully belong, so far as a civil service commission is concerned. Finally, many of the so-called legislative and judicial activities are really administrative and might well be assigned to the executive agent of the commission.

The conflict of opinion on the subject of a responsible personnel executive versus a commission was most sharply drawn when the President's Committee on Administrative Management recommended the elimination of the present Federal Civil Service Commission and the appointment by the President of a nonpolitical personnel director selected by means of a competitive professional examination given under the auspices of the proposed Civil Service Board. The latter organization was, according to the proposal, to perform only advisory and investigatory duties and to serve on a *per diem* basis. It was to be "the watchdog of the merit system." This

proposal looked toward the complete integration of personnel management under the authority of the chief executive.[14]

In view of the relatively heavier administrative responsibilities, the policy of appointing a chief administrator and associating with him two or more commissioners who will handle the semijudicial and semilegislative duties would seem to commend itself and in fact has been embodied in law in several jurisdictions. This, in effect, is what the first Hoover Commission proposed for the Federal service, and it was actually adopted in 1949, as mentioned earlier in this chapter. Such a distribution of authority within the agency is also advocated in the model law drawn up by the National Municipal League and the National Civil Service League, two agencies specially concerned with the promotion of good personnel standards.

There are those who go even further and are ready to commit semijudicial and semilegislative duties to the single commissioner on the ground that much more important matters than those coming under these headings are cared for by single officials in many public capacities. However that may be, the position appears tenable that the three-member commission, each member having an equal vote, might well be superseded either (1) by a full-time commissioner with two associates, the latter to aid in handling semijudicial and semilegislative matters, if it is believed that the functions so classed require several heads, or (2) by a single commissioner endowed with complete authority. The most recent advocacy of the single-headed agency came from Professor James K. Pollock, who in his dissenting comment as a member of the first Hoover Commission criticized the compromise proposal of the majority. He observed that elevating the chairmanship to a higher place of authority and prestige "can hardly be expected to produce harmonious relationships within the commission," and that this plan "thrusts the burden for successful execution upon a chairman who is expected to pursue policies in the formulation of which he has only one vote out of three."[15]

Again passing reference should be made to the necessity of tying the personnel agency into the operating units. Such an agency's effectiveness is to be measured by the attitudes of line executives and supervisors toward it and the extent of their coöperation with it. As already indicated, this problem can best be met in large organizations through the appointment of personnel specialists who are attached to the operating units but who participate in a personnel council on which the central agency is represented. These specialists then become the interpreters of the policies approved in the several branches of the organization. In a way they become educators of line executives, who are in a position to make or break even

[14] Reeves and David, *op. cit.*; Lewis Meriam, *Personnel Administration in the Federal Government*, Brookings Institution, Pamphlet No. 19 (Washington: 1937).

[15] *Personnel Management*, p. 54.

the most enlightened and progressive personnel policy. A broad program requires not only adequate status and competent guidance but also well-devised channels into and away from the line departments. It is for this reason that considerable stress is laid on the personnel council. Among jurisdictions which have personnel councils or a systematic practice of consultation with operating personnel officers, besides the Federal service, are New York State and City, New Jersey, Illinois, and California, to name only a few.

Perhaps the following principles are the most sound, from the standpoint of theory as well as of practicality:

1. Administration of the personnel program should be in the hands of a single qualified individual, directly responsible to the executive.

2. If a personnel board is desired, it should be restricted in its functions to rule-making, appeals, and similar matters. Moreover, the membership should include at least one representative of the classified employees, and there is much to commend the selection of the entire board from within the service.

3. This central personnel agency should be vested with authority to perform all those functions discussed above and should be so organized as to permit close coöperation with the other staff agencies and the chief executive.

Meanwhile, the trend in internal organization of central personnel agencies is demonstrated by the organization of work in the California State Personnel Board and in the New York City Civil Service Commission. As in the Federal commission, the traditional functional subdivisions for examining, classification, and the like, have given way to organizational segments reflecting basic elements of the management process. California, for example, has among its units a Standards and Surveys Division and an Operations Division, both manned by personnel technicians who may be called "generalists," because they are concerned with the total scope of personnel services for given occupations rather than with the technique of job classification exclusively or examination preparation exclusively.[16]

V. PUBLIC RELATIONS

A. ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS

The first requirement of success for the circus clown, the automobile manufacturer, the radio announcer, or the sidewalk vendor is that he know his audience and sense its desires. So, too, the primary task of the personnel agency's public relations staff is to analyze the publics whose understand-

[16] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Merit System Methods*, No. 99, May, 1955.

ing and support it seeks and be ever alert to shape its program to fit their specific needs.[17]

It is an elementary truth among students of public opinion that "the public" is an abstraction with little specific meaning. Broadly stated, there are as many "publics" as there are persons, and the acme of perfection in public relations work would be so to develop the public relations program that every affected person received individual attention. Obviously, this would be impossible; but equally absurd is the common practice of failing to differentiate at all among the more obvious publics affected by personnel policies.

Among the important publics whose interest and coöperation the personnel agency should seek may be listed the following: the chief executive, the administrative and operating heads, the rank-and-file employees, the legislators, the press, the schools, the radio broadcasters, potential applicants for examinations, professional organizations, pressure groups, and—most important of all—the "man in the street." The success or failure of the personnel program will be influenced by the attitudes and behavior of each of these publics, and each has its peculiar interest in the agency's operations. Experience has shown, for example, that without the unstinting support of the chief executive, the progressive administration of the merit system is impossible. Legislative support is likewise essential lest the personnel agency find itself starved for want of funds to carry its program forward. Each of these publics will, of course, require a program of contacts apart from that necessary to reach the man in the street, and the latter will in turn require a program different from that intended to reach the rank-and-file employees. The first task of the personnel staff thus becomes one of analyzing the publics to which it must appeal and discovering their foibles and fancies, their prejudices, misconceptions, and interests. Discovering the publics themselves is only the first step; the second, and equally important, task is to find out the attitudes which characterize each of them, whether favorable or unfavorable.

The value of attitude analysis seems obvious. As previously stated, the basic test of success in a democratic government is the extent to which it serves the public as the latter desires to be served. Opinion surveys enable the public official to keep informed as to what the public wants, or, if necessary, to educate it to want what the law prescribes. The value of "consumer analysis" has been recognized by private corporations for a number of

[17] The first authoritative report on this subject was *Public Relations of Public Personnel Agencies* (1941), prepared by a special committee of the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, William E. Mosher, Chairman. A more recent publication and the model for all public jurisdictions is Eleanor S. Ruhl, *Public Relations for Government Employees: An Action Program*, Civil Service Assembly Personnel Report Series, No. 524 (Chicago: 1952). See also Elton Woolpert, *Municipal Public Relations* (Chicago: 1940).

years, but few public agencies have made any serious effort in this direction.

The chief reason for this neglect has been the failure of public officials to utilize available techniques of attitude measurement and the distrust by legislators of "information" activities. Limits of space forbid a thorough analysis of these techniques here, but assurance can be given that there are effective, relatively simple, and reliable means of finding and measuring the attitudes and stereotypes of individuals and groups toward persons, policies, and procedures. A few studies which reflect general attitudes toward public employment are discussed in Chapter 3. The task of an individual personnel agency, however, goes more to analysis of specific attitudes and issues in its own community or jurisdiction.

Through opinion surveys it should be possible for the personnel agency to keep accurate check on the attitudes of the publics with which it is concerned. Specifically, such a program should serve (1) to provide a basis for differentiating the levels of understanding of the various groups to which the agency directs its attention, and for selecting the media best suited to each group or public; (2) to discover stereotypes and "blind spots" with regard to the work of the agency which can be corrected by appropriate methods; (3) to inform the agency as to the exact character and location of sore spots in its contacts with the various publics—which sore spots may be due to lack of information about the agency's activities—or to direct attention to real flaws in the agency's operations, of which the officials may or may not be aware; (4) to keep officials posted on changes in the attitudes of the publics concerned and thereby permit them to anticipate the "unexpected" reactions, at the polls and elsewhere—reactions which frequently disrupt the best-laid official plans.

In a democracy such objectives are especially important. Only thus can the partner relationship which lies at the base of the democratic way of life be made vital and the evils of a self-serving bureaucracy avoided. As the seaman daily checks his course by the sun and stars, so should the public official constantly check his by what is on the public's mind.

Such a program of opinion surveys, if adopted, leads inevitably to two further developments: (1) flexibility in the development of policies and (2) the need for consciousness of the public relations function within the personnel agency.

Obviously, if the results of opinion sampling are to be put to use, management must stand ready to alter or reverse policies on which it has determined, or postpone them until a program of public education has made them acceptable. This is a fact which politicians fully appreciate but which many reformers, personnel technicians, and proponents of good government too frequently ignore. Lack of flexibility in adjusting policies and procedures to public desires has caused more failures of progressive public ad-

ministration programs than any other single factor.[18] It does not follow that the public agency must be a reed bending to the whims of every pressure group. But prudence requires that innovations which conflict with existing public attitudes be adjusted so far as possible without compromising the fundamentals of effective administration, and, where conflict is inevitable, that new policies or procedures be introduced slowly and every effort made to educate the publics concerned to their necessity and desirability. There is no need to labor the fact that public relations "boners" should be prevented, that unpopular policies and procedures should be avoided, and that every activity of the personnel agency should be reviewed to determine the probable response to it. Public relations are constantly in the making.

The second outgrowth of a concept of public relations, which places primary importance on the interchange of information between the personnel agency and its publics, is the necessity for special attention to the public relations function within the organization. Effective public relations work requires (1) a recognition that the action and behavior of every clerk and officer who is in contact with the public constitute the conduct of public relations, and (2) in the larger jurisdictions a specialized staff concerned with interpretation and analysis of public attitudes and with coördination of the organization's efforts to meet them. Normally only the central office is financially able to maintain a full-time public relations staff. The administrative head of the agency will, of course, be looked upon as the nerve center of the public relations program, but in the larger agencies the technical side of the program will of necessity devolve upon an assistant or a staff, technically prepared to undertake public relations work.

A look at the nature of public relations should not be concluded without citing the very practical advice in the Civil Service Assembly pamphlet of 1952. This outstanding handbook states, in summary, that an effective program rests on four pillars:

1. *Public relations is positive, not negative.* You tell the people what you are going to do and how you are going to do it before they hear a distorted "grapevine" version. You tell them how it worked, even what mistakes you made. And you don't forget to tell them how you corrected your mistakes.

2. *Public relations is everybody's business.* Your public relations can't be solely the responsibility of a public relations man. The acts and attitudes of each and every public employee make or break public relations. The employees who come into daily contact with the public are in a sense the "public relations ambassadors" of the

[18] On the importance of internal criticism as a public relations device, see H. C. Beyle, "Reporting as a Means of Citizen Control," *Governmental Research and Citizen Control of Government*, Proceedings of the 28th Conference of the Governmental Research Association (Detroit: 1940).

agency. But everybody is on the team. A misfiled letter or a needless set of forms can be just as much a public relations hazard as an ill-tempered answer to a citizen's question. You've got to make public relations everybody's business.

3. *Public relations is a continuous activity.* You can turn your publicity on and off, but the public is still going to draw some conclusions about you. Better keep them informed. And here is one public relations rule you must never violate: Employees must be told before a new policy or program is announced to the public.

4. *Public relations is in everything you do.* Many people think public relations is a news release, an annual report, a speech, an employee newsletter. It is. But it is more than that. It is your tone of voice when you answer the telephone; it is the way you write letters and the way you type them; it is the way you housekeep your office; it is the way you announce examinations; it is how you notify delinquent taxpayers; it is the dependability with which you pick up garbage; it is the neatness of a cop's uniform. Public relations is the effect everything you do has upon your public.[19]

B. PUBLIC RELATIONS TECHNIQUES

1. Their Scope and Character. The actual job of informing, instructing, and winning the support of the agency's many publics involves a further selective process: (a) the determination of what facts are to be reported to what publics; (b) the determination of the medium to be used in each case; and (c) the determination of how the medium can be best used in order to achieve the ends desired. Such a process will produce, not *the* annual report, or *some* radio speeches, but *a comprehensive system of public relations.*

Guidance in the determination of what facts the general public wants and will absorb may, of course, be obtained from the surveys previously maintained. Does the man in the street rate "the percentage of provisional appointees working beyond legal limits" as being of much greater interest than the "finances of the retirement fund"? Then by all means the reports intended for the man in the street should emphasize the former and minimize the latter. Likewise, each public will have its own general area of high interest. The public relations staff should work constantly to adjust its wares to its special markets.

Potentially useful media include almost every known means for the communication of facts and ideas. Books, newspapers, pamphlets, flyers, and other forms of published material; radio, television, and motion pictures; speeches, exhibits, and tours of inspection; as well as all types of formal and informal personal contacts are included in the armory of the public relations staff.

But even more important is constant attention to the fourth pillar cited

[19] Ruhl, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–16. Every public agency concerned with public relations would do well to have this excellent booklet, which is obtainable for $2 (or at substantially lower prices in multiple orders) from the Civil Service Assembly, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

above: "Public relations is in everything you do." This involves appraisal and improvement in such daily routine activities as the following:

a. Letter writing. Are letters simple, clear, and friendly?
b. Regulations drafting. Are regulations sensible and understandable?
c. Telephone manners. Are they cordial and responsive?
d. Seeing that employees are adequately informed of the total organization's work and of policies and the reasons for them so that they can serve as sympathetic interpreters to the public. Is the "internal" information program working?
e. Encouraging key personnel to accept speaking invitations from local organizations. Have those who need it been given speech training?
f. Anticipating problems or issues that may cause unfavorable reaction. Are employees alerted to these and are answers to possible questions thought through ahead of time?
g. Physical appearances. Do cleanliness and order stand out when the casual visitor enters the offices? Is automobile equipment kept properly identified, painted, and washed?
h. Getting advice and counsel. Are interested citizen groups called on from time to time for consultation on policy questions or other matters that may affect the organization's responsiveness to the public interest?

These are by no means exhaustive but simply illustrative of the many avenues by which effective public relations are maintained. They typify the "substance" of good public relations.

2. Media for Public Information. Because of the special importance of the written and spoken word, a few paragraphs are included here on the matter of publications and mass media for news and information.

a. *Official Publications.* Written and published materials are the oldest and most widely used method of putting the achievements and problems of the agency before its publics, and many of them are still archetypes of unattractive presentation and more or less indigestible content. In general, it is possible to classify documentary presentation into four classes, running the gamut from no popularization to extreme popularization: (1) the report for administrative use by the agency staff, legislators, and the chief executive; (2) the report for technical publics—employees, operating officials, other personnel agencies, and researchers; (3) the report for the high-interest general public—candidates for employment, civic leaders, teachers, and the like; (4) the report for the incidentally interested citizen who reads as he runs.

The information to be presented falls into two general categories: (1) reports on standard, infrequently changing information; (2) reports on continuing operations. The first includes such things as laws, rules and regulations, classification and compensation plans, procedure manuals,

handbooks for employees, information kits (particularly valuable for legislators), service leaflets containing brief popular summaries of standard policies and procedures, and general government handbooks. No attempt need be made to issue such publications periodically. They should be published only when occasion warrants, and each should be presented in such form as to be most acceptable to the public to which it is directed. The distinction between such background information and the current operating data given in the second class of report appears to have been completely ignored in most governmental reporting. As a result, either reports are a garbled conglomerate of both types of information or emphasis is on one to the exclusion of the other.

Reports on current data, as well as those on background information, must be keyed to the different publics to which they are directed. Thus, there will be reports for administrative officials, such as monthly or quarterly statistical summaries; reports for high-interest publics, such as a monthly bulletin; and reports to the general public, such as a popular annual report and special leaflets on current problems. Space forbids a discussion here of the techniques of presentation involved in compiling and publishing these various reports.[20]

b. *Newspapers.* In spite of the skill with which official publications are prepared and the effort expended on their distribution, however, it is unlikely that they will reach more than a limited section of the voting public. Fortunately, there are well-organized and almost omnipresent means by which the general public can be reached—mass publicity through media such as the newspapers, radio, television, and movies. It is on these and minor related media that the public relations staff must rely to reach its most remote but largest public.

The most powerful of the mass-information media is still the newspaper, and the evidence indicates that considerable reliance is regularly placed on it by progressive personnel agencies, particularly in announcing examinations and their results. The larger state and municipal personnel agencies and the Federal Civil Service Commission have a regular press release service.

No hard and fast rules can be laid down on the matter of what should be presented to newspapers. It is the "nose for news" that is the distinguishing mark of a good reporter—an ability to see the unusual quirk which raises an otherwise commonplace happening out of the humdrum of routine.

[20] Examples of well-written special-purpose pamphlets—although devoid of attractive photographic material—are the following publications of the U.S. Civil Service Commission: *The Government Personnel System. A Guide for Federal Executives and Supervisors*, Personnel Management Series, No. 4 (Washington: September, 1954); and *The Role of the Civil Service Commission in Federal Employment*, Pamphlet No. 52 (Washington: January, 1955). They may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, for a price of 15 cents each.

The breadth of functions which characterizes modern government takes public employees into almost every field of human activity, and while much of their work is routine and uninteresting, the dangerous, the dramatic, the novel, and the significant are there as well. Many government jobs are unique in themselves and make excellent feature material. Others, such as police work, the coast guard, or the courts, involve much human drama. The research activities going on within government circles can compete with any detective story, popular movie, or television show in discoveries and experiences significant to human welfare.

In Washington and other centers, a concentration of public employees has resulted in the big metropolitan dailies having special columnists who write chatty news every day aimed primarily at public employees. The subjects, however, are predominantly those involving government personnel administration. These columns, though sometimes garbled and oversimplified, constitute important sources of general news, therefore, on personnel policy and legislative changes, new developments and achievements, sources of complaint, and trends in the merit system.

The success of a newspaper publicity program will not be determined by the number of stories which the agency prepares or suggests. Only by actually going to the newspapers themselves and measuring what sees the light of day can such a program be evaluated.

c. *Radio and Television Broadcasting.* The only real competitor to the press as a medium for reaching the public is radio and television broadcasting. Encouraged by station officials (who must, in order to retain their licenses, see to it that a significant portion of their time is devoted to educational topics), government officials have turned more and more to these sources as a publicity outlet. Civil service agencies, however, have utilized them in a serious way in relatively few jurisdictions, although more and more of them—such as California, Wisconsin, and New York City—have developed regular programs publicizing interesting governmental activities and are using "spot announcements" for recruiting purposes.

The techniques of radio and television presentation are not normally so familiar to public relations specialists as are those of the newspapers. Usually it will be necessary to call in outside help in the development of programs and to insist on careful preparation and long-range planning. Audiences are eminently creatures of habit and soon learn which programs should be immediately tuned out. Only specially trained persons will be skillful enough to get and hold their attention. Television is still too new, at this writing, to have taken much hold for use by public agencies.

d. *Photography and Movies.* To supplement the appeal of the printed or spoken word, or to tell a story in its own right, photographers offer a valuable and popular medium. Still pictures can be used to illustrate printed matter in news releases, popular reports, and exhibits. The storytelling or

documentary photograph holds great possibilities, as was once demonstrated by the prize-winning work of the Resettlement Administration and by several other Federal agencies; yet this phase of publicity has not been well developed by personnel agencies.

Motion pictures are the most effective of all photographic media, but until recently the number of films dealing with public personnel activities has been negligible. Yet their potentialities are great—for training workers in their jobs, for popularizing employment opportunities in the public service, for educational work in public schools, and for countless other uses. The principal difficulty in getting the production of motion pictures under way is the lack of money. From twenty to fifty thousand dollars would be required to make a ten- to fifteen-minute sound film. It must be remembered, however, that a properly produced film can be used frequently and for a long time.

e. *Public Speeches.* Almost all personnel agencies have come to rely on public speeches, delivered by officials or members of the staff, to carry a major share of the public relations burden. This is properly so, for speeches are flexible, cost little in time and effort, and can readily be adapted to varying situations. Some agencies have at times held in-service training classes in public speaking in order to insure a reserve of good speakers when requests for such talent come to the agency. In some areas various governmental agencies have formed speakers' clubs to train employees in the speaking art. If speeches are to be delivered—and all personnel agencies should be ready and eager to explain their work to interested groups—they must be delivered well.

f. *Other Minor Media.* Certain other media, while they will by no means assume so prominent a part in the public relations program as those just mentioned, will nevertheless be employed in a well-rounded program. They include, for example, exhibits, demonstrations, and tours.

The opportunity to participate in exhibits of one sort or another occasionally comes to any public agency. Periodic fairs and expositions, special civic displays brought together on a large scale or as individual exhibits in commercial show windows, or display cases in public libraries or museums afford opportunities for arousing interest in one or more functions of government. Through them the personnel agency's story may be told in a dramatic and effective way. Best of all, they offer a chance to reach people who would be relatively untouched by other forms of publicity.

Tours and demonstrations can be used to show the agency actually at work by taking groups of people through the agency office during regular business hours. Groups for which tours may be arranged include newly elected legislators, newly appointed line officials, new employees, civic and women's clubs, and school classes. The actual disturbance to office routine

which a limited number of outsiders causes is small in relation to the benefits to be reaped in understanding and good will. Particularly is this true in regard to classes of school pupils, where attitudes formed early in life are governing for many years.

3. The Basis for a Program. Wherever ultimate responsibility for the public relations program is placed, in its broader sense the program must enlist the support and interest of every public employee, from the chief executive to the office boy, as well as citizens outside the public service whose aid may be solicited from time to time. In the last analysis, public relations cannot be confined to a list of "techniques" or to the work of a limited number of specialists. It is a way of life which pervades every action of every public employee. It is subjected to the scrutiny of the lowliest citizen. It vibrates between the public official and the citizen whenever the two come into contact, whether personally or through pictures, the printed page, exhibits, or a radio voice. It is a process of stimulus and response, of action and reaction. It embraces the whole range of direct contact with members of the public.

The public relations program may be ideally organized, competently manned, and ready to employ the latest in publicity techniques, but still the personal attitude of John Q. Public toward his government may be crystallized in a few moments when he, as a candidate for employment or as a motorist or taxpayer, stands face to face with the personnel employee, the policeman, or the treasurer to conduct his business. All the press releases in the world will not change his attitude if he has found these personal contacts unsatisfactory. On the other hand, good impressions created in such direct contacts will survive almost any amount of neglect of the more formal public relations activities.

Improvement of contact practices can come only through organized efforts to train employees in such matters. The value of training is thoroughly appreciated by private agencies, where efforts along this line vary from sessions on courtesy to the permanent and comprehensive programs of contact analysis and training practiced by the larger companies. Many a modern department store can describe a training program that far outstrips that of the average public agency.

Not only must the public employees themselves be systematically enlisted in the public relations program, but interest on the part of qualified citizens throughout the community may also be capitalized on to excellent effect. No opportunity should be lost to tap the reservoir of civic-minded persons who are ready to lend their aid to community enterprises. Such persons will thereby gain a feeling of partnership in civil service enterprises and become exponents of the merit system, and the personnel agency itself can in this way keep in touch with citizen thought and popular reaction to its work. On examining boards, on grievance committees, on ad-

visory commissions, as aids in the recruiting process—these are but a few of the ways in which citizen interest may be harnessed and good public relations fostered.

The scope of the public relations program here described is probably so extensive that none but the largest agencies could undertake it in its entirety. Certainly, however, public relations is not an "all or none" function. Each personnel agency can select from the whole range of public relations practices those devices for which it has need and which it can afford to undertake. Whatever it does, and does well, will produce returns that will fully justify the expenditure of money and effort involved.

This section of this chapter has been developed in the conviction that the vitality and permanence of democracy in government depend upon an informed and interested citizenry. A further logical step in accounting for the stewardship of those engaged in the public business is that of adopting devices whereby the public and its elected representatives may appraise the efficiency of the agencies of government, if possible with reference to some acceptable standard. A dependable appraisal will, of course, be valuable also for the purposes of internal criticism.

The average citizen, however, is patently ill equipped to pass critical judgment on the policies and procedures of operating personnel agencies. Normally, he lacks a knowledge of what constitutes the "best practices" in personnel administration. In addition, the state of record keeping and the organizational complexities of the typical personnel agency are such as to make a major research task of any undertaking which seeks to discover if the actual approaches the ideal.

What is needed is a short, scientific, and simple means of evaluating the agency's work. This applies not only to the personnel, but to other functions as well. The health and fire departments have made definite strides in the working out of an appraisal form for evaluation purposes. In a number of other areas, such as health, finance, and purchasing, the interest in scientific evaluation has grown greatly.[21]

In the midst of all this activity but little attention has been devoted to the evaluation of personnel administration, although a large portion of the work of personnel agencies is reducible to quantitative terms. At the present writing, the invention of appraisal instruments in the personnel field is retarded more by the inadequacy and diversity of public personnel reports than by anything else. Until fuller and more uniform reports are published, little can be accomplished in the direction of an appraisal device. Comparative data upon specific personnel functions are an obvious prerequisite of the development of any objective method of evaluation. At various

[21] The periodical literature on measuring results in almost every field of public administration is so extensive that one cannot fail to find ample illustrations upon perusal of the standard journals in the field of government.

points throughout this study, the absence of adequate statistics from many personnel agencies has been pointed out. The results are that civil service commissions are unable to present and interpret significant data to their publics and are also without points of reference as a basis for comparing and evaluating their own work.

The adoption of a standardized approach by which agencies might be evaluated comparatively would also have a salutary effect on the character of record keeping. Unnecessary records of little value would normally fall by the wayside, there being little demand for them. Items of high diagnostic value, on the other hand, would be greatly in demand to facilitate evaluation, and the agency would be under some compulsion to collect and report them. In this way, reports would come eventually to be relatively standardized, and both the citizen and the expert would find his task enormously simplified when intelligent criticism was in order.

SUMMARY

With the compelling need to create machinery resistant to pressures for party patronage, it is little wonder that the first and most common form of organization for direction of a merit system was the bipartisan commission, oriented toward the negative function of keeping spoils politics at a minimum. As public personnel administration evolved, this very bipartisan character, along with the administrative isolation, amateur quality, and political aura of many commissions, made for limited success of this form. Nevertheless, a number of commissions or boards have conspicuous achievements to their credit in raising the level of effectiveness of the American public service.

Although the U.S. Civil Service Commission has had a gradual growth in prestige and in the scope of its functions, marked strides in the Federal service have also taken place in the development of personnel offices within the operating departments and agencies, about which more is to be said in the next chapter. In both states and cities, there is a clear trend in the direction of establishing single directors in charge of the personnel function, usually supplemented by a board or council to advise on and oversee the operations. Some form of merit system organization exists now in practically every city of any size in the country. In number, the states still lag far behind.

The bright spot in state administration is the operation of merit system councils for the various welfare and health agencies, under the stimulus of Federal grant-in-aid provisions, in all those states that do not have state-wide merit systems of their own. Thus, in those major segments of state government activity—employment security, public assistance, child welfare, public health control and disease prevention, and vocational rehabilitation—a merit system is actually nation-wide. Where state-wide

merit systems exist, the multiple bipartisan commission is still the dominant type of organization set up to administer the system. There is general agreement among experts, however, that either the strong-chairman plan or the single administrator is to be preferred to the straight multiple body for the central personnel agency.

Most central personnel agencies have confined their attention, usually by necessity (due to statutory or fiscal limitations), to the recruiting, examining, and appellate functions of personnel management. Few have approached the ideal of comprehensive, positive programs of leadership and standard-setting for all phases of human relations on the job.

A special activity deserving greater attention by central personnel agencies is that of public relations. As in the case of other governmental functions, the dissemination of information about the personnel program is a proper and indispensable duty of public servants in a democracy. An uninformed public means an indifferent and unintelligent citizenry. Apathy has spelled in the past and will spell in the future the crumbling away of democratic institutions. An informed and critical citizenry is nowhere more needed than in the supervision of the way in which manpower is directed into and husbanded in the public service. Public relations must, therefore, be recognized as a vital function of public management and one that we cannot afford to handle as an incidental side issue. It is perhaps in this area that the central personnel agency in a jurisdiction, as distinguished from operating personnel offices, can render one of its highest services.

24

The Operating Personnel Office

The early struggles to gain acceptance of the merit principle in the American public service naturally led to preoccupation with the establishment and strengthening of central personnel agencies. The civil service commission, with its rules and restraints, was the white hope of protection against the sabotage of the spoilsman. Not only could it be relied upon to exercise the necessary controls; it could serve as a convenient "whipping boy" to which the appointing officer could irresponsibly refer the office-seeking politician with a shrug of the shoulders. Against the depredations of the patronage-minded legislator or party committeeman the independent commission could afford to stand fast when the program bureau could not. To be sure, the commission is still nonexistent or has not achieved great stature in many states and cities as yet; and in those localities preoccupation with the central personnel agency is an understandable and laudable enterprise.

But in the more progressive states, the larger cities, and the Federal Government, the evolution of public personnel administration has gone well beyond this stage of emphasis on negative control. The history of this development is discussed fully in Chapter 2. Since the merit system reform days, interest of the personnel profession has become increasingly centered on the personnel function in an operating agency of government—whether it be a municipal health or fire department, a state department of taxation or of welfare, or one of the mammoth Federal departments or agencies. It is with the organization for this operating personnel function that the present chapter deals.[1]

[1] The first significant discussion from this viewpoint was presented by Lewis Meriam in his volume *Public Personnel Problems from the Standpoint of the Operating Officer* (Washington: 1938). See also the brief but illuminating statement by Oliver Short, "The Functions of a Departmental Personnel Officer," *Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of the Civil Service Assembly, 1936* (Chicago: 1937).

I. THE PLACE OF THE PERSONNEL FUNCTION

The central thesis of this chapter is that personnel management, like any other phase of administration, is a responsibility of line officials, of those who are accountable for the success of a public agency or program. Being such, it is necessarily interwoven at all levels of a hierarchy and in all aspects of the supervision and direction of the organization. It cannot be properly viewed as an isolated entity or concept. Personnel administration permeates the everyday acts of every supervisor and unit chief, as well as those of the top executive. It is simply part of the machinery, part of the system by which they get their work done. If we view the basic objective of personnel management as maintaining effective human resources and human relations in the organization, then it is largely a *manner* of administration. The problem to be discussed, then, is how to equip line management to best carry out its personnel responsibilities. The problem may also be stated as how to organize personnel administration as a "grass-roots" concept in an enterprise.

The basic need is to provide specialized staff assistance to line managers. This usually means, at least in large organizations, the establishment of a special office or division composed of professionally trained persons giving full time to leadership in personnel administration. One of the best statements in recent years of what such an office should do grew out of a conference of top executives in an American railroad corporation that employs about 50,000 people. These leaders agreed tentatively on the following objectives of a proposed new personnel department:

To assist management in *meriting and obtaining the enthusiastic and constructive help of all employees* in constantly improving every service and reducing unit costs. (a) To plan, develop and recommend basic policies of employees relations, after consultation with members of management. (b) As called upon, to help management carry out approved personnel policies. (c) To maintain close contact with management and work with them in connection with their personnel problems. (d) To help management realize that employees are valuable, creative, and respected members of the company. (e) In coöperation with management to appraise periodically employee attitudes and over-all performance in order to determine the results of current policies or practices. (f) To assist management in establishing and strengthening the processes of communication between management and employees and between employees and management.

To use methods that recognize the inherent desire of employees to help the railroad maintain and improve its service. (a) To provide opportunity for employee participation in making improvements in procedures and policies. (b) To encourage maximum development of individual capacity and self-confidence. (c) To foster methods which will enable management to utilize the maximum abilities and interests of employees.[2]

[2] Supplied in 1946 by Dick Carlson of Rogers and Slade Co., Management Consultants, New York.

The same definition could well be applied to a personnel office in a public agency. Not all by any means yet fit this standard. Many have suffered from inadequate professionalization. Others have been too aloof from the program objectives of the organization, looking upon adherence to certain procedures as ends in themselves. Some have been preoccupied with paper-processing functions and the enforcement and interpretation of statutes and regulations. As we have already seen,[3] the human relations and training functions have been slighted in favor of the functions required explicitly by statute. This neglect is due partly to inadequate fiscal support, partly to poor direction from executive heads, and partly to the lack of aggressiveness or imagination of some personnel officers. Those who have not had a broad liberal education, coupled with some special attention to the art and science of administration, are rarely able to display the grasp and vision necessary to make a personnel unit serve its highest purpose. Years of experience as a "chief clerk" are not necessarily contributory to this quality of mind and personality. Nevertheless, it is gratifying to find at all levels of government—Federal, state, municipal—numerous instances in which the professional personnel staff is exercising real leadership in its particular department and really contributing to better personnel administration by all segments of management.

It may be well at this point to insert a word about the issue of whether personnel activities are a "service" or a "control." This subject has been a popular one for debate among personnel technicians over the years. From what has been said above one might infer that naturally personnel work is a service. In a broad sense this is true, but the relationship is often oversimplified. The personnel office attached to the chief executive of an agency is obviously subordinated to the program objectives of the organization and renders a "service" to that executive. However, in so far as it influences or even formulates for him the agency's personnel policies or carries out delegated authority from him to assure adherence to certain standards, it inescapably exercises a control. It is one of the channels through which he manages. Thus, what is a service to one point in the hierarchy may be a control to another. This perspective on personnel *services* is not always acquired by middle and minor supervisors, who sometimes insist that the personnel unit serve *them*, giving them exactly what *they* want regardless of whether it is in line with directives of the top executive. Like all other management specialists, such as budget examiners, public relations experts, fiscal controllers, organization and methods analysts, and space and equipment technicians, the personnel man is employed by the executive expressly for the purpose of taking the load off the latter's shoulders in guiding, informing, helping, and, if necessary, restraining subordinate levels in the line in matters involving the particular specialty. This, in turn, imposes a great

[3] See Chapters 11 and 14.

responsibility upon the staff specialist to so exert his influence and, where he must, so exercise his controls that they will be readily understood and accepted by the line operators. This duty calls for a maximum of tact, skill, and persuasiveness, especially when applied to the personnel field. For, again we reiterate, good personnel administration can be realized only as its objectives and techniques are woven into the whole fabric of the organization and as every supervisor is aware of and concerned with his responsibilities in this regard. Rather than there being an issue here between "service" and "control," the problem comes down to one of joint endeavor and teamwork between line supervisor and staff specialist, which calls for suitable personality and adequate training on the part of both.[4]

Finally, mention should be made of the ways in which a top executive can use his personnel staff. Some suggestions of these ways is implicit in the discussion in the preceding paragraph. Beyond that, attention should be called particularly to the need for the chief personnel officer to participate in all top staff meetings and in general program planning. Without this inside status he can hardly contribute his maximum; this is one of the principal ways in which he can keep alive an awareness of the human aspects of the machine through which the organization gets its work done. It is much better that his counsel be brought to bear in the formative stages of a new program, a new public policy, or a revised organization than to have it after decisions are reached and commitments made. If the personnel man is worth having at all, he is worth having when his knowledge and insight can count, not when it is too late. This is far more important than the mere point of having the personnel director report directly to the executive head of the agency, on which some writers have laid too much stress. It is the degree to which he and his staff are used on important problems and their status as "insiders" that are significant.

Related to this point is the recognition by the chief executive of what a personnel office is for. To make the most of it, he must see it as an instrument for influencing the morale and efficiency of the staff. When there are problems of developing staff enthusiasm, when need for greater understanding and coöperation is evident, when insularity or animosity within the organization is to be dealt with, when the most effective utilization of principal staff members is in question, when, in short, anything involving the attitudes, behavior, and usefulness of the agency's officers and employees is up for attention, the personnel office should be represented in the deliberations. If it is "worth its salt," it will make a contribution. If it is

[4] See the discussion of this subject as brought out in the following articles in *Public Administration Review:* Willard N. Hogan, "A Dangerous Tendency in Government," Summer, 1946, and O. Glenn Stahl, "Straight Talk About Label Thinking," Autumn, 1946. Of general reading value also is Ross Pollock, "The Executive and His Personnel Officer," *Personnel Administration*, September, 1955, pp. 24–30.

viewed as a mere recruiting and placement unit for lower-level personnel and a source of information on rules and regulations, it will be just that and little more.

Yet, even in its routine functions the constructive place of the personnel office should not be overlooked. It can be immensely useful, especially in the public service, which is circumscribed more closely by law and regulation than is industry, in suggesting *how* certain objectives can be achieved. This is a lesson that often has to be learned by the new administrator, particularly the political head of an executive establishment who has had little experience in running the complex human machine known as an administrative organization. As Paul Appleby observes, even civil service laws are not olways so rigid as popularly supposed, and under these laws administrators can usually do whatever good administration may require so long as they recognize that what needs to be done can be done only in certain ways. He goes on to counsel the political head of an agency: "If he will put to career administrators in the department a statement of his *general* objective and ask them to tell him how to reach it, they will find a way. The incoming administrator is likely to make the mistake of attempting to issue orders based on some one particular way of attaining an objective, and the way may be, and frequently is, utterly illegal."[5] This wisdom is especially applicable to the field of personnel administration.

With this background on the place of the personnel function in the broad scheme of things, we may now turn to a somewhat closer examination of the scope and nature of the work of the personnel office.

II. SCOPE OF PERSONNEL OFFICE FUNCTIONS

A number of relatively recent writings provide a comprehensive picture of the functions of a modern personnel office in a public agency.[6] Because of the size and far-flung character of many of the individual departments, the chief attention on this score has been given to the Federal Government. In fact, it is only in a relatively few large cities and states that agency personnel offices exist in any true sense of the term. Size alone, of course, is one factor that dictates the need. Smaller state and local agencies of only one or two hundred employees often cannot afford to have full-time personnel specialists on their staffs. Even in such instances, how-

[5] Reprinted from *Big Democracy* by Paul H. Appleby by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Copyright 1945 by Paul H. Appleby, p. 145.

[6] Very full treatment is found in *Evaluating Your Personnel Management*, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Personnel Management Series, No. 6 (Washington: October, 1954), and in Chap. A4 of the *Federal Personnel Manual*. See also *A Personnel Program*, Federal Security Agency, Training Manual No. 3 (Washington: 1944); Henry F. Hubbard, "The Elements of a Comprehensive Personnel Program," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1940, pp. 1–18; Virgil Couch, "The Scope of Personnel Activities in the Federal Service," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1948, pp. 1–15; Short, *op. cit.*; and Meriam, *op. cit.*

ever, some officer should, as a part-time matter, be primarily responsible for seeing that adequate personnel policies and practices are developed and followed.

Inasmuch as the preceding chapters deal with the various phases of personnel administration in great detail, it is unnecessary to redefine and redescribe here each of these functions as it is found in an operating personnel office. It may be useful, however, to list these activities in the form in which they reflect themselves in personnel office work and to introduce any special considerations that have not been brought out in the functional chapters themselves. The following broad duties are typical in a sketchy way of a well-rounded operating personnel office:

1. *Policies and instructions:* developing these in all areas of personnel administration, for management approval, and promulgating them in usable form.
2. *Job analysis and evaluation.*
   a. Assisting supervisors in developing facts about new or changed positions.
   b. Evaluating positions in accordance with class standards.
   c. Developing or interpreting class standards.
   d. Contributing to analysis of organization problems.
3. *Staffing.*
   a. Ascertaining and organizing staffing needs for recruitment purposes.
   b. Working with the central personnel agency in establishing qualification and testing standards; developing and administering tests in specialized areas peculiar to the agency, or organizing boards of examiners to do so; participating in developing sources of qualified candidates; requisitioning lists of eligibles.
   c. Investigating work histories of persons outside the agency.
   d. Maintaining qualifications index on present employees; checking with other agencies for candidates when necessary; referring of candidates as vacancies occur.
   e. Assisting the selecting and appointing officials in evaluation of candidates either from inside the agency, from other agencies, or from examination registers.
   f. Processing of appointments, promotions, and other actions, checking for adherence to law and regulation.
   g. Interviewing and corresponding with all applicants and employees interested in placement.
   h. Evaluating placements through follow-up inquiry.
4. *Salary and wage administration.*
   a. Where discretion is authorized, making wage and salary studies as the basis for setting pay scales; or interpreting and executing relevant provisions of law on compensation.
   b. Convening and guiding negotiations with employee unions on pay matters.
   c. Administering special pay provisions for satisfactory service, for outstanding performance, for geographic, cost-of-living, or hazard differentials, and for movement from job to job.

5. *Employee relations.*
   a. Advising management on all administrative matters that affect human relations and morale.
   b. Counseling with employees and supervisors on human relations problems.
   c. Sponsoring suggestion programs and other means of eliciting employee participation in work improvement.
   d. Arranging for provision of adequate health services.
   e. Maintaining a safety education program; facilitating provision of injury compensation.
   f. Checking on adequacy of physical working conditions.
   g. Establishing machinery for adjustment of grievances, and umpiring its use.
   h. Establishing and maintaining employee representation plans; meeting with employee unions on personnel policy questions and in developing policy.
   i. Interpreting leave policy.
   j. Assisting in or providing recreational and other services.
6. *Performance standards and evaluation.*
   a. Assisting supervisors in making and recording objective appraisals of employee performance.
   b. Directing and assisting in setting up performance standards.
   c. Guiding the staff in focusing efforts on performance development and improvement.
   d. Stimulating use of various forms of employee recognition.
7. *Staff training and development.*
   a. Analyzing and pointing up training needs; conducting training method research.
   b. Working with supervisors in perfecting on-the-job training techniques, in organizing group training, and in evaluating training.
   c. Planning and conducting such orientation, supervisory, clerical, and other training as can best be handled centrally.
   d. Maintaining liaison with outside educational institutions on preëntry training curricula and on supplementary in-service training.
   e. Preparing training materials.
   f. Encouraging or developing "house organs."
8. *Separation.*
   a. Conducting exit interviews.
   b. Advising on and processing retirements.
   c. Conducting reductions in staff in accordance with policies and rules.
   d. Advising supervisors on disciplinary suspensions and removals.
9. *Employee rights and obligations:* keeping employees informed of various rights and obligations pertaining to their public employment status.
10. *Records and reports.*
    a. Maintaining statistical records on employee population, turnover, and movement.
    b. Maintaining all files on employee work histories.
    c. Reporting to top management, supervisors, and employees on all developments that affect or potentially affect the human resources and morale of the agency.

11. *Personnel research.*
    a. Conducting attitude surveys.
    b. Studying testing, interviewing, and rating devices.
    c. Analyzing exit interviews, turnover, absences, and tardiness.
    d. Improving forms and procedures.
12. *Public relations.*
    a. Presenting information on personnel operations of interest to the public.
    b. Conducting helpful, considerate correspondence in reply to all inquiries.

This is not a comprehensive tabulation. But a mere recitation of the list, when used in conjunction with the more substantive treatments of the various subjects in earlier chapters, is enough to give a broad idea of the part the personnel office must play in personnel administration.[7] More will be said later in this chapter on the two activities of research and of records and reports.

Such a skeleton outline also does not take into account the time-consuming special fields of personnel concern that are incidental to one or another of the activities listed. For example, in the Federal service, personnel offices must give a great amount of attention to such matters as arranging for employee security investigations, receipt of clearances, and any related suspensions or removals; answering debt collection letters and credit inquiries; assuring adherence to the executive order prohibiting discrimination in personnel actions on account of race, religion, or color; enforcing veteran preference requirements in selection, reduction, or movement of personnel; answering letters and calls from members of Congress; and commenting on the wisdom and feasibility of proposed legislation on pay, recruitment, retirement, hours, leaves, and the like. These are illustrative of current facets of the personnel office job that are inherent in many of the activities previously listed.

To be sure, not all operating personnel offices in the public service are covering the whole range of functions outlined, and not all are meeting their highest purpose as staff advisers, as envisaged in the first section of this chapter. An increasing number are doing so, particularly in the Federal service. Consistent with the size and need of individual departments, we will probably see further development in this direction in states and cities. Certainly, as central personnel agencies and the merit system become firmly established, we should expect public administrators to develop more fully their right arm of administration—a competent personnel staff.

III. METHODS OF OPERATION

Brief attention should be given to the methods and channels through which a personnel office gets the above-listed activities accomplished.

[7] An analysis of the respective roles of supervisor, personnel office, and employees in each personnel function is found in Couch, *loc. cit.*

Some of these methods have already been mentioned; others have been implied. The purpose here is to review them systematically in order to look at a personnel office from the standpoint of technique.

1. The first and most basic means through which a personnel office operates is the development of policy. It must see both the need for policy and the possible solutions to problems, so that it can take the initiative in management-employee coöperation in policy formulation.

2. Closely related is the development of written instructions. The primary problems in this connection are: writing the instructions in simple, usable style; organizing or indexing them for easy reference; keeping them up to date; and seeing that they reach and are used by all officials who need them. These objectives are not too difficult of achievement in smaller jurisdictions, but they pose very considerable problems in Federal agencies, where, particularly since the war years, there has been constant revision of overall rules and regulations in almost every branch of personnel administration.[8] The ideal plan, of course, is a classified loose-leaf manual system. The most formidable example of such a system is the U.S. Civil Service Commission's *Federal Personnel Manual.* This is the core upon which any Federal department must build its supplementary policies and instructions.

3. A personnel office also operates through the establishment and interpretation of various personnel standards. These may relate to position classifications, to qualification requirements, to testing criteria, to performance minima, to safety measures, and the like. Such standards are usually not the exclusive product of a personnel office; they are more often a joint product, with the various operating specialists in the agency supplying the technical information and scrutiny on those matters that affect occupations under their direction. The function of the personnel division here is to see that the standards *are developed*, to supervise their development, to reconcile differences in viewpoint, to coördinate related standards with each other, and to see that they are used.

4. Another means of personnel staff operation is training of the operating line. It is the duty of a personnel unit to use every technique possible, ranging from group meetings to individual consultation and "shot-in-the-arm" circulars, in order to keep supervisors aware and fully informed of their personnel responsibilities. Here is the crux of the personnel job, for only as line management is permeated with an understanding and acceptance of good personnel policies and methods can an organization expect to achieve good personnel administration. This has led some authori-

[8] For a description of how a written instruction plan in an operating agency can be integrated with instructions of a central personnel agency see Elinor G. Hayes and Edward B. McMenamin, "Personnel Instructions for the Person Who Uses Them," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1948, pp. 19–23.

ties to refer to the personnel man's role as one of "working himself out of a job." But, unless we can envisage the day when all operating supervisors are paragons of personnel skill and virtue, attainment of such an objective is an unlikely prospect.

5. An additional channel through which the personnel division operates is in serving as a catalytic agent for bringing top management and employee representatives together to solve mutual problems. This end is achieved in developing employee representation plans themselves, in soliciting employee participation in policy development, and in keeping management reminded of the profit to be gained from gleaning employee ideas and viewpoints.

6. Occasionally a personnel office engages in certain direct services. Thus, it may maintain a clearing house of information for employees on recreational resources, housing, outside educational opportunities, social agencies, and the like. It may operate an emergency loan fund. It may supply the service of writing job descriptions for busy supervisors, on the basis of oral information given by the latter. Where there are large numbers of persons to be hired in very routine occupations and the individual discretion of operating officials is not vital, the personnel unit may even make final selection of appointees. All such direct services must necessarily vary in type and volume, depending upon the needs and conditions of the particular organization.

7. Finally, personnel divisions work to some extent by the exercise of certain controls. These controls are almost invariably limited to the fields of selection and position classification. By its nature, final determination of the class into which a position falls cannot be left with every supervisor to decide for himself. The very process calls for the utmost in uniformity. This does not mean, however, that the judgment of supervisors and experts in specific occupations has no part to play in job evaluation. More often than not such judgments are the ones that prevail, but there must be a neutral point somewhere to avoid inequities and to restrain the myopic views of some specialists. Furthermore, these controls are sometimes exercised with the assistance of review committees, made up of operating officials, to advise on the evaluation of highly technical and borderline positions.

The other area in which controls are commonly exercised by personnel offices is that of selection of personnel. In this field some staff unit must, of necessity, see that all reasonable sources of candidates for the given situation are used, that minimum qualification requirements are adhered to, that irrelevant factors such as race are not determining, and that all laws relating to veteran preference, oaths of office, citizenship, age, and the like, are complied with. The personnel office is the logical unit to perform these tasks.

Undoubtedly there are other modes of operation through which personnel divisions get their work done that do not fit neatly into any of the above categories. The principal techniques, however, have been listed.

It is appropriate here to mention the somewhat controversial point of the utility and necessity of a college education for professional personnel work. It is apparent that the breadth of experience and understanding required and the professional outlook needed make it almost imperative that professional personnel specialists be drawn from the ranks of college graduates. The background essential to dynamic personnel work—with a full appreciation of human values, of motivating influences, and of the job world in the modern social environment—can be acquired with rare exceptions only through the intensity, the continuity, and the discipline imposed by a full collegiate education, preferably one of the broadest sort.

IV. ORGANIZATION AND RELATIONSHIPS OF THE PERSONNEL OFFICE

It has been the practice in most jurisdictions, and particularly in the Federal service, for operating personnel units to be organized around the several functional personnel specialties. Thus, the common pattern in a Federal department or bureau has been a subdivision of the personnel office into the following groups of specialists: classification and pay administration (wage or salary administration is sometimes separate); employment or placement (occasionally there are separate units having to do with testing); training; and employee relations. There are, of course, several varieties of combinations of these. It is also common to find a procedures and methods unit in a personnel division, and in one or two instances a separate "investigation" section.

There is some debate as to the feasibility of such a setup. Before considering this issue, it might be well to take a look at some criteria for measuring how well a personnel office is fulfilling its purpose:

1. Each operating supervisor should be kept constantly aware of his responsibilities for personnel administration.
2. Each operating supervisor should be able to fulfill those responsibilities in a satisfactory manner, with the help of his Personnel Office.
3. Personnel problems should be treated as unified wholes, rather than in isolated segments, with a heavier emphasis on human relationships than on paper processes.
4. The Personnel Office should maintain high technical standards in its work.
5. The staff of the Personnel Office itself should have an opportunity to develop personally on the job.[9]

These guidelines argue for a form of personnel office organization in which individual general personnel representatives handle all personnel matters

[9] Kenneth O. Warner and Donovan Q. Zook, "The Role of the Generalist in Personnel Management," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1946, pp. 117–118.

for a given subdivision (with 300 to 500 employees each) of the agency, using functional specialists only for unusual or knotty problems. This is what is called the "generalist" approach. It was first tried out during World War II in the Foreign Economic Administration, the War Manpower Commission, several installations in the defense departments, and a few other Federal agencies, "Excessively narrow specialization," Warner and Zook warned, "threatens full success of the federal government's personnel program."[10]

As drawbacks of the specialist approach, they cite these points: (1) Supervisors are forced to identify which personnel subspecialty their problems fall under and to deal with each specialty separately. (2) Supervisors fail to get continuing overall advice on an integrated basis. (3) The personnel office tends to see problems in fragments. "The various groups of technical specialists become so completely engrossed in examining small fractions of personnel problems that they frequently fail to see the whole."[11] (4) This approach tends to narrow sharply the individual development of the personnel technician.

The generalist idea has taken hold widely in the Federal service and in states and municipalities.[12] It has long existed in smaller bureaus, where size does not permit sufficient personnel staff to warrant having separate functional specialists.

Some of the arguments against the generalist approach are (1) that personnel representatives may develop only superficial familiarity with specialized personnel functions; (2) that there is no opportunity for expert advice on any one specialty; (3) that a personnel generalist may become so interested in the personality implications of particular cases that he loses his professional objectivity and becomes merely an advocate of what some supervisor wants; (4) that training and employee relations work, and classification and placement call for somewhat different education, interests, and talents; (5) that it is difficult to develop well-rounded generalists at junior and intermediate levels, since there is too little time for them to become adequately skilled in all techniques; (6) that the generalist plan does not fit all situations—an example being a central staff personnel office in a large department which performs policy-making and reviewing functions but not operating personnel services.

Some of these objections can be offset by maintaining a central group of

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 117.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

[12] Probably half of the country's public personnel offices are so organized. For a survey of the situation see Lyman H. Cozad and Kenneth O. Warner, "Personnel Generalist: Experience and Advice," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1955, pp. 131–138. The organization of central personnel agencies, notably the U.S. Civil Service Commission and the California State Personnel Board, also emphasizes the generalist approach in the standard-setting, operational, and inspectorial functions.

functional specialists to whom the generalists can turn for special help, just as a general medical practitioner calls in a specialist for consultation on a complicated or unusual illness. Others can be minimized through careful initial selection of personnel representatives and through their continuous training by the functional specialists. No one has yet found a key to the selection problem, however, beyond reference to such concepts as maturity, breadth, objectivity, and human relations effectiveness, as measures of the ideal generalist. This issue of specialist versus generalist, therefore, is worthy of continuous experimentation.

Another consideration relating to personnel office relationships is the role of a general administrative officer, concerned with all management staff services, in a given program bureau, division, or operation. This official on the immediate staff of line administration of the particular unit may represent that unit on policy issues and may, in effect, carry out instructions of a personnel office which is servicing several such units. If the personnel office handles its relationships with that unit largely through this administrative officer, the latter, in effect, is performing, personnel-wise, like the generalist. An important difference is that in this case the generalist is on line management's staff rather than on the personnel office staff. Hence it may be argued that a still more desirable adjunct of the generalist idea is to give the line operating official the maximum delegation of personnel responsibility by placing the generalist on his immediate staff. This obviously would leave the personnel office with little reason to have more than a group of functional specialists, since no one would propose both a line unit administrative officer and a personnel office generalist as intermediaries between individual supervisors and personnel technicians.[13]

Space does not permit full discussion of other aspects of personnel office organization. There is, for example, the special problem of relationships on personnel matters between headquarters and field establishments.[14] Related to this is the companion problem of decentralization or delegation from one level in the hierarchy to subordinate levels. Should the personnel offices at the bureau levels be part of a central personnel setup, or should

[13] For further discussion of personnel office organization and relationships see the following articles in *Personnel Administration:* Earl P. Yocum, "Organizing the Personnel Office at the Operating Level," November, 1944, pp. 11–16; Warner and Zook, "Improving Relationships Between the Personnel Office and the Operating Official," September, 1946, pp. 2–10; Frank E. Miller, "The Unit Area Plan for Personnel Management," September, 1947, pp. 47–50; Warner, "What's Ahead for Personnel," November, 1947, pp. 1–15; James F. Wright, "Making the Most of Personnel Staffs," November, 1947, pp. 39–43; Harold L. Dickinson, "Some Problems in Establishing a Generalist Personnel Office," July, 1950, pp. 19–22; Julius E. Eitington, "Broadening the Personnel Worker," July, 1953, pp. 19–21; and David M. Watters, "The Generalist vs. the Specialist," January, 1954, pp. 27–31; also James A. Nielson and Carter C. Miller, "Evolution of a Personnel Organization," *Public Personnel Review*, January, 1955, pp. 28–31.

[14] See Merrill J. Collett, "Field-Headquarters Personnel Relationships," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1949, pp. 13–16.

they be part of the bureau line organization? How far should department-level personnel offices go in exercising line controls? These and similar questions must be left to further experience and research for answering.

One of the problems of pressing concern to Federal administration has been the concerted drive on the part of some legislators and administrators to reduce arbitrarily the size of personnel office staffs in the various departments and agencies. There have even been limitations on many personnel staffs in appropriation bills requiring that personnel workers (including secretarial help) exist in a ratio of no more than one to a certain number of employees (such as 1 to every 135) in the organization serviced. The reaction against an alleged oversupply of personnel technicians in Federal agencies is probably due to a number of causes: amateurish or overzealous attitudes of a few personnel people; natural resistance of operating heads to the various personnel standards and controls imposed by Federal law and regulation, much of which frustration is directed against the technicians who are required to enforce them; impatience of political appointees with merit system procedures; the perennial hunt for a "whipping boy" in the never-ending campaign to reduce Federal expenditures; and, most of all, appalling ignorance on the part of many legislators and even executives of the most elementary requirements in operating large organizations under modern personnel concepts.[15]

Before closing this section mention should be made of the growing practice of collaboration between department personnel officers in a given jurisdiction. Reference to the Federal Personnel Council, and its successor the Interagency Advisory Group (U.S. Civil Service Commission), has been made frequently throughout this book. Similar machinery is growing in the states and localities. New York State has had a formally established personnel council of department personnel directors for a number of years. Similar arrangements have been started formally or informally in California, Illinois, New Jersey, Los Angeles County, Maryland, and New York City. As the personnel function is given more recognition in operating establishments, the banding together of personnel officers to discuss common policies and problems will undoubtedly occur in more and more jurisdictions.

Professional associations serve a related purpose in numerous localities. A stimulating and healthy influence has been provided by such organizations as the American Society for Public Administration, the Civil Service

[15] For the best discussion of the issue of size see Virgil Couch, "Ratios and Costs of Personnel Administration," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1949, pp. 16–22. For an analysis of work load see Herbert H. Rosenberg, "Work Measurement in the Personnel Office," *ibid.*, September, 1947, pp. 17–25, and Arnold Kotz, "Budgeting for Personnel Staff," *ibid.*, September, 1948, pp. 16–20. For the Congressional point of view see House Rep. No. 2198, 80th Cong., 2nd sess., *Organization, Functions, and Relative Costs of Personnel Offices* (June 4, 1948).

Assembly of the United States and Canada (to be known as the Public Personnel Association after 1957), and the Society for Personnel Administration. All of these organizations have field chapters in various centers throughout the country, with a few even abroad. In addition, research and professional interest has been fostered from time to time by the American Political Science Association, the American Academy of Political and Social Science, and the Society for the Advancement of Management.

V. RECORDS AND REPORTS

Personnel records are, in the main, of the following broad types: (1) records on employees; (2) records on applicants; (3) records on positions; (4) policy and procedural directives, rules, and regulations; (5) pay-roll, leave, and retirement records; (6) correspondence files.[16] Several of these deserve special comment. In the first place, pay-roll, leave, and retirement records may not be personnel records at all. Because of the processes involved, many regard these primarily as fiscal records that can best be kept by persons skilled in bookkeeping and accounting. For this reason pay-roll, leave, and retirement records are often maintained by finance offices rather than personnel offices, particularly in the Federal service. This in no way diminishes the personnel office's responsibility for pay, leave, and retirement policy and interpretation from a substantive standpoint. The prevailing practice in state and local agencies, however, is still to carry on these record-keeping functions within the personnel offices or within the same office which handles requisitions for eligibles. In fact, in the early days of merit system control the "checking of the pay roll" by the central personnel agency was considered a *sine qua non* of such a system. It was by this control that recalcitrant division heads could be prevented from surreptitiously slipping a political appointee on the rolls.

The category of records on employees is the most complex. Ideally it should consist of (1) individual employee folders covering the total employment history and training of each employee; (2) confidential files on some employees, containing inquiries, complaints, or other data which are of such a nature that for them to remain in the regular folders, which are often referred to supervisors interested in candidates for jobs, might unjustifiably prejudice the employees' opportunities for employment success in the organization; (3) index of employee qualifications necessary for placement purposes and other indexes or cards needed for statistical reporting; (4) placement contact records to maintain continuity of relationships and make adjustment simpler in those instances in which interviews or inquiries are conducted between placement officers and employees; (5)

[16] The purposes of and devices used in personnel records are outlined in *A Personnel Program*, Federal Security Agency (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), Training Manual No. 3, pp. 75–84.

health examination records and reports of special health conditions or treatments, which probably should be kept in the health room. A personnel operation is not likely to be very up to date unless it contains an orderly system of files for each of these purposes. It is impossible to say what proportion of public agencies measure up to these elementary criteria.

Records on applicants are primarily of three types: (1) those on applicants from other departments in the same jurisdiction who are eligible for transfer; (2) those on persons seeking reinstatement; and (3) registers or certificates of eligible candidates from outside. Some of the principles in the handling of such files are, in effect, covered in the chapters on staffing. Suffice it to say here that, where applications of persons eligible for selection are kept, it is necessary to have an occupational and qualifications index similar to that used for current employees. Only in this way can the personnel office be assured that all such candidates will always be considered for any openings that they are qualified to fill.

Necessary records on positions consist, of course, of individual job descriptions, class specifications, organization charts, and other program or comparative information that will be of use in the evaluation of duties and responsibilities.

Increasing attention has been given in recent years to the simplification and improvement of personnel records. In the Federal service this area has received major attention by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the former Federal Personnel Council. These groups collaborated in numerous record and procedure improvement projects which have simplified and reduced the cost of much paper work. Notable examples are a decentralized leave-reporting form and system; a standard personnel folder on individual employment history that is transferred between departments when the employee transfers; a standard summary personnel card; and use of mechanical equipment for qualifications indexes and for statistical reporting. These and various others have been developed within recent years. Other jurisdictions doubtless can match these achievements for simplicity and functional design. They are tangible evidences of the value of widespread participation in administrative improvement. The principal credit for facilitating democratic participation and agreement in these projects should go to the Federal Personnel Council.

Reporting is a less mature aspect of personnel management. Few will claim that they have found the ideal plan for reporting to top executives on personnel activity and trends in their organization. The statistical side of the problem is commonly taken care of by mechanical means, with basic data punched or coded on cards that are subsequently sorted and tabulated by automatic machines, by hand-operated "keys," or by other devices. Thus, the facts on numbers and movement of personnel, pay rates,

location, promotions, separations, and the like, can readily be compiled for periodical reports or for *ad hoc* requests.

Pointing up significant developments, analyzing work loads, demonstrating areas of need for personnel work, showing what factors and conditions are influencing morale, and indicating trends in the organization that call for action are much more difficult to synthesize and report on. A more specialized book than the present one would be required to give this subject its due.[17] It should be noted in passing, however, that the better a personnel office's regular reporting system, the better prepared it is to meet the special requests for reports that it continuously receives from the chief executive, from budget authorities, and from the legislative body.

VI. PERSONNEL RESEARCH

Personnel research is not a field separate from the various aspects of personnel administration dealt with in the earlier chapters of this book. Mention is made of the subject here in order to synthesize a point of view. It is the point of view that is willing to venture a new hypothesis, to act on facts and not conjecture, to experiment, to learn and revise on the basis of organized study of experience. In short, it is the scientific method.

Are there actually any areas of personnel management that are *not* susceptible of improvement through a stand-off look at how things are going, a taking stock of aims, of methods, of results? We need only to survey briefly the several specialties to remind ourselves of how markedly the personnel art has been advanced through scientific research: Where would job evaluation be without job analysis and class standards? Wage and salary fixing, without systematic analysis of pay data? The development of morale, without interview programs, attitude surveys, and experiments in supervision? A mature plan of employee representation and participation, without orderly study of many experiences? The evaluation of performance, without studies of human motivation and work behavior? The training and development of employees, without research in teaching and learning techniques? Attention to environment, health, and safety principles, without analyses of their relationship to productivity and job satisfaction?

The great advances in this field of administration, as in most of the arts and sciences, are largely attributable to the patient and thorough search of trained investigators, such as those in the Hawthorne studies, for answers to the puzzling questions of human relations. This has required

[17] For two stimulating pamphlets on reporting of personnel operations and of their value to management, see the following publications of the Department of the Navy: *Is Your Personnel Program a 'Best Buy' for Management?* (Washington: 1947) and *Personnel Reports to Top Management* (Washington: 1946).

spending the time and the energy necessary to gather facts, to permit a detached view of them, and to breed a critical appraisal and imagination equal to the task. It invariably requires money. Vastly more money has been spent by private industry than by government in personnel research. This is another field in which progressive industries have led the field.

Notable instances of personnel research in the public service have been cited here and there throughout our discussion. There are, for example, the many significant test validation studies by several civil service commissions, the assessment of men during the war by the Office of Strategic Services,[18] occasional attitude surveys, the personnel work-load studies in the Departments of the Army and the Navy, the employee appraisal of supervision in the Social Security Administration,[19] and the efforts in various agencies to develop job performance standards.[20] Unfortunately, the volume has been pitifully small considering the need and the demonstrated productiveness of such research as has been done in the past. One of the means that has been only slightly exploited is the use of nearby university staffs for joint research enterprises in public jurisdictions.[21] Such collaboration between academic and public groups should prove of increasing practical value. It is a fact that among personnel units in government agencies a genuine research staff is indeed rare. Until greater appreciation of problems of administration is had among executives and legislators, financial support for such activity will continue to be negligible. Resort to outside assistance is therefore imperative.

Research is a continuing process. It is never complete. Hence, a fully staffed personnel office should have some members skilled in statistical methods, in psychometrics, and in psychological research techniques. While the emphases change, the need for research goes on. As one writer has aptly put it: "In the 1920's, management thought of personnel research in terms of stop-watches and test blanks. In the 1930's, the Hawthorne investigators . . . proclaimed the importance of the interview. Uses as well as methods of personnel research—or fact finding for the guidance of administrative decisions on personnel—have changed in response to changing emphases in administration."[22]

Personnel research, as a function of personnel offices, is of vital importance to the continuing growth of the profession and to its service to man-

[18] OSS Assessment Staff, *Assessment of Men* (New York: 1948).

[19] Milton Hall, "Supervising People—Closing the Gap Between What We Think and What We Do," *Advanced Management*, September, 1947, pp. 129–135.

[20] See the discussion in the chapter "Evaluation and Incentives," *passim*, and the symposium "Standards of Performance," in *Personnel Administration*, July, 1948.

[21] John M. Pfiffner, "Public Personnel Administration and the Universities," *Personnel Administration*, March, 1948, pp. 7–9.

[22] Elinor G. Hayes, "New Uses for Personnel Research," *Personnel Administration*, October, 1945, p. 5.

agement. It is particularly needed in public jurisdictions (1) to develop and improve methods of selecting employees who will be both productive and effective in work with others; (2) to develop more sharply the actual qualifications—knowledge and skills—required for specific classes of work; (3) to devise fresh ways of developing employee aptitudes and skills in human relations and supervision; (4) to solve the problem of evaluating performance so as not to conflict with high motivation; (5) to ascertain at what points the position classification concept should be modified to facilitate movement and growth of personnel; (6) to check up on all personnel services and practices.[23]

SUMMARY

The modern concept of the personnel function emphasizes its role within an operating establishment rather than in a central personnel control agency. Good personnel administration is a reality only to the extent that it is part of the everyday thought and action of line supervisors. A personnel office is primarily a staff service to the principal line officer, but it usually, of necessity, exercises some controls in his behalf over his subordinates in the hierarchy. Its highest usefulness, however, is in facilitating effective personnel decisions by the operating line.

This role of the personnel office is carried out through an overseeing of all functions that affect human relations, selection of personnel, and working terms and conditions. The scope of these responsibilities is suggested by the very chapter headings in this book. They are carried out by the personnel office through leadership in policy formulation, establishment of standards, promulgation of instructions, training of line operators, exercise of certain controls, and various methods designed to bring management and employees together for joint action.

Much is expected of the personnel officer. He must be at once an adviser, an example, an interpreter, a controller, and an observer. Professional preparation is essential for such a role.

Personnel offices, as found in the Federal Government particularly, tend to follow a fairly standard pattern in internal organization. A basic question is the degree to which personnel men should operate as generalists in the field or as specialists in single aspects such as job classification or employment. This problem is inextricably bound up with the matter of relationships with the line divisions and their management service officers. Experience is fast confirming the value of the generalist approach.

One of the areas in which personnel offices have made notable strides in recent years has been the improvement and the simplification of record

[23] A popular and fascinating summary of the influence of modern research on the social sciences, including personnel administration, is found in Stuart Chase's *The Proper Study of Mankind* (New York: 1948).

keeping, procedures, and paper processing. The quality of research and of reporting of personnel management accomplishments and problems, however, has not kept pace. In recognition of the need for continuous personnel research and reporting, much remains to be done. Until the normal place of detached fact finding, as a technique to keep consideration of the human factor alive and on realistic grounds, wins better support from executives, personnel directors, and those who hold the purse strings, personnel administration will fall short of its supreme goals of creating and maintaining a highly productive work force with a healthy *esprit de corps*.

25

International Personnel Administration

No book on "public" personnel administration in any country today would be quite complete without some discussion of that administrative field in which every country has a vital interest—international organization. The purpose of this chapter is not to make a comprehensive analysis of personnel administration in international agencies but to present briefly, with the United States as a backdrop, the principal personnel problems and the differences that occur in the international realm.

I. THE SCOPE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Between the two world wars and especially since World War II international agencies with administrative or quasi-administrative functions have greatly expanded. Some idea of the nature and range of current international organizations may be gained from a mere listing of the principal ones, the largest being marked with asterisks:

General
- *United Nations
- Council of Europe
- *Organization of American States (Pan American Union—the central organ)

Agriculture
- *Food and Agriculture Organizations of the United Nations
- International Seed-Testing Association

Commercial and Financial
- Bank for International Settlements
- Inter-American Economic and Social Council (Organization of American States)
- Inter-American Statistical Institute
- *International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs
International Statistics Institute
*International Monetary Fund
International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property
Organization for European Cooperation

Commodity

International Cottom Advisory Committee
International Sugar Council
International Tin Research Committee
International Wheat Council
International Rubber Study Group

Educational, Scientific, and Cultural

Inter-American Cultural Council (Organization of American States)
International Bureau of Weights and Measures
International Council of Scientific Unions
International Hydrographic Bureau
World Meteorological Organization
Pan American Institute of Geography and History
*United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

Political and Legal

Inter-Allied Reparation Agency
Inter-American Council of Jurists (Organization of American States)
*International Court of Justice
North Atlantic Treaty Organization
*Permanent Court of Arbitration

Social and Health

Inter-American Commission of Women
Inter-American Indian Institute
International Criminal Police Commission
*International Labor Organization
Office of UN High Commissioner for Refugees
Pan American Sanitary Organization
*World Health Organization

Transport and Communications

*International Civil Aviation Organization
International Telecommunication Union
Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses
Permanent International Association of Road Congresses
Postal Union of the Americas and Spain
*Universal Postal Union

Although none of the above organizations has a large staff in comparison with Federal or state bureaus in the United States, the United Nations has a secretariat of about 4000 persons, and the other organizations asterisked have sizable staffs, in a few instances numbering well into the hundreds. The largest organization ever set up was UNRRA (United Nations

Relief and Rehabilitation Administration), established during the war and since liquidated, which had a staff of 20,000. The above list is not complete. It comprises simply the major organizations, in most of which the United States participates. There are several hundred international agencies of a multilateral type, to say nothing of scores of bilateral commissions and boards of one kind or another. The above list, however, is indicative of the scope and nature of the principal organizations that have permanent staffs. The total size of the international civil service is estimated at around 9000 persons.[1]

II. BASIC DIFFERENCES AFFECTING PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

Before examining some specific problems that arise in the international jurisdiction, we must take note of the fundamental conditions there that make the problems and objectives of personnel administration quite different from those in the American public service.

The first and most obvious condition that creates some confusion is that of dealing with many languages. The staff of an international agency is necessarily made up of persons from more than one country. Nearly every international agency, to meet demands of member states, adopts two or three *official* languages. All written materials have to be prepared in more than one language. The official languages used often affect the distribution of the staff among the different nationalities. Someone who can easily use or translate to one of the official languages must work in each subunit! Oral conferences are impeded by inability of employees to understand each other fully or clearly. Even more difficult is the problem of finding words in the other language that connote exactly what a term means in the language of the person initiating the statement. This has arisen even among citizens of the English-speaking nations when disagreement has occurred because of different connotations placed on such words as "administrative" and "executive."

Language, however, appears not to be as great a barrier to understanding and teamwork as the wide variation in concepts of organization and administration among the various nations.[2] The second basic condition that adds complexities, therefore, is the necessity for reconciliation of these national differences. The nature of the varying concepts will be clearer upon reference to the specific problems discussed in the balance of this chapter. In any event, mention should be made here of the basic lack of

[1] The source for most of the foregoing information is *Yearbook of International Organizations, 1954–55*, Union of International Associations (Brussels: 1954). See also U.S. Department of State, *International Agencies in Which the United States Participates*, Publication 2699 (Washington: 1946).

[2] According to Robert I. Biren, "Staffing an International Agency," *Public Personnel Review*, July 1, 1947, p. 123.

definition of line and staff relationships. Many nationalities are unfamiliar with these concepts. It is not surprising that there has been resistance to pinning these relationships down too definitely. In addition to "sailing a ship while building it," as Biren puts it, an international agency finds life further complicated in that "the officers of the ship are being required to study new methods of navigation as they sail, to transmit orders in strange tongues, and, finally, . . . [to] proceed full speed over an unknown course to a none-too-well defined destination."[3]

The third underlying complication is the necessity for dealing with a world-wide recruiting ground. The United Nations Charter, for example, lays down the rule that "due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible."[4] As we shall see below, this creates the difficulty of equating employment terms and conditions to meet each country's situation and makes many selection processes inapplicable. Yet nearly every international organization must provide to some extent for international composition of its staff.

There are other perplexing issues which plague the personnel processes in an international civil service. One is the peculiar relationship of the agency, and hence its employees, to the host country in which its headquarters are housed. This is brought out in problems of pay, taxation, and the whole range of privileges and immunities which require a code different from that traditionally covered by the concept of diplomatic privilege. Another problem is that of the proper degree of national participation in selection and direction of international staffs. Thus, some misunderstandings have occurred as to the efforts of the United States to insure that American appointees to international secretariats were first of all loyal Americans and not linked with efforts to sabotage the American government and its foreign policies.

With this background, we may now turn to the specific personnel problems and means of solving them.[5]

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

[4] Art. 101, par. 3.

[5] The following appear to be the best discussions of the general subject: William P. Lehman, "International Personnel Administration," *Personnel Administration*, September, 1947, pp. 3–11; Biren, *loc. cit.;* William C. Rogers, "The International Civil Service," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1946, pp. 156–161, which is a summary of a panel discussion at the 1946 annual conference of the American Society for Public Administration; Adrian Pelt, "Peculiar Characteristics of an International Administration," *Public Administration Review*, Spring, 1946, pp. 110–113; Guy de Carmoy, "Thoughts on Some Administrative Problems of International Organizations," *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives*, 1950, No. 3, pp. 464–477; and Georges Langrod, "Les Problèmes Fondamentaux de la Fonction Publique Internationale," *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives*, 1953, No. 1, pp. 9–111.

On the United Nations personnel program, the following are useful: Mary Smieton, "Problems of International Personnel Administration," *Journal of the Institute of Personnel Management*, November–December, 1949, pp. 288–298; Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The United Nations Secretariat* (New York: 1950), pp. 54–89; Secretary General, United

III. PROBLEMS OF STAFFING

Some of the complexities in recruiting and placing staff members are forecast in the preceding paragraphs. First of all it is obvious that the sheer physical dimensions of the recruitment task are staggering. The initial staffing of the United Nations, headquartered in the United States, was accomplished in part by sending out recruitment missions or representatives to the principal world capitals, where recruitment committees were organized in some states, working agreements with governmental units were devised in others, agents were contracted for in a few, and some direct recruitment was done. Actually, however, this elaborate system of teams accounted for less than half of the non-American staff; most of the recruitment from other countries was done by operating officials of the United Nations through such personal channels as they chose to use.[6] Much of the formal machinery has since been eliminated.

Clerical and custodial employees have usually been recruited almost entirely from local residents at headquarters of the particular agency. Even where this is done, it calls for familiarity of hiring officers with local employment sources and customs. For higher-level employees, the general feeling expressed by experts at a panel discussion on the subject in 1946 was that liaison between the international agency personnel office and national advisory committees on candidates was a workable plan and better than hit-or-miss recruitment by each selecting official.[7] However, in the United Nations some of the world-recognized authorities who served as operating officials were better able to recruit a competent staff than anyone else.

Another recruitment problem has been the awkward one of applying a quota system among the various member countries in face of the fact that certain techniques and sciences are highly developed in some places and neglected in others. Thus, certain nations are bound to have better candidates than others in many fields; and the less fortunate countries are sometimes reluctant to release scarce technicians. As William Lehman points out: "A great many professions simply are not practiced in a great many countries. Experienced economists, public health specialists, anthropologists, social welfare administrators, budget officers, personnel technicians, industrial hygienists, and others are to be found in relatively few of the nations. Many appointments, as a result, require a compromise with normal selection standards. The principle of geographic representation has

Nations, *Reports on Personnel Policy*, 7th (1953), 8th (1953), and 9th (1954); K. T. Behanan, *Personnel Policy in the United Nations Secretariat* (New York: 1952); F. R. Scott, "The World's Civil Service," *International Conciliation* (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), January, 1954, pp. 257–320; and F. Honig, "The International Civil Service," *International Affairs*, April, 1954, pp. 175–185.

[6] Lehman, *op. cit.*, p. 9. The best treatments of staffing problems are "U.N. and the Agen-

undoubtedly lowered to some extent the calibre of the staff of the [UN] secretariat."[8]

This problem of inapplicability of common standards, which to a considerable extent relates even to the more stereotyped occupations, obviously makes such devices as application blanks, tests, and interviews almost impossible of standardization in world-wide selection processes. Organizing examinations on an international competitive basis is costly and complicated. In addition to the language hurdle, there is the matter of striking a fair balance between educational systems. In the United Nations, however, standard American tests are used for typists, stenographers, secretaries, and duplicating machine operators. United Nations linguists have also evolved tests for bilingual typists and for interpreters, translators, précis writers, and reporters.[9]

The United Nations Preparatory Commission had recommended, with respect to testing, that examinations be given in the language chosen by the candidate, that countries with similar academic traditions be grouped into examination areas, and that no written tests be used for higher posts.[10] Nevertheless, Biren observes that screening and selection of candidates in international organizations will for some time have to be based on analysis of applications, on reference and collateral investigations, and on personal interviews where possible.[11]

But even these methods offer no simple solution. How are international agencies to obtain reliable information on a candidate living thousands of miles from headquarters? Can a national government be relied upon to supply objective information? As a matter of fact, reference responses have for the most part been prompt and frank.[12] But some machinery for consultation between international personnel directors and the member governments appears necessary to assure selections, particularly for technical positions, on as objective a basis as possible.[13]

Other aspects of the staffing problem deserve at least passing mention. The problem of negotiation with prospective candidates is often difficult because of the varying practices to which they are accustomed involving pay, hours of work, leaves, housing allowances, and other terms and conditions of employment. Then there is the need to provide some kind of

---

cies," *Planning*, May 23, 1949 (published by *Political and Economic Planning*, London), and International Civil Service Advisory Board, *Report on Recruitment Methods and Standards for the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies* (United Nations, N.Y.: 1950).

[7] Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

[8] Lehman, *op. cit.*, p. 8. See also Biren, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

[9] Lehman, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[10] Pelt, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

[11] Biren, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] See Pelt, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

tenure and opportunities for careers in the international service. The small size of most international agencies and the necessity for maintaining some balance of nationalities at all levels mitigate against the normal approaches to this subject, which are none too simple as they are! Contracts in the lower and middle grades in the United Nations have been made chiefly for an indeterminate period, subject to revision every five years on the basis of reports by supervisory officers. Employees are not to lose their jobs for any reason extraneous to their performance. Higher officials are offered five-year contracts, subject to renewal. There are also temporary appointments for various specialists. Some of the problems of a career could be met by providing for more interchange of personnel between the United Nations secretariat and the several specialized international organizations.[14]

At this point of reference to careers based on merit, attention might be called to the vast degree of difference among nations in their approach to performance evaluation. To some nationalities it is simply unheard of. The story is told of the surprising reaction of a Latin American in the United Nations to a northern brother's explanation of what was expected of him as a supervisor in rating his employees. "What!" he exclaimed in alarm. "You mean that I should *judge* my fellow man?" Coming from a country where we ordinarily regard respect for the individual as being less than our own, this is an attitude that gives pause. It is possible that we Americans are too prone to label and categorize our fellows as to quality.

IV. THE PROBLEM OF LOYALTY

In the last analysis, where must the loyalties of an international official lie? To the country of which he is a citizen or to the organization by which he is employed?

This is clearly decided for United Nations employees by the charter, which requires that they place their loyalty to the United Nations above loyalty to country.[15] The report of the United Nations Preparatory Commission, as accepted by the General Assembly, stated: "For the duration of their appointments, the Secretary-General and the staff will not be servants of the State of which they are nationals, but the servants only of the United Nations." Permanent staff members are therefore prohibited from holding any other employment, public or private, from receiving any honors, favors, or gifts, and from running for political office. The Preparatory Commission went on to say: "But the obligations of the officials are not purely negative. It is essential that officials should be inspired by a sense of loyalty to the United Nations and devotion to the ideal for which it

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 112. See also Lehman, *op. cit.*, p. 9. A current "transfer agreement" is limited in usefulness because of variations in retirement and other conditions among the agencies.

[15] Art. 100, par. 1 and 2.

stands, and that they should develop an 'esprit de corps' and a habit of daily cooperation with persons of other countries and cultures. Loyalty to the Organization is in no way incompatible with an official's attachment to his own country, whose higher interest he is serving in serving the United Nations. It clearly involves, however, a broad international outlook and a detachment from national prejudices and narrow national interests."[16] A similar rule applies to practically every international agency now in existence.

The League of Nations first established the principle that men and women would be recruited to serve the League alone. It was not to be made up of experienced civil servants merely detailed (or "seconded," as the British say) to the League from the member governments. Hence, the tradition has been well established that the international public servant's loyalty must transcend mere faithfulness to his own country. How significant this is may be realized when we imagine the mixed feelings that an American must experience when he is asked to render primary fealty to a jurisdiction other than the United States. There is no reason to believe that citizens of other nations would feel any less of an emotional twinge. One may speculate whether following out logically the postwar atomic-age hysteria in the United States, with its investigations and espionage charges the order of the day, and with laws requiring loyalty checks or oaths in the Federal Government and several states, would not automatically disqualify an American for our public service if he ever accepted employment in and therefore allegiance to an international organization. Actually, the problem has never come up, because there are numerous officials in our national government now who at one time or another have served an international agency. Certainly none of them, by virtue of this experience, could be suspected of traitorous tendencies. The international loyalty is therefore, as the United Nations Preparatory Commission emphasized, *not* a negation of national loyalty but an extension of it to a higher plane.

A special problem in this connection has been that of getting assurances from appointees that they recognize their obligations to the international unit. For example, the tradition of an oath of office is nonexistent in England. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was one agency which ran into difficulty in seeking a formal declaration of allegiance from new employees in London. An Englishman assumes that his loyalty to a public employer or any other is expected and understood. To ask him to *swear* that he will be loyal is to indicate some distrust of him and to insult him. The matter was finally settled for British staff members

[16] See Pelt, *op. cit.*, p. 110. Another interesting article on loyalty is H. E. Thonassis Aghnides, "Standards of Conduct of the International Civil Servant," *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives*, 1953, No. 1, pp. 179–187.

by having them *sign* a declaration of loyalty when they accepted employment.[17]

V. CONFUSION OVER THE POSITION CONCEPT AND PAY

In the chapter on position classification we indicated the indigenous character of the position concept in the American public service and private industry. Actually, there is a noticeable similarity to these views, which we take for granted, in the public services of only Canada and Brazil. Most nations either lack the concept entirely or give it very limited application. This is the case not only in States in which systematized personnel work is unknown but also in such highly developed civil services as those of England and Germany.

Little wonder, then, that American personnel technicians in international agencies find quite perplexing the reconciliation of their modern views on job evaluation with the older view of most other nationals, which emphasizes status adhering to the individual rather than to the position. William Lehman points out in this connection: "Most officials of international agencies are disinclined, in their early planning, to draw organization charts. They are usually taken aback at the idea of preparing a job description prior to appointment. 'How can we say what a person *will* do,' they ask, 'until we have seen what he *can* do?' It was not uncommon for officials to protest their inability to define positions and ask in the same breath for the appointments of a half-dozen persons to the undefined jobs. Officials frequently preferred to offer appointments with the condition that duties and salary would be fixed after the appointee arrived."[18] Further, a former high official of the German civil service makes out a good case by rhetorical questions: "Why this special limitation, the position? Will it get you tomorrow's executive? Is it more important to pick an individual for the position than to find men of great general ability who will be your leaders? Why must we think always of the position? Why not think of the man?"[19]

As Lehman goes on to observe: "The impossibility to date of reconciling these basic concepts has retarded international personnel activities. It has been a barrier to the performance of any very useful position classification work; it has caused confusion in recruitment work; it stands in the way of progress on the problem of standard international testing; and in discussions of selection and promotion programs it has caused the most accomplished linguists to find that they are not talking the same language."

[17] Herbert H. Lehman, then Director General of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, in an address before the Washington chapter of the American Society for Public Administration, February 14, 1945.

[18] Lehman, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

[19] *Ibid.*

Nevertheless, he expresses hope that a true synthesis of the great variety of views on this subject will emerge, one which "will retain objective standards and over-all integration while it eliminates the tendency to over-specialize and to miss some of the potentially most able administrators."[20]

It goes without saying that the confusion over the position concept extends to pay, with a few added complications. Equal pay for equal work in the international arena has seemed utterly impossible. Differences in compensation in a given occupation, already a problem in a country as big as the United States, are aggravated when on a world-wide basis. Because accountants are commonly paid less in Australia in relation to other occupations than they are in the United States, should an international agency vary accountants' pay according to the country of origin, or should it meet the highest standard for the occupation wherever that exists, or should it hit somewhere in between the highest and the lowest? The difficulties under any alternative are too obvious to require enumeration. Likewise, the special influence of the country in which the headquarters happens to be located, as to both cost of living and occupational traditions, must be kept in mind. This problem is magnified when an organization has offices in more than one country.

Pay practices in international agencies have been about as varied as the functions of the agencies themselves. Where American personnel men have been represented some semblance of relating pay to kind and level of work has prevailed. But formal methods for controlling compensation have been few and often ineffective. Even in the United Nations an early Salary Administration Section, which was concerned with position evaluation and application of salary scales, was abolished in 1947. Thus, operating officials set the salaries of subordinates independently. Some attempt at maintaining general class specifications and pay standards was apparently continued, however, for their guidance.[21] It is quite possible that the personal rank concept, as now used in the International Labor Organization, will better suit the needs of international organizations than the position concept.

A special aspect of pay has been the income tax liability of international employees. Most international civil servants are exempt from national income taxes. Where they are nationals of the country in which they are stationed, the organization reimburses them for taxes paid. It has been suggested that international organizations have a tax of their own or a "staff contribution" scheme.[22] The United Nations adopted such a plan in 1948. The employee is listed at a gross salary including an item for taxes,

[20] *Ibid.*
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
[22] In the panel discussion described by Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

which is deducted as an "assessment," leaving the net salary where it was. An assessment plan also operates in several other international secretariats.

VI. TRAINING

This is one area in which the behavior of international organizations is not greatly dissimilar to that of our own public jurisdictions. In short, in-service training is seriously neglected when one considers the need. Interest in preëntry training has been greater than that in in-service programs.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace initiated before the war an exploration of the administrative aspects of international organization. It analyzed the experience of the Secretariat of the League of Nations, sponsored two conferences on experience in international administration during 1942 and 1943, and stimulated the preparation of several specialized monographs. Then, to get a more thorough exchange of opinion and clarification of ideas on the question of training for international administration, the Endowment later in 1943 called together a distinguished group of international officials and educators to meet in Washington to confer on the subject. Although no systematic report of conclusions emerged, the proceedings which were published contain many illuminating observations.[23] The conferees tended to be more interested in the long-range objective of international organization than in the short-term purposes of military government, relief, and rehabilitation. They explored the kinds of training available and desirable, the mechanics of training, in-service versus outside training, and the kinds of persons to be selected for training. Undoubtedly the deliberations of this group were of assistance to those participants who two years later had something to do with getting the United Nations machinery in motion.

Among the institutions in the United States which have a special interest in or program for training in international administration are Yale University, with its Institute of International Studies; Columbia University, with a Director of Training in International Administration; Harvard University, with its School for Overseas Administration; Syracuse University; and Swarthmore College. These represent, of course, largely preëntry programs. An International Center for Training in Public Administration is also currently authorized by the United Nations as a coördinating venture rather than an operating entity.

The only international organization which appears to have had a very ambitious program of in-service training was the now defunct United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. It carried on instruction in the agency's organization and operations; courses concerning the

[23] *Proceedings of a Conference on Training for International Administration, 1943*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Washington: 1944).

geographic, social, economic, and cultural characteristics of particular countries or regions to which missions were being dispatched; specialized operational instruction in health, welfare, industrial and agricultural rehabilitation, etc.; training in the rudiments of languages spoken in the particular areas; and information on preparation for, personnel rules in, and living in the field.[24] These subjects were covered, of course, in programs set up for the various missions before they embarked to the country of need. It is difficult to see how such an urgent and transitional objective as that of UNRRA could have been efficiently met except through an organized staff training program.

The United Nations Secretariat has more recently become interested in in-service training. At first there was little formalized training except in linguistics. Although some fairly ambitious plans have been discussed, primarily along the lines of supplementary training in outside institutions to offset the deficiencies of the less-well-prepared nationals whom the quota system practically forces the United Nations to appoint, too little has so far been accomplished.[25] International agencies which report well-developed training programs are the World Bank (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development)[26] and the Pan American Union.[27]

VII. AN INTERNATIONAL CAREER CIVIL SERVICE

In accordance with the recommendation of the United Nations Preparatory Commission, the General Assembly in 1946 directed the Secretary General to form, in consultation with the heads of other agencies, an International Civil Service Commission to advise on recruitment and selection matters. The title subsequently was changed to International Civil Service Advisory Board.[28] Its mission is to consider methods of recruitment and the means whereby common standards of recruitment may be insured.

In recent years there has been increasing expression of need for an international career service. In view of the small size of most international organizations, it is natural to expect some profit from centralized recruiting for common jobs, pooled recruitment missions, a common retirement system, and some basic standards on such matters as pay and leave policies. As long as each international organization operates separately in these

[24] Frank Munk, "Training an International Civil Service," *Personnel Administration*, November, 1945, pp. 13–15.

[25] Lehman, *op. cit.*, p. 10. See the recommendations of the International Civil Service Advisory Board, *Report on In-Service Training in the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies* (United Nations, N.Y.: 1952).

[26] Donald D. Fowler and Murray D. Bryce, "Building Team Spirit in an International Staff," *Personnel Administration*, September, 1953, pp. 22–26, 33.

[27] Paul W. Bigbee, "Training Applied to an International Organization," *Personnel Administration*, September, 1954, pp. 32–35.

[28] The board has met regularly since 1949.

spheres the advantages of across-the-board policy development and of interorganization careers will not be realized.[29]

As a part-time body, with a small full-time staff, the International Civil Service Advisory Board cannot be expected to perform miracles, but it is difficult to imagine how any reasonably competent board can fail to be of some service. The emphasis so far has been on an advisory role. The only other integrating influence has been that provided by the United Nations through its bilateral agreements with its specialized agencies on personnel matters and its Consultative Committee on Administrative Questions. The question is whether a central personnel unit in the international realm will ever assume the control character of civil service commissions in the United States public service. There would be greater justification for its independence than prevails in an American jurisdiction, because in the international areas there is no common executive head in whom leadership can be vested. An international civil service commission would, of necessity, have to be a kind of supra agency whose strictures would be binding only by virtue of a voluntary compact among the individual international organizations.

SUMMARY

The great expansion of international administrative organization since the two world wars has brought with it problems of personnel administration. These problems arise from the basic difficulties of multiple languages, reconciliation of national differences in administrative philosophy, a world-wide recruiting ground, and relationships with the host country. Many of the perplexities center in the attempts to recruit, test, investigate, and select candidates on some objective and accurate basis, in the face of such hurdles as national quotas for the international staff, vast differences in educational systems, uneven distribution of qualifications, and the limited opportunity for careers. On top of this is the special consideration of assuring the employment of a staff that is supremely devoted to the purposes of the international agency above all other loyalties. As was to be expected, there has been little agreement on the position concept and on common guidelines for pay. Central control of compensation has been sacrificed to the maintenance of operating accord. In-service training has been conspicuous for its absence in all but a few instances, but the subject is re-

[29] See Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 158, and U.S. Sen. Rep. No. 90, 82nd Cong., 1st sess., *United States Relations with International Organizations*, Sec. V: *The Internal Operations of the United Nations and Certain International Organizations in Which the United States Participates* (Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 1951), pp. 42–48. The latter report proposes an independent international civil service commission to set up uniform selection and pay standards and policies. It concludes that such a central agency is necessary "if a genuine career service is to be built up, composed of persons whose character and ability are of the highest type and who will ultimately be able to meet the variety of situations which arise from day to day in the United Nations system."

ceiving increasing attention. Finally, the establishment of an International Civil Service Advisory Board bids well to mitigate many of the staffing difficulties that have so far been faced.

Even if the list of problems is incomplete, it plainly demonstrates the uniqueness of operating international administrative machinery and the necessity for treating and evaluating it in a class by itself. We cannot judge the effectiveness of international personnel administration by American standards alone. In fact, it deserves observation for what we can gain from it in ideas as well as for what we can bring to it. After all, experience in the public jurisdictions of the United States has not been so perfected that we can properly assume that we know all the answers. Although American ingenuity and willingness to experiment have caused many plans and practices to be *tried*, not all of the applications have been *true*.

PART VIII

General Conclusions

Away with the cant of "Measures, not men!"—the idle supposition that it is the harness and not the horses that draw the chariot along. If the comparison must be made, if the distinction must be taken, men are everything, measures comparatively nothing.

—George Canning, Speech in the House of Commons, 1801

26

The Horizons of Public Personnel Administration

Since the foremost task of management is the management of men, and since pay rolls constitute the largest single item in the operating budget of most representative public jurisdictions, the chief test of good public management is an organization's spirit and the quality of its members. High-caliber personnel is the most valuable asset of any large-scale organization. Good morale and motivation, in turn, make for a kinship binding men together as they move toward a common worth-while goal. They breed enthusiasm, good will, and coöperativeness. Their consequences are measured in terms of personal satisfactions, in the constant development of new ideas leading to improvements in methods, and, finally, in more and better output.

To insure selection of personnel on the basis of merit and fitness and to develop policies and practices that are conducive to high motivation calls for dedicated leadership, the kind that through its contagious influence permeates the whole organization. Its original source will be the head of the administration. Its channels will flow through the various offices and units of the jurisdiction, eventually reaching every worker.

What does the far-sighted leadership of today see on the horizons of public personnel administration? Assessment of current practice, scanning of the literature, appraisal of professional managerial discussions and of employee union interests—together these point up certain trends and developments that dominate the current scene or presage the future. Among these outstanding, evolving aspects of public personnel management appear to be the following:

1. *Development of the merit system.* The continuing growth and strengthening of the merit idea in public employment is practically guaranteed. All the enduring signs are in the direction of extension and improvement

of the basic philosophy of a qualified, expert, impartial civil service. It may seem trite to reiterate the point, but no concluding chapter would do justice to the subject if it did not acknowledge this fundamental fact.

2. *The keystones of sound personnel policy.* The broad outlines of personnel policy and method that make for high productivity and morale are essentially the same as they were five, ten, or even thirty years ago. The factors which make for sensitivity and responsiveness to the human elements in a work situation are varied and, from all indications, will continue to follow a pattern something like this: sound selection and placement procedures; fair pay policies permitting an appropriate standard of living; assurance of income in periods of sickness, disability, and old age; wholesome working conditions; opportunities for participation and growth; recognition of work well done; and, in all things, justice and fair dealing. When these conditions are realized, the work life becomes a way of living, not simply the doing of a job. To create satisfactions and to afford opportunities for self-realization for the work force are objectives worthy of the systematic attention of responsible executives in a democratic government.

3. *Flexibility and reduction of mechanistic methods.* Public personnel systems are undergoing constant evolution in technical methodology. In this process it is clear that we are moving more and more away from faith in the infallibility of arbitrary procedures and more and more toward development of and reliance on the judgment of men. This is evidenced in the trend away from overly structured performance rating schemes, the tendency toward broader classifications of jobs, the growing suspicion of "package" training programs, the development of tests and other selection devices for broader rather than narrower occupational segments, to mention only a few. Such a trend, in turn, demands greater emphasis on the proper selection and development of men in managerial roles—from first-line supervisor to top-level executive, for they are the ones who make the bulk of the important personnel decisions.

4. *Managerial role of personnel work.* Following through on the implications of the above trend, civil service commissions or other central personnel agencies must assume more of a managerial role and be so organized that they tie in more genuinely with the chief executive. The divorcement of the personnel function from operating management, dominant in the early civil service reform movement, is not bearing up under modern scrutiny. Recognition of the personnel function as a day-to-day concern of all who direct the work of others is creating a need for personnel services within the operating departments and a greater sense of responsibility on the part of chief executives—presidents, governors, mayors—for overall personnel policy and operations. The conception of a virtuous central personnel agency holding out year after year against a wicked and irresponsible operating management is fading. Personnel management has improved

where there has been a proper executive climate, and there is little enduring hope for it where executive leadership is poor or uninterested. Maintenance of merit principles and all-round good public personnel administration will depend in the last analysis on vigilant citizen interest and the intelligence of the voter in electing and maintaining in office the right kind of executive and legislative leadership.

5. *Professionalization of personnel work.* The foregoing does not in the least suggest that the role of the professional personnel man will decline. On the contrary, his part in the scheme of things is being raised to a newer and broader level. He is an adviser to top management, the guardian of all considerations that have to do with the maintenance and development of the human resources of the organization. The personnel profession continues to thrive and to call for more broadly educated people than ever before. Under these circumstances public jurisdictions must make certain that their personnel leadership is of a truly professional variety.

The handling of personnel objectives is so largely an administrative matter and so interwoven with every phase of operations that its coördination should be assigned to a single competent individual who has his accepted place as a peer of other administrative heads. Like theirs, his place should be close to the chief executive or to his deputy. The personnel executive should be a man of the highest standing and of proved competence, selected through merit procedures, appointed for an indefinite period, and removable only for cause and after an appropriate hearing. Such an official should have an adequate staff, which would undoubtedly result in much larger appropriations than are now available for the conduct of many a civil service commission. In the larger jurisdictions provision should also be made for adequate personnel staffs in the several departments. By this means administration of personnel would be dealt with on a uniform basis and in close coöperation with those in direct charge of the work force.

6. *Human relations.* Much has been achieved, or at least verbalized, but greater stress is still needed on the human relations aspects of management. Viewing the worker as a person worthy of attention and respect is essential to democratic procedures. His genuine participation in determining the methods of work and working conditions is vital to successful administration. Consciousness of and ability to develop this administrative climate are the most important requisites of a good executive. Needless to say, the head of the public department, as well as middle management, must have this insight and capacity. Discipline there must be, but as the tide of leadership rises the need of appealing to it will subside. Good leadership will tolerate none of the petty despotism, the fear and subservience that are bred in some public offices; nor will it be content with the easygoing "routine-ism" that still characterizes a few others.

7. *Career development.* Some broad problems linking together all branches of the public service are getting attention now as the cruder evils of blighted personnel management have been vanquished in many places. There is somewhat less interest nowadays in monolithic careers in a single public jurisdiction and more concern about interchange of personnel among jurisdictions. The pressures on merit systems and retirement plans in the future will be for modifications that not only permit but encourage this kind of mobility among public service career men. The city-manager profession and the fields of agriculture and public health are already leading the way. At the same time there is some disposition, particularly in the Federal service, to promote greater movement between the public service on the one hand and industry or education on the other.

Other developments affecting career patterns are observable in the continual growth and improvement of in-service training and in the greater receptivity to "rank-in-the-person," as distinguished from the position concept, in application to executive, scientific, and other higher-level employment.

8. *Employee organizations.* Note should be taken that the advances in public personnel administration have not diminished the growth of or feeling of need for employee unionization. Collective negotiation has become commonplace in many jurisdictions, particularly the more progressive municipalities. The representational function of the union and the satisfactions it provides to employees in other ways suggest that it is not a transitory phenomenon. The ever widening influence and recognition achieved by public employee unions emphasize the need for greater unification or coördination among unions and for leadership in the organizations of a progressive, responsible type that has been missing in the typical, special-interest union in the past.

9. *Prestige of public service.* The problem of deserving and developing public respect for governmental services and employment is all the more insistent now that we have come to recognize that big government is here to stay. Public management in general and public personnel operations in particular can never rise much above what the public expects of them. As long as these activities are viewed contemptuously, it will continue to be difficult to attract and hold the highest-caliber persons in public service careers. In the face of continual disparagement by ignorant, and sometimes malicious, people, it is little short of a miracle that our public jurisdictions employ the large share of devoted, able civil servants that they do. It will be a mark of maturity in our society when we finally slough off the ancient and inaccurate myths about public service and become more rational about its significance, purpose, and quality. We are moving gradually in that direction. Only then can we hope for establishment of the prestige for government work that the growth and endurance of our democracy requires.

10. *Need for research.* If public personnel administration is to progress it must be based more completely on objective research than it has been in the past. No more important proposal can be made than the suggestion that sufficient funds be made available to enable the personnel agency to carry on research as one of its normal and essential responsibilities. An appropriation for this purpose can easily be justified in terms of dollars saved. Further justification is found in the more adequate handling of the basic functions of the agency.

Probably hundreds of examinations are given each year by examining bodies that fail to rank the competitors "according to merit and fitness" because the tests have not been properly validated, standardized, and weighted. Too many agencies fail to subject their tests to critical examination by determining the correlation between test results and performance of appointed candidates. In addition, such problems as leadership, evaluation, incentives, training, attitudes, and many others continue to cry out for systematic analysis of experience. We must know the precise effects of different management techniques, for the plain fact is that in a field like personnel management we are dealing with methods and systems in which we do not have nearly all the answers. Trial and error, informed guessing, and exchange of professional opinion—while useful—do not constitute a firm basis for solid progress.

Research work is called for with respect to practically every phase of the employment cycle from recruitment to separation or retirement. There is no dearth of pioneering studies. What is needed is a more widespread appreciation of fact finding and analysis as a normal function of personnel management and also a collaboration among those interested in this phase of management to the end that general conclusions may be reached.

No progress of much consequence or of any enduring quality is likely to come in the broad field of management of manpower unless and until more resources and effort are spent on fundamental scientific research in such areas as worker productivity, motivation, and the effects of various personnel policies. A good beginning has been made, but the future of public personnel administration will depend critically upon the development of a research philosophy. All the questions—and we are dealing essentially here with the social sciences—will not be solved in short order, any more than they have been in the natural sciences. A prominent writer has reminded us: "It is not necessary to learn all about man and his behavior. No worker in the natural sciences yet knows what life is, or precisely what electricity is. But he knows enough to direct some of the processes of life and of electricity; enough to stamp out yellow fever and light a thousand cities."[1]

[1] Stuart Chase, *The Proper Study of Mankind* (New York: 1948), p. 46.

CONCLUSION

There is no single movement which will net such economy or promote such performance as may be realized through the continued improvements in the quality and the motivation of public personnel. Government today has long ceased being an incidental or second-rate business of the people of the United States. From the point of view of the essential character of the services performed, from the point of view of size and of the percentage of the national income spent, the public business is clearly the foremost business enterprise of the country. Unless history misleads us, there is no reason to believe that it will be otherwise as time goes on. The most important and fruitful development challenging the American public is maintaining public personnel administration on a level second to none and continuing to secure for the public service men and women of capacities commensurate with the vast responsibilities vested in modern government.

Bibliography

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND GUIDES

Caldwell, Lynton K., *Comparative Public Administration; An Outline of Topics and Readings* (Graduate Program in Public Administration, Albany, N.Y., 1953). A comprehensive list of references, classified by several general subjects as well as by nation, relating to the public service systems in the principal countries of the world and to those in colonial and trust territory governments and in international agencies.

De Grazia, Alfred, *Human Relations in Public Administration: An Annotated Bibliography* (Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1949). The most extensive bibliography (363 items) on the broad field of human relations, brought together from the fields of anthropology, industrial management, political science, psychology, public administration, and sociology. The annotations are so complete that in many instances they constitute admirable abstracts of the books and articles listed. The classification of items is useful as well as unique.

Pfiffner, John M., "A Human Relations Reading List," *Personnel*, September, 1949. A very complete listing of books from the various disciplines, covering scientific management, organization, supervision, leadership, training, industrial psychology, collective bargaining, and the like. The annotations are crisp and critical, with particular usefulness to students.

Ross, Clay M., *A Survey of Public Personnel Legislation and Administrative Regulations* (Bureau of Public Administration, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, 1940). Analytical summary of personnel problems and tabulation of provisions of civil service laws of various jurisdictions.

Seckler-Hudson, Catheryn, *Bibliography on Public Administration—Annotated* (American University Press, Washington, 1953). The most complete and up-to-date annotated listing on the whole field of public administration. Contains an excellent bibliography on personnel management, with very useful annotations.

United States Civil Service Commission, *A Bibliography of Public Personnel Administration Literature* (Washington, 1949; Supplements Nos. 1–5, 1949–1954). The most detailed bibliography on the subject, arranged by the major aspects of personnel programs. Includes references to articles and official documents as well as books. Briefly annotated. Contains an excellent index by subject and author.

II. GENERAL BOOKS

A. EMPHASIS ON PRIVATE BUSINESS

Calhoon, Richard P., *Problems in Personnel Administration* (Harper, New York, 1949). This comprehensive volume evaluates the results of personnel policies and techniques in more than 500 private companies.

Evans, J. J., Jr., *A Program for Personnel Administration* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1945). A brief, popularly written work, describing the function of personnel management and the role of the personnel administrator in industry.

Follett, Mary Parker, *Dynamic Administration*, Collected Papers (Harper, New York, 1942). An excellent array of lectures by one of the pioneer thinkers in administration. Reveals a profound insight into leadership and human relations, focused particularly on business practice but with much wider significance for the orderly control of human affairs—governmental and international.

Gardner, Burleigh B., and Moore, David G., *Human Relations in Industry*, 3rd ed. (Irwin, Homewood, Ill., 1955). A semipopular analysis of the social system in the factory, with particular reference to informal organization, communication, change, and delegation.

Golden, Clinton S., and Ruttenberg, Harold J., *The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy* (Harper, New York, 1942). A discussion by two union officials of the elements of industrial peace, with emphasis on collective bargaining and union-management coöperation.

Halsey, George D. (ed.), *Handbook of Personnel Management*, rev. ed. (Harper, New York, 1953). A compendium of forms and exhibits illustrating the techniques of personnel management, intended primarily for personnel managers in factories, stores, and offices.

Hoslett, Schuyler Dean (ed.), *Human Factors in Management*, 1st and 2nd eds. (Harper, New York, 1946, 1951). Two symposia of outstanding papers by leading authorities, covering leadership, training in human relations, counseling, and research.

Jucius, Michael J., *Personnel Management*, 3rd ed. (Irwin, Homewood, Ill., 1955). A modern work with chapters on manpower, economic security, motivation, women in industry, and executive training, as well as the usual basic material. Includes 30 case problems.

Knowles, William H., *Personnel Management; A Human Relations Approach* (American Book Company, New York, 1955). Unlike most texts, this book leaves the technical and procedural aspects of personnel management to the various subject-matter fields and instead stresses the impact of ideology, ethics, and the social sciences on the personnel function. An excellent exposition of the evolution of personnel management and of human relations as an interdisciplinary approach.

Maier, Norman R. F., *Psychology in Industry*, 2nd ed. (Houghton-Mifflin, New York, 1955). A standard and up-to-date work on private business personnel problems from the viewpoint of psychological causation and effect; covers group supervision, attitudes, tests, motivation, counseling, and labor relations.

Mayo, Elton, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization* (Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, Boston, 1945). A scholarly analysis of the significance of the human-relations problem in modern life. Stresses the importance of man's persistence in association and in seeking coöperative activity, requiring research in and systematic methods of easing individuals from one group of associates into another.

Mee, John F., *Personnel Handbook* (Ronald Press, New York, 1951). A 1167-page book of practical aids and procedures for the personnel technician.

Moore, Herbert, *Psychology for Business and Industry*, 2nd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1942). A sound, practical work on the possible contributions of psychology to various phases of management, with primary emphasis on personnel.

National Industrial Conference Board, *Personnel Administration in the Small Company*, Studies in Personnel Policy No. 117 (NICB, New York, 1951). A 92-page

survey of the organization for personnel administration in 57 selected companies, and the programs and services provided for employees.

Northcott, C. H., *Personnel Management; Its Scope and Practice.* 2nd ed. (Pitman, London, 1953). A good source for comparative study of British thinking and practice in industrial personnel management.

Pigors, Paul, and Myers, Charles A., *Personnel Administration.* 2nd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1951). One of the best texts on personnel management in private enterprise, particularly from the human motivation and relations point of view. Addressed primarily to the personnel administrator. Contains a valuable and extensive appendix of case illustrations. Slights some aspects of the subject, such as job evaluation and union relationships.

Roethlisberger, F. J., and Dickson, W. J., *Management and the Worker* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1939). This is a detailed account of the research program carried on at the Hawthorne works of the Western Electric Company, covering a 12-year period. The project involved a series of controlled experiments with reference to various working conditions as well as an extensive series of interviews to discover what was on the worker's mind. The end result is the conception of an industry as a little society, a kind of social organism engaged in the production both of goods and of balanced human beings. This is a landmark work.

Scott, Walter D., Clothier, Robert C., and Spriegel, William R., *Personnel Management,* 5th ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1954). A standard work in the field of private employment management. One of the most comprehensive and up-to-date books in that field. Contains a valuable appendix setting forth by charts and graphs the status of personnel management in 628 private concerns. There are also 5 films and 5 filmstrips available in conjunction with this text.

Sheldon, Oliver, *The Philosophy of Management* (Pitman, London, 1930). Admirable and stimulating treatise on the art and science of management, with particular reference to its responsibility for the work force.

Tead, Ordway, *The Art of Administration* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1951). Lays great emphasis on leadership, democratic processes, and educational and human aspects of administration. Thesis: The widest freedom for personal initiative, as well as sharing in the results, capitalizes on normal desires of workers and leaders to produce high quality at high level.

Tead, Ordway, *The Art of Leadership* (Whittlesey House, New York, 1935). A thought-provoking and analytical treatment. This was a vanguard book when written and is still basically supported by the findings of researchers in more recent years.

Tead, Ordway, *Human Nature and Management,* 2nd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1933). One of the better early books on the psychological foundations of management, with emphasis on the creation of morale, leadership, and receptivity for training.

Tiffin, Joseph, *Industrial Psychology,* 3rd ed. (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1952). A general work on the subject, containing especially useful chapters on different kinds of tests.

Viteles, Morris S., *Industrial Psychology* (Norton, New York, 1932). An early standard work on the psychological aspects of personnel administration.

Watkins, Gordon S., Dodd, Paul A., McNaughton, Wayne L., and Prason, Paul,

The Management of Personnel and Labor Relations, 2nd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1950). An extensive work covering all aspects of the subject, with special attention to joint labor-management relations and collective bargaining.

Williams, Edgar G., *Cases and Problems in Personnel and Industrial Relations* (Ronald Press, New York, 1955). A handy book of 51 concrete policy and operational issues that have arisen in modern industrial personnel management. Useful as instructional tool along with general text.

Yoder, Dale, *Personnel Management and Industrial Relations*, 3rd ed. (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1948). A thorough book on personnel administration in private industry. Contains a substantial chapter on "Employment Relationships in the Public Service."

Yoder, Dale, *Personnel Principles and Policies—Modern Manpower Management* (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1952). Stresses the guiding generalizations and recognized goals of personnel management, with comprehensive coverage of all facets of manpower, including a good chapter on research. Case problems and study suggestions appear at conclusion of each of 30 chapters.

B. EMPHASIS ON PUBLIC SERVICE

American Academy of Political and Social Science, *The Annals*, "Bureaucracy in America," March, 1954. An excellent symposium of articles on issues of governmental administration, many bearing on personnel policies.

American Assembly, The Sixth, *The Federal Government Service: Its Character, Prestige, and Problems*, Final Edition (Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, New York, 1954). A series of brilliant background papers by experts and scholars and a final report by leading citizens on the most significant administrative problems in American government. An excellent primer on politics and administration, with emphasis on the critical issue: personnel.

Appleby, Paul, *Big Democracy* (Knopf, New York, 1945). A book rich with wisdom and quotable observations on the nature of the administrative process, with considerable attention to matters of import to personnel administration. To those who continue to regard the public service as an inferior form of employment, this volume should provide an enlightening analysis. Appleby is an eloquent exponent of the high mission and unmatched significance of the public executive. This book is a "must" for all students of public administration.

Carpenter, William Seal, *The Unfinished Business of Civil Service Reform* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1952). A brief appraisal of the achievements of civil service reform, urging greater control of administration by the executive as the central element of "unfinished business."

Case, Harry L., *Personnel Policy in a Public Agency: The TVA Experience* (Harper, New York, 1955). The most authoritative and up-to-date presentation of the TVA personnel story. A stimulating portrayal.

Charlesworth, James C., *Governmental Administration* (Harper, New York, 1951). One of the better general texts. Goes more fully into administrative method than others.

Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel (New York, 1935): *Better Government Personnel*, the report of the Commission.

Minutes of Evidence, Hearings in Washington, New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Richmond.

A Bibliography of Civil Service and Personnel Administration, by Sarah Greer (Monograph 1).

Civil Service Abroad: Great Britain, Canada, France, Germany, by Leonard D. White, Charles H. Bland, Walter R. Sharp, and Fritz Morstein Marx (Monographs 2–5 in one volume).

Training Public Employees in Great Britain, by Harvey Walker (Monograph 6).

Problems of the American Public Service (Monographs 7–11 in one volume).

"Responsible Government Service under the American Constitution," by Carl J. Friedrich.

"Municipal Civil Service in the United States," by William C. Beyer.

"Employer and Employee in the Public Service," by Sterling D. Spero.

"Veteran Preference in the Public Service," by John F. Miller.

"Personnel Practices in Business and Governmental Organizations," by George A. Graham.

Government by Merit: An Analysis of the Problem of Government Personnel, by Lucius Wilmerding, Jr. (Monograph 12).

The first of the above titles, *Better Government Personnel*, is the report of the commission, which outlines a number of specific recommendations, the main objective being the development of career opportunities both within a given service and articulated between the various jurisdictions from the local to the Federal. This report constituted in its day a challenge for the development of effective civil service reform. The final monograph, that by Wilmerding, is a more detailed analysis and criticism of those existing conditions and policies, accompanied by a number of discriminating recommendations for improving the public service.

The monographs on the subjects listed were prepared by highly competent authors and constitute a valuable contribution to the literature. This report served as a milestone in the development of a clearer understanding of public personnel problems. It contributed to the launching of a reform program that is now giving the public service the status which it deserves in modern society.

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel Management: A Report to the Congress* (Washington, 1949). A brief and incisive summary of the major shortcomings in Federal personnel administration, with very general recommendations for improvement. Includes some landmark proposals but is too much the product of compromise with political realities to be a brilliant work. Its weakness rests in its virtue in this respect.

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Task Force Report, *Federal Personnel* (Washington, 1949). A much more detailed analysis of the subject that is covered more generally in the commission's report, *Personnel Management*. Since most of the Task Force recommendations and views are reflected in the commission report, they may be taken as substantially those endorsed by the commission itself.

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington, 1955). Widely regarded as the best of the 1955 crop of "Hoover Commission" reports. Its quality derives from the excellent

Task Force report on which it drew. Omits some of the latter's recommendations, however.

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Task Force Report on Personnel and Civil Service* (Washington, 1955). Probably the most brilliant *official* document on the Federal civil service that has ever been written. Rich in its analysis, incisive in its penetration, and challenging in its proposals. Lays emphasis on managerial competence and strengthening of merit system, areas neglected in the 1949 report.

Congressional Joint Commission on the Reclassification of Salaries, 66th Cong., 2nd sess., House Doc. No. 686 (Washington, 1920). A report which set the pace for classification and wage standardization policies, but which also pioneered in the direction of outlining the implications of a broad personnel program in the public sphere.

Dimock, Marshall E., *The Executive in Action* (Harper, New York, 1945). A good summary of the executive function in government and business, embracing its relation to organization, planning, leadership, and coördination.

Dimock, Marshall E., and Dimock, Gladys O., *Public Administration* (Rinehart, New York, 1953). A refreshing reorganization of the usual textbook approach to the study of this subject.

Feldman, Herman, *A Personnel Program for the Federal Civil Service*, 71st Cong., 3rd sess., House Doc. No. 773 (Washington, 1931). This report, prepared under the auspices of the Personnel Classification Board, covers the whole range of Federal personnel policies, the section dealing with a comprehensive government wage policy being especially good.

Field, Oliver P., *Civil Service Law* (University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1939). A detailed review of the problems encountered in setting up and administering a civil service law. The best source book on legal aspects.

Finer, Herman, *The Theory and Practice of Modern Government*, rev. ed. (Holt, New York, 1949). This encyclopedic work (1954 double-column pages) is invaluable to the student of the governmental systems of England, France, Germany, and the United States. Part Six is devoted to a penetrating comparative analysis of the civil service systems of the four countries. The work is well documented.

Goode, Cecil E. (ed.), *The Federal Career Service—A Look Ahead*, Pamphlet No. 8 (Society for Personnel Administration, Washington, 1954). A compilation of selected speeches and papers delivered before the 1954 Annual Conference of the Society for Personnel Administration.

Hyneman, Charles S., *Bureaucracy in a Democracy* (Harper, New York, 1950). A stimulating analysis of the many difficulties in the way of conscientious administrators, including some interesting references to the personnel function. Bears more pointedly on internal executive relations and on executive-legislative relations.

International City Managers' Association, *Municipal Personnel Administration*, 5th ed. (Chicago, 1950). The most comprehensive synthesis of practices and proposals for merit system administration in cities.

Kammerer, Gladys, *Impact of War on Federal Personnel Administration, 1939–1945* (University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, 1951). A good critique of the results

of adapting the merit system to wartime pressures, pointing up contributions as well as unsolved problems.

Kingsley, J. Donald, *Representative Bureaucracy* (Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1944). An on-the-spot and modern analysis of the British civil service which challenges several of the widely held notions about the characteristics of that service.

Knapp, Betsy, *The Awkward Age in Civil Service* (National League of Women Voters, Washington, 1940). A useful and readable propaganda pamphlet for getting constructive action on civil service reform.

Leighton, Alexander, *The Governing of Men* (Princeton University, Princeton, 1945). The first winner of the Society for the Advancement of Management Human Relations Award. Following a section on problems of governing Japanese war relocation camps, Part II sets forth some findings and principles on the fundamentals of human motivation and coöperation that are unexcelled.

Lepawsky, Albert (ed.), *Administration; The Art and Science of Organization and Management* (Knopf, New York, 1952). An excellent and comprehensive collection of readings, expertly organized and tied together by insightful commentary by the author. Fine as a supplement to a general text.

Macmahon, Arthur W., and Millett, John D., *Federal Administrators* (Columbia University, New York, 1939). A historical and biographical analysis of administrative personnel in Federal departments carried to the bureau level, together with discussion of selection, training, and tenure of heads then in office.

Mayers, Lewis, *The Federal Service: A Study of the System of Personnel Administration of the United States Government* (Appleton, New York, 1922). A standard treatment of the subject in its time.

Meriam, Lewis, *Public Personnel Problems* (Brookings Institution, Washington, 1938). A broad and exceptionally well-informed treatment of the functions of the central personnel agency "from the standpoint of the operating officer." Illustrations are largely derived from Federal administration.

Millet, John D., *Management in the Public Service; The Quest for Effective Performance* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1954). A management-oriented text, dealing with the common problems of work direction, work operation, and internal services that permeate all governmental organizations.

Nigro, Felix (ed.), *Public Administration Readings and Documents* (Rinehart, New York, 1951). A good selection of supplementary readings for the general study of public administration.

O'Brien, James C., and Marenberg, Philip P., *Your Federal Civil Service* (Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1940). A useful compendium of information designed primarily for the prospective Federal employee but now out of date.

Pfiffner, John M., and Presthus, R. Vance, *Public Administration*, 3rd ed. (Ronald Press, New York, 1953). One of the outstanding texts on administration, with a fine balanced treatment of the background and dynamics of administration as well as the usual facets of the subject.

President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement, *Report*, House Doc. No. 118, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, 1941); also *Documents and Reports to Accompany Report on Civil Service Improvement*. An official analysis of practices in

the Federal service, containing recommendations for minor improvements but no major overhauling.

Reeves, Floyd W., and David, Paul T., *Personnel Administration in the Federal Government* (Washington, 1937). One of the studies prepared for the President's Committee on Administrative Management, advocating comprehensive reforms in Federal personnel administration, with special attention to the reorganization of the Civil Service Commission. Excellent argument for a single-headed commission.

Reining, Henry, Jr., *Cases of Public Personnel Administration* (W. C. Brown, Dubuque, Iowa, 1949). A brief but useful compendium of 62 illustrative problems and their solutions, from actual experience in various public jurisdictions, covering almost every phase of personnel management.

Sharp, Walter R., *The French Civil Service: Bureaucracy in Transition* (Macmillan, New York, 1931). The standard work on this subject in English and one of the outstanding contributions to the literature of the field. Valuable not only for its analysis of the French civil service system but also for the breadth of treatment of general problems.

Simon, Herbert, *Administrative Behavior* (Macmillan, New York, 1947). A new approach to the various sociological aspects of administration: structure, communication, motivation, ethics, informal organization. The "realpolitik" of administrative determinations and action.

Spero, Sterling, *Government as Employer* (Remsen Press, New York, 1948). The most comprehensive treatment available of unionism in the public service. Includes excellent historical analysis and thought-provoking treatment of the right to organize, bargaining, representation, the right to strike, and similar problems.

Torpey, William G., *Public Personnel Management* (Van Nostrand, New York, 1953). A general text summarizing practices in various personnel specialties in Federal, state, and local government. Contains illustrative personnel forms and problem questions for students.

United States Civil Service Commission, *Facts About the Federal Career Service.* Pamphlet 60 (Washington, 1955). A good summary dispelling many of the myths about Federal employment and employees. Scheduled to be brought up to date and reissued semi-annually or annually.

United States Civil Service Commission, *The Government Personnel System.* Personnel Management Series No. 4 (Washington, 1954). Designed as a "guide for Federal executives and supervisors," this book actually would serve anyone as a helpful summary of the philosophy and objectives of the personnel system in the national service.

United States Civil Service Commission, *History of the Federal Civil Service, 1789 to the Present* (Washington, 1941); and *Brief History of the United States Civil Service Commission, 1930–1950* (Washington, 1950). Valuable as source documents in any historical inquiry.

Waldo, Dwight (ed.), *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration; A Book of Readings.* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953). A good array of outstanding articles and excerpts, some old, some modern, that may be used as stimulating supplementary reading in public administration, grouped by subjects and issues.

White, Leonard D. (ed.), *The Civil Service in the Modern State* (University of

Chicago, Chicago, 1930). A collection of documents published under the aegis of the International Congress of the Administrative Sciences and containing key laws and documents dealing with the civil services of Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New South Wales, France, Belgium, Italy, Rumania, Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Sweden, Norway, and Japan. A useful source containing extensive bibliographies. Illuminating introductions have been contributed by authoritative writers.

White, Leonard D., *Government Career Service* (University of Chicago, Chicago, 1935). A general discussion of the broad problems involved in the creation of a true career civil service system.

White, Leonard D., *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, 4th ed. (Macmillan, New York, 1955). A standard work in the field, devoting considerable attention to personnel problems. Contains valuable discussions of morale, prestige, and leadership, and a penetrating analysis of the general problems of coördination and integration.

White, Leonard D., *Research in Public Personnel Administration*, rev. ed. (Social Science Research Council, Washington, 1942). A highly suggestive list and a practical one, covering topics in personnel administration that deserve the attention of those interested in the use of research procedures.

III. PROFESSIONAL PERIODICALS

A. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

The following periodicals are for the most part the official organs of organizations having to do more or less directly with private or public administration. Recognizing the place of personnel as an integral part of administration, some space is fairly regularly allotted to articles having to do with this subject. Practically all of the magazines in the list carry criticisms of new works and current bibliographies.

Advanced Management (New York, 1939–). Quarterly publication of the Society for Advancement of Management; successor to *Society for the Advancement of Management Journal* (1936–1939). Articles by experts on various related subjects in the field of management.

American City (New York, 1909–). General publication on all phases of city government, designed primarily for public officials.

American Political Science Review (Menasha, Wisconsin, 1906–). Organ of the American Political Science Association, written by and for political scientists.

The Annals (Philadelphia, 1891–). Issued bimonthly by the American Academy of Political and Social Science. A kind of symposium on current issues, each number ordinarily devoted to a series of papers on a single subject. Public personnel problems have been featured in several instances.

Journal of Public Administration (London, 1923–). Organ of the Institute of Public Administration. Contains contributions of leading administrators and specialists in the field, with considerable emphasis on personnel. A professional organ for administrators.

Local Government Service (London, 1920–). Official journal of the National Association of Local Government Officials. A live organ serving the well-organized employees of local authorities; covers municipal activities on a national scale.

Management Review (New York, 1926–). Organ of the American Management Association, an organization consisting of and appealing to those interested and engaged in private business. The publications of the American Management Association in serial form are particularly valuable to those concerned with this field. The more pertinent series are Personnel, General Management, Office Management, and Public Relations.

Monthly Labor Review (1915–). Published monthly by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Particularly valuable for comparative wage data, statistics on living costs, and summary articles on various aspects of personnel.

Municipal Journal and Public Works Engineer (London, 1899–). Although designed for engineers, contains thoughtful articles on administrative problems and movements, including personnel.

Municipal Review (London, 1930–). Published by the Association of Municipal Corporations. Reports and comments on new legislation and activities of English cities.

Municipal Year Book (1934–). Published annually by the International City Managers' Association. Includes useful statistics on municipal employment as well as a summary review of the year's developments in public personnel administration.

National Municipal Review (New York, 1912–). Progressive and stimulating organ of a reformer group; not necessarily limited to municipal developments.

Periodicals of various *Leagues of Municipalities* (leagues in individual states).

Public Administration Review (Chicago, 1940–). The journal of the American Society for Public Administration, published quarterly. Articles and notes on subjects of interest to public administrators and students.

Public Management (Chicago, 1919–). Organ of the International City Managers' Association. Contributions are from competent writers approaching administrative problems from practical viewpoints.

Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives (Brussels, 1927–). Organ of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences, publishing articles from the pens of outstanding authors from various countries on topics of a public administrative character.

State Government (Chicago, 1926–). Monthly publication of the Council of State Governments. Contains articles of general political and administrative interest.

B. PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

Good Government (New York, 1881–). Published bimonthly by the National Civil Service League. Analysis of current information and trends and critical treatment of shortcomings of merit systems as operated. Well edited.

Journal of Applied Psychology (Washington, 1917–). A bimonthly publication of the American Psychological Association. Contains original articles, usually based on research, on such subjects as morale, testing, and vocational interests, or any other subject in which the principles of psychology are studied or applied.

Occupations—The Vocational Guidance Magazine (1923–). Published monthly from October to June, inclusive, by the National Occupational Conference.

Devoted to problems of vocational guidance and placement, particularly from the standpoint of guidance officers in the schools. Includes material of value to all personnel officers, however.

Personnel (1915–). Journal of the American Management Association, published quarterly. Devoted to personnel problems and practices from the standpoint of private establishments. A useful source for current developments and the best business practices.

Personnel Administration (Washington, 1938–). Bimonthly publication of the Society for Personnel Administration. Original articles on personnel administration, stressing experiences and ideas in new developments and trends.

Personnel Administration Abstracts (Washington, 1955–). A new bimonthly publication of brief abstracts of current books and periodical articles. Also includes selected cases and exhibits.

Personnel Journal (Baltimore, 1922–). Published by a private corporation eleven times a year. Contains articles primarily by private business personnel leaders.

Personnel Psychology (Washington, 1948–). A privately published quarterly which promises a very considerable contribution to the study of the application of psychology to work situations. Most of the articles are based on original research.

Psychological Abstracts (Washington, 1927–). A monthly publication of the American Psychological Association, containing noncritical abstracts of the world's literature in psychology and related subjects. Includes sections on personnel psychology and industrial applications.

Psychometrika (Princeton, 1936–). Official journal of the Psychometric Society, published quarterly. The only publication devoted primarily to tests and measurements.

Public Personnel Review (Chicago, 1940–). The official quarterly journal of the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada. Presents significant articles and reviews of material dealing with public personnel administration.

Public Personnel Studies (1923–1931). Published by the Bureau of Public Personnel Administration. Exclusively devoted to public personnel problems.

Supervision (New York, 1939–). Published monthly by a private corporation. Primarily concerned with foremanship, safety, production, and similar problems in manufacturing plants.

IV. LEADING REFERENCES BY CHAPTERS

Chapter 1

THE EVOLUTION OF MODERN BUREAUCRACY

See pertinent chapters in works listed under "General Books," B, by the following authors: Appleby; Hyneman; Pfiffner; Waldo; White (*Civil Service in the Modern State* and *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*).

Chapter 2

AMERICAN BUREAUCRACY AND THE MERIT SYSTEM

See, under "General Books," B, the titles by the following authors: American Assembly; Commission of Inquiry (report, *Better Government Personnel*); Commis-

sions on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; Mayers; Reeves and David; United States Civil Service Commission; White.

Curtis, George William, *Orations and Addresses*, 3 vols., ed. by C. E. Norton (Harper, New York, 1894). The public papers of one of the leaders in the civil service reform movement. Volume 2 is devoted to addresses on the civil service.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, State Merit System Services, *Directory of State Merit Systems* (Washington, 1954). A useful listing of officials both in state-wide merit systems and (in other states) in merit system councils for state health and welfare agencies.

Fish, Carl R., *The Civil Service and the Patronage* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1904). Basic for the period covered.

Foulke, William D., *Fighting the Spoilsmen: Reminiscences of the Civil Service Reform Movement* (Putnam, New York, 1919). An interpretation and review of the reform movement by one of its leaders.

Joint Congressional Committee on Retrenchment, *Report*, Sen. Rep. No. 47, 41st Cong., 2nd sess. (1868). Includes data on abuses under the spoils system in this country and a discussion of civil service administration in other countries, particularly England.

Municipal Year Book (International City Managers' Association, Chicago). An excellent annual compilation of data on current municipal government, published annually. Contains much information on personnel matters.

White, Leonard D., *The Federalists* (1948); *The Jeffersonians* (1951); *The Jacksonians* (1954) (Macmillan, New York). Collectively these excellent volumes constitute the most complete administrative history of the Federal Government in existence. Unexcelled for historical insight.

Chapter 3

SCOPE AND STATUS OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

See, under "General Books," B, the titles by the following authors: American Assembly; Appleby; Commission of Inquiry (report, *Better Government Personnel*); Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch; Macmahon and Millett; Reeves and David.

Ahlberg, Clark D., and Honey, John C., *Attitudes of Scientists and Engineers About Their Government Employment* (Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse, 1950). A report of an opinion study for the Division of Psychological Sciences, Office of Naval Research.

American University, The (Charles M. Hersh, Principal Investigator), *College Seniors and Federal Employment* (The American University, Washington, 1953). A report of an opinion study for the Division of Psychological Sciences, Office of Naval Research.

Cahn, Frances T., *Federal Employees in War and Peace* (Brookings Institution, Washington, 1949). A Brookings Institution study of the attitudes of Federal employees toward the service and their careers. Also analyzes wartime personnel policies.

Janowitz, Morris, and Wright, Deil, "The Prestige of Public Employment: 1929

and 1954," *Public Administration Review*, Winter, 1956, pp. 15–22. Brings the White technique up to date by applying it to the Detroit area. Shows much higher prestige for public employment.

Stromsem, Karl E., and Dreese, Mitchell, "Attitudes of NIPA Interns Toward a Career in the Federal Service," *Public Administration Review*, Autumn, 1950, pp. 254–261. An indicator of attitudes of high-caliber young people who are oriented to the public service.

White, Leonard D., *The Prestige Value of Public Employment in Chicago: An Experimental Study* (University of Chicago, Chicago, 1929). A pioneer investigation of great value.

White, Leonard D., *Further Contributions to the Prestige Value of Public Employment* (University of Chicago, Chicago, 1932). A continuation and extension of the investigation begun in *The Prestige Value of Public Employment*. These two works by White present precise and objective data in the first studies on the subject of prestige of public service.

Chapter 4

RECRUITMENT

See, under "General Books," B, the titles by the following authors: Commission of Inquiry (*Better Government Personnel* and *Government by Merit*); Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch; Kammerer.

Civil Service Assembly, *Recruiting Applicants for the Public Service*, A Report to the Assembly by the Committee on Recruiting Applicants for the Public Service (Chicago, 1942). A standard work on the subject.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Division of State Merit Systems, *Merit System Methods*. A monthly news sheet on state personnel practices.

Chapter 5

METHODS OF EXAMINATION

See, under "General Books," A, pertinent chapters by the following authors: Maier; Mee; Pigors and Myers; Scott, Clothier, and Spriegel; Tiffin; Viteles; Yoder.

Adkins, Dorothy C., and Collaborators, *Construction and Analysis of Achievement Tests* (U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, 1947). The most complete treatment of the most prevalent kind of civil service test. A technical analysis, going into great detail.

Anastasi, Anne, *Psychological Testing* (Macmillan, New York, 1954). A comprehensive work discussing principles of testing and presenting examples of major types of tests in current use.

Bingham, Walter V., *Aptitudes and Aptitude Testing* (Harper, New York, 1937). An appraisal of the relation between interests and abilities, with descriptions of aptitude tests and cautions to be exercised in their use.

Bingham, Walter V., *Oral Examinations in Civil Service Recruitment*, Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada, Pamphlet No. 13 (Chicago: 1939). Experiences in Pennsylvania, with suggestions and criticisms susceptible of broad application.

Bingham, Walter V., and Moore, Bruce V., *How to Interview*. 3rd ed. (Harper, New

York, 1941). A pioneering work on the uses, techniques, and dependability of the various types of interview.

Brown, William, and Thomson, Godfrey H., *The Essentials of Mental Measurement*, 4th ed. (Macmillan, New York, and Cambridge University, London, 1940). A standard British work on intelligence and related aptitude testing.

Buros, Oscar Krisen (ed.), *The Fourth Mental Measurements Yearbook* (Gryphon Press, Highland Park, New Jersey, 1953). A 1163-page reference work, supplementing earlier editions, which describes 793 tests classified and indexed by subject matter, including critical reviews and bibliographical items on each. Covers all commercially available tests published in English-speaking countries. Also contains a classified list of 429 books on mental measurement and 758 excerpts from book reviews in various journals.

Cattell, Raymond B., *Description and Measurement of Personality* (World, New York, 1946). One of the first books on personality testing.

Civil Service Assembly, *Oral Tests in Public Personnel Selection*, A Report to the Assembly by the Committee on Oral Tests in Public Personnel Selection (Chicago, 1943). The most thorough analysis of the principles and problems of competitive oral testing.

Eysenck, H. J., *The Structure of Personality* (Wiley, London and New York, 1953). A useful modern treatment of the stage of development of personality analysis.

Eysenck, H. J., *Dimensions of Personality* (Routledge, London, 1947, and Macmillan, New York, 1948). A British work on personality measurement.

Fenlason, Anne F., *Essentials in Interviewing* (Harper, New York, 1952). Outlines concepts on the make-up of the individual and the way he reacts to his environment, applying these to successful interviewing. Contains examples, exercises, and case analyses.

Gehlmann, Frederick, Ferguson, L. W., and Scott, John F., *Personality Tests—Uses and Limitations*, Personnel Report No. 561 (Civil Service Assembly, Chicago, 1956).

Goheen, Howard W., and Kavruck, Samuel, *Selected References on Test Construction, Mental Test Theory, and Statistics* (U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, 1950). A useful reference tool for the practitioner.

Office of Strategic Services, *Assessment of Men: Selection of Personnel for OSS* (Rinehart, New York, 1948). A report on the unique program of practical testing conducted during World War II.

Pfiffner, John M., *Research Methods in Public Administration* (Ronald Press, New York, 1940), pp. 79–206. Good comment from the point of view of the administrator.

Stoddard, George D., *The Meaning of Intelligence* (Macmillan, New York, 1943). One of the outstanding and relatively up-to-date books on the subject.

Strong, E. K., Jr., *Vocational Interests of Men and Women* (Stanford University, Palo Alto, 1943). A standard guide on interests and aptitude measurement.

Super, Donald E., *Appraising Vocational Fitness* (Harper, New York, 1949). One of the outstanding general works on measurement.

Thorndike, E. L., *The Measurement of Intelligence* (Columbia University, New York: 1927). A pioneering standard work on the subject, but somewhat out-of-date.

Thurstone, L. L., *Primary Mental Abilities* (University of Chicago, Chicago, 1938). A revealing study of the primary factors based on the results of a battery of fifty-six tests, samples of which are included.

United States Civil Service Commission, *Civil Service Handbook*, X–105 (Washington, 1946, with later inserts). Instructions for rating unassembled examinations. The most comprehensive treatment of rating of experience and education.

Vernon, Philip E., *The Measurement of Abilities*, rev. ed. (University of London, London, 1947). A British work on aptitude testing.

Wechsler, David, *The Range of Human Capacities*, 2nd ed. (Williams & Wilkins, Baltimore, 1952). Summarizes current knowledge regarding individual differences, particularly those aspects which bear on the range and limits of human capacities.

Other good general works on testing:

Cronbach, Lee J., *Essentials of Psychological Testing* (Harper, New York, 1949).

Goodenough, Florence I., *Mental Testing* (Rinehart, New York, 1949).

Greene, Edward B., *Measurements of Human Behavior*, rev. ed. (Odyssey, New York, 1952).

Chapter 6

SELECTION: FROM OUTSIDE THE SERVICE

See, under "General Books," B, the titles by the following: American Assembly; Commission of Inquiry; Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch; President's Committee on Civil Service Improvement.

Civil Service Assembly, *The Employment of Veterans in the Public Service in the United States*, A Report to the Assembly by the Committee on Veteran Employment Policies (Chicago, 1944). A brief report of recommendations on veteran preference policy for public jurisdictions.

Civil Service Assembly, *Placement and Probation in the Public Service*, Reports to the Assembly by the Committee on Placement in the Public Service and the Committee on Probation in the Public Service (Chicago, 1946). These two reports, published in one volume, comprise a standard work on the subject. They approach the subject from a realistic point of view.

McCarthy, John P., *Veterans' Preference in Public Employment*, unpublished thesis, (University of Chicago, December, 1947). Contains the most complete synthesis of state and local rules on the subject.

Miller, John F., "Veteran Preference in the Public Service," in *Problems of the American Public Service*, Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel (New York, 1935). The best treatment of the subject as of that time.

Mosher, Fritz, "Is Veteran Preference the Answer?" *Personnel Administration*, January, 1946. The most critical article on veteran preference that has appeared.

National Civil Service League, Committee on Veteran Preference, *Report* (New York, 1945). A brief report of recommendations on the subject for merit system jurisdictions.

United States Civil Service Commission, *Annual Reports*. Contain data on effects of Federal veteran preference.

United States Civil Service Commission, *Apportionment and Residence . . . Their*

Effect on Federal Civil Service Appointments (Washington, 1947). A pamphlet giving facts and figures on the subject.

United States Civil Service Commission, *History of Veteran Preference in Federal Employment, 1865–1955* (Washington, 1955). The best summary of the facts on this subject; no evaluative discussion.

White, Leonard D., *Veterans' Preference—a Challenge and an Opportunity*, Civil Service Assembly Pamphlet No. 17 (Chicago, 1944). A thoughtful analysis of the veteran employment problem, with constructive suggestions on solution.

Chapter 7

SELECTION: FROM INSIDE THE SERVICE

See, under "General Books," B, the titles by the following authors: American Assembly; Commission of Inquiry (Wilmerding); Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch; International City Managers' Association; Macmahon and Millett; White.

Civil Service Assembly, *Placement and Probation in the Public Service*, Reports to the Assembly by the Committee on Placement in the Public Service and the Committee on Probation in the Public Service (Chicago, 1946). The report on placement contains one of the best discussions of promotion policy.

Stahl, O. Glenn, "Perspective on Promotion Policy," *Public Personnel Review*, July, 1954, pp. 115–122. A discussion of major issues on movement of personnel within the largest civil service.

United States Civil Service Commission, *Building Better Promotion Programs.* Personnel Management Series No. 2 (Washington, 1952). An excellent summary of goals for Federal practice.

Chapter 8

CAREER SYSTEM PATTERNS

See, under "General Books," B, the titles by the following authors: American Assembly; Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (1955).

Belsley, G. Lyle, *Federal Personnel Management in Transition* (Public Administration Clearing House, Chicago, 1953). An excellent survey of personnel issues to be faced and resolved upon a change in Federal Government administration.

Corson, John J., *Executives for the Federal Service* (Columbia University, New York, 1952). A challenging program for action in time of crisis.

Chapter 9

THE CLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS

See, under "General Books," the titles by the following authors:

A: Scott, Clothier, and Spriegel; Yoder.

B: Commission of Inquiry (Wilmerding); Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification; Meriam; White.

Baruch, Ismar, *The Administration of a Classification Plan Through Periodic Audits: An Example Taken from the Departmental Service of the Federal Government*, Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada (Chicago, 1936). This pam-

phlet outlines simply and clearly the basic procedures involved in a classification audit.

Baruch, Ismar, *History of Position Classification and Salary Standardization in the Federal Service, 1789–1938* (Farm Credit Administration, Washington, 1939). A rather detailed summary of statutes and executive orders on the subject, with brief discussions of their importance.

Betters, Paul V., *The Personnel Classification Board* (Brookings Institution, Washington, 1931). For historical purposes the most extensive account of the organization and operation of the board.

Civil Service Assembly, *Classification and Compensation Plans, Their Development, Adoption, and Administration,* Technical Bulletin No. 1 (Washington, 1928). A report adopted by the Assembly at its annual meeting in 1928. Particularly valuable for its standardization of terminology and procedure.

Civil Service Assembly, *Position Classification in the Public Service,* Report to the Assembly by the Committee on Position Classification in the Public Service, Ismar Baruch, Chairman (Chicago, 1941). The outstanding book on the subject. The most comprehensive and informative treatment yet produced. Will undoubtedly be a standard source for many years to come.

Civil Service Assembly, *Report of Technical Committee on Rules for the Installation and Administration of Classification and Compensation Plans* (1930). Mimeographed. A supplementary report designed to accompany Technical Bulletin No. 1 on the development and uses of classification and compensation plans.

New York State Legislature, Joint Commission on Classification of Positions in the Civil Service, *Report,* transmitted to the Legislature January 21, 1932 (Albany, 1932). Valuable report, not only for its picture of chaotic conditions in a large state service, but also for a lucid presentation of general principles and classification procedures.

Pfiffner, John M., *Research Methods in Public Administration* (Ronald Press, New York, 1940), pp. 334–366. A good summary from the point of view of general administration.

The following are representative works on job evaluation in private business:

Benge, Eugene J., Burk, Samuel L. H., and Hay, Edward N., *Manual of Job Evaluation* (Harper, New York, 1941).

Ells, Ralph W., *The Basic Abilities System of Job Evaluation,* Wisconsin Commercial Reports, Vol. III, No. 2 (University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1951). Presents a plan for job evaluation based on analysis of abilities and types of knowledge needed as job elements.

Gomberg, William, *A Labor Union Manual on Job Evaluation,* 2nd ed. (Labor Education Division, Roosevelt College, Chicago, 1948).

Life Office Management Association Clerical Study Committee, *Clerical Salary Determination* (New York, 1948).

Lytle, Charles W., *Job Evaluation Methods,* 2nd ed. (Ronald Press, New York, 1954).

Otis, Jay L., and Leukart, Richard H., *Job Evaluation, a Basis for Sound Wage Administration,* 2nd ed. (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1954).

Patton, John A., and Smith, Reynold S., *Job Evaluation* (R. D. Irwin, Chicago, 1949).

Riegel, John W., *Salary Determination* (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1940).

Riegel, John W., *Wage Determination* (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1937).

United States Employment Service, *Industrial Job Evaluation Systems, with Annotated Bibliography* (Washington, 1947). One of the best summaries of different forms of job evaluation in private business.

Chapter 10

COMPENSATION

See pertinent chapters in works listed under "General Books," B, by the following authors: Commission of Inquiry; Commission on Organization of Executive Branch (1949); Feldman; International City Managers' Association.

Except for works on problems peculiar to wartime (government wage controls, etc.), no up-to-date discussion of basic public pay policy as yet exists in book form. Some of the following items are out of date, statistically speaking, but still are valuable for the economic discussion involved:

Crowley, John C., *Institutional Employee Maintenance* (Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1947). The best modern analysis covering problems of pay deductions for quarters, food, laundry, etc., for employees in public hospitals and other institutions requiring certain employees to live on the premises.

Douglas, Paul H., *Real Wages in the United States, 1890–1926* (Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1930). A scholarly and authoritative treatment for the period.

Douglas, Paul H., *The Theory of Wages* (Macmillan, New York, 1934). A standard work on the subject.

Douglas, Paul H., *Wages and the Family* (University of Chicago, Chicago, 1925). The problem of minimum wages with family differentials.

Great Britain, *Report of the Cost-of-Living Committee of the Civil Service National Whitley Council* (London, 1920). The report which was the basis for the plan of automatically adjusting salaries in the British service to changes in the cost of living.

Municipal Year Book (International City Managers' Association, Chicago). This annual compendium contains much current data on public service pay scales.

Personnel Classification Board, *Report of Wage and Personnel Survey*, 70th Cong., 2nd sess., House Doc. No. 602 (Washington, 1929). Contains statistical data regarding conditions of employment in private enterprise and in various public jurisdictions, with recommendations of the board.

Personnel Classification Board, *Closing Report of Wage and Personnel Survey* (Washington, 1931). Summary of the findings of the board through its various surveys of public and private employment conditions. A comprehensive statement, especially valuable to those interested in classification schemes.

United States Civil Service Commission, *Pay Structure of the Federal Civil Service, June 30, 1954* (Washington, 1955). A standard reference volume.

CHAPTER 11

LEADERSHIP AND THE WILL TO WORK

See, under "Bibliographies and Guides," the following authors: De Grazia; Pfiffner. See also pertinent chapters in works by the following authors listed under "General Books":

A: Chase; Follett; Gardner and Moore; Golden and Ruttenberg; Hoslett; Jucius; Mayo; Pigors and Myers; Roethlisberger and Dickson; Tead; Yoder.

B: American Assembly; Appleby; Commission of Inquiry (Spero, White); Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch ("Additional Views," Pollock, in 1949); Dimock; Leighton; Reeves and David; Simon.

Andrews, Kenneth R. (ed.), *Human Relations and Administration: The Case Method of Teaching* (Harvard University, Cambridge, 1953). A collection of papers by those who teach and do research at the Harvard School of Business Administration.

Barnard, Chester I., *The Functions of the Executive* (Harvard University, Cambridge, 1939). This masterful treatise analyzes the nature of organization, with particular attention to its physical, biological, and social foundations. Barnard's emphasis is on the leadership functions and qualities that make for a system of coöperation in an organization based on the consent and responsibility of the organized. Probably the first book to stress the importance of recognizing informal organization (human adaptations) as well as the formal structure.

Burnham, Paul S., and Palmer, Stuart H., *Counseling in Personnel Work.* A Bibliography: 1945–1949 (Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1951). Classifies and indexes over 400 books, pamphlets, and articles, including many on employee counseling.

Cabot, Hugh, and Kahl, Joseph A., *Human Relations; Concepts and Cases in Concrete Social Science* (2 vols.) (Harvard University, Cambridge, 1953). Based on a number of years of teaching by the case method at Harvard, these excellent volumes contain useful selective readings from a wide variety of sources as well as specific cases for analysis. The organization of "cases" in Volume II parallels generally the subject headings of Volume I, which covers "Concepts."

Campbell, Clyde M., *Practical Application of Democratic Administration* (Harper, New York, 1952). An assembly of papers by twelve authors, including Campbell, on democratic administration in education—covering school, adult, and community education.

Cartwright, Dorwin, and Zander, Alvin, *Group Dynamics; Research and Theory* (Row, Peterson, Evanston, Ill., 1953). Along with introductory theory on group dynamics, summarizes research findings of 51 scholars on such problems as leadership, group effectiveness, setting of goals, communications, and relations between groups and individuals.

Chase, Stuart, *Men at Work* (Harcourt, New York, 1945). An admirable, popularly written volume, made up of articles by the author dealing with problems of an industrial civilization. Contains the best popular description of the Hawthorne studies, as well as chapters on labor-management committees, the "J" training programs, and work simplification in the Social Security Board.

Chase, Stuart, *The Proper Study of Mankind* (Harper, New York, 1948). The most brilliant popular synthesis of the progress being made by social science research in solving human-relationship problems in many situations, including the work place. Cites various landmarks and achievements of note. An inspiration and a challenge.

Chase, Stuart, *Roads to Agreement* (Harper, New York, 1951). An extremely good popular treatment of successful methods in the science of human relations, with emphasis on reducing conflicts. Of practical value to personnel administrators.

Civil Service Assembly, *Employee Relations in the Public Service*, Report to the Assembly by the Committee on Employee Relations in the Public Service, Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman (Chicago, 1942). A sound treatment of the subject, with emphasis on union-management relations.

Cleeton, Glen U., and Mason, Charles W., *Executive Ability, Its Discovery and Development* (Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1946). A standard work on testing and training for leadership.

Dickinson, Harold L., "Semantics: Its Application to Personnel Administration," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1951, pp. 8–14. An interesting application of the science of semantics.

Dooher, M. Joseph, and Marquis, Vivienne (eds.), *The Supervisor's Management Guide* (American Management Association, New York, 1949). A handy symposium covering such subjects as employee relations, leadership, communication, and conference training, by Walter Dietz, Alvin Dodd, Rensis Likert, John Pfiffner, and others. Contains Pfiffner's bibliography on human relations.

Drucker, Peter F., "The Way to Industrial Peace: II. Citizenship in the Plant," *Harper's Magazine*, December, 1946. The second of three successive articles (November, 1946, through January, 1947). Contains an outstanding exposition of the human relations foundation of industrial peace.

Dubin, Robert, *Human Relations in Administration; The Sociology of Organization, with Readings and Cases.* (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1951). A formidable compendium of essays by leading thinkers in human relations, including Barnard, Dimock, Drucker, Mayo, Roethlisberger, Simon, and many others, as well as the author. Covers problems of organization and control, as well as leadership, communication, and similar matters. Includes four papers on "Bureaucracy," three on "Human Relations in the Navy," and other individual chapters relating especially to government. Part II contains 48 cases on human relations and organization problems.

Goode, Cecil E., "Significant Research on Leadership," *Personnel*, March, 1951, pp. 342–349. Summarizes in convenient form the major conclusions from some of the more significant studies in this area.

Hall, Milton, and Mallard, William P., "Making Employer-Employee Coöperation Practicable," *Personnel*, January, 1946. A precedent-setting treatment of suggestion systems.

Lasswell, Harold D., and Lerner, Daniel (eds.), *The Policy Sciences—Recent Developments in Scope and Methods* (Stanford University, Palo Alto, 1951). This symposium of outstanding papers relates to the impact and interrelationships of the social sciences on problems of modern humankind, and the methodology and

potentiality of research in this broad area. In addition to several chapters by the editors, the book includes the writing of Likert, Mead, Kluckhohn, and others.

Likert, Rensis; Zander, Alvin; Kahn, Robert L.; and Schwab, Robert E., *Motivation: The Core of Management* (American Management Association, New York, 1953). A pamphlet of four stimulating articles on the subject.

Lippitt, Ronald, and White, Ralph K., "The Social Climate of Children's Groups," in *Child Behavior and Development*, Roger G. Barker, Jacob S. Kounin, and Herbert F. Wright, (eds.) (McGraw-Hill, New York and London, 1943). A unique experiment demonstrating the universal superiority of democratic leadership over autocratic or laissez-faire leadership.

Loken, Robert D., and Strong, Earl P., *Supervision in Business and Industry* (Funk & Wagnalls, in association with *Modern Industry Magazine*, New York, 1949). A brief survey of the modern approach to supervision, divided into sections on "Job Management" and "Man Management."

Maier, Norman R. F., *Principles of Human Relations* (Wiley, New York, 1952). A general work, amply fortified with case material. Special chapters on role-playing, training, group-decision, and democratic supervision.

Miller, Delbert C., and Form, William, *Industrial Sociology* (Harper, New York, 1951). A study of the interrelations between the worker and the social milieu in which the worker moves, including social organization, social adjustments, placement, and morale.

Parker, Willard E., and Kleemeier, Robert W., *Human Relations in Supervision* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1951). A simply written textbook primarily directed to first-line supervisors, with emphasis on modern concepts of human relations. Contains questions and problems for discussion, sample techniques, and a few case studies, and brings the human-relations approach into all facets of personnel administration.

Pfiffner, John M., "An Outline of the Supervisor's Job," *Personnel*, November, 1946. A handy outline of all facets of supervision.

Pfiffner, John M., *Supervision of Personnel—Human Relations in the Management of Men* (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1951). An excellent treatise on the approach to administration which recognizes the dignity and importance of the individual. Oriented to the public service. Especially useful as a synthesis of modern research on the subject.

Pigors, Paul, *Effective Communication in Industry* (National Association of Manufacturers, New York, 1949). A brief and one of the very best analyses of communication of meaning. Discusses order-giving, differences in people, and policy thinking, and stresses that communication is a two-way process, based on understanding.

Redfield, Charles E., *Communication in Management; a Guide to Administrative Communication* (University of Chicago, Chicago, 1953). A useful summary and evaluation of the theory and practice of communication within management and between management and employees.

Roethlisberger, F. J. (with the assistance and collaboration of George F. F. Lombard and Harriet O. Ronken), *Training for Human Relations* (Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Boston, 1954). The first interim report of a

ten-year program for advanced research and training in human relations. Based on actions and problems of trainees in seeking better understanding and changing behavior.

Sanford, Fillmore H., *Authoritarianism and Leadership: A Study of the Follower's Orientation to Authority* (Institute for Research in Human Relations, Philadelphia, 1950). A report of objective research on the make-up of leadership, concluding that leaders are made by their followers, who must like or respect the leaders in order to follow; also, that authoritarianism is far more typical of industrial leadership than the democracy or equalitarianism.

Stahl, O. Glenn, "What a Bureaucrat Thinks About Executives," *Journal of Social Issues*, December, 1945. A brief analysis of the earmarks of good and poor executives.

Stouffer, Samuel, *The American Soldier:* Vol. I, *Adjustment During Army Life;* Vol. II, *Combat and Its Aftermath* (Princeton University, Princeton, 1949). The monumental reports on attitude surveys among American soldiers in World War II. Summarized by Stouffer in "A Study of Attitudes," *Scientific American*, May, 1949.

University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, *Productivity, Supervision, and Employee Morale*, Human Relations Series 1, Report I (1948). A precedent-setting study showing the different characteristics of supervision in high-production and low-production work groups.

Viteles, Morris S., *Motivation and Morale in Industry* (Norton, New York, 1953). An able and inclusive analysis based on a broad outlook, of equal application to public management.

Williams, Roger J., *The Human Frontier* (Harcourt, New York, 1946). A relatively brief and semi-popular survey of the potential contributions of social and natural scientific research to human relations—social, industrial, and international.

Chapter 12

EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION AND REPRESENTATION

See pertinent chapters in works by the following authors listed under "General Books," B: Case; Commission of Inquiry (Spero); Reeves and David; Spero; White.

Civil Service Assembly, *Employee Relations in the Public Service*, A Report to the Assembly by the Committee on Employee Relations in the Public Service, Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman (Chicago, 1942). Although the title connotes coverage of other activities, this volume is a standard work on employee organization and representation from a progressive point of view.

Bernstein, Irving, "The Growth of American Unions," *American Economic Review*, June, 1954, pp. 303–318. A research study predicting the future of unionization on the basis of past experience. Indicates future steady growth in the long run.

Johnson, Eldon, *Unionism in the Federal Service* (University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1938). An outstanding dissertation tracing the history and significance of the organization movement in the national government.

Mire, Joseph, "Collective Bargaining in the Public Service," *Papers and Proceed-*

ings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association, 1946. A leading analysis of the subject.

Municipal Year Book (International City Managers' Association, Chicago). This annual reference work gives general statistics on unionization in city governments.

Public Administration Clearing House, *Public Administration Organizations* (Chicago, 1954). Contains a list of public employee unions as well as professional associations.

Spero, Sterling D., *The Labor Movement in a Government Industry: A Study of Employee Organization in the Postal Service* (Macmillan, New York, 1927). An excellent account of the early history of unionism in the postal service.

Tennessee Valley Authority, *The Employee Relationship Policy* (Knoxville, 1945). The basic plan for labor-management relations in TVA.

White, Leonard D., "Strikes in the Public Service," *Public Personnel Review*, January, 1949. A brilliant analysis of this very difficult philosophical subject.

Ziskind, David, *One Thousand Strikes of Government Employees* (Columbia University, New York, 1940). A socio-legal study of strikes in government employment in the United States. Brief treatment, though obviously the product of extensive research. The most comprehensive list available.

CHAPTER 13

EVALUATION AND INCENTIVES

See, under "General Books," the titles by the following authors:

A: Pigors and Myers; Scott, Clothier, and Spriegel; Viteles; Yoder.

B: Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch.

National Industrial Conference Board, *Employee Rating*, Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 39 (New York, 1942). A summary of rating methods.

Pfiffner, John M., *The Supervision of Personnel—Human Relations in the Management of Men* (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1951). Contains an excellent chapter (XIII) on incentives.

Pockrass, Jack, "Performance Evaluation—Forms or Substance," *Personnel Administration*, September, 1954, pp. 1–6. A challenge to traditional concepts of rating.

Probst, J. B., *Measuring and Rating Employee Value* (Ronald Press, New York, 1947). The most recent work on the Probst rating plan.

Randall, Raymond L., *Developing Management Potential Through Appraisal Panels* (U.S. Civil Service Commission, Personnel Management Series No. 8, Washington, 1955). A good summary of an up-to-date technique for application to executives.

Smith, R. C. and Murphy, M. J., *Job Evaluation and Employee Rating* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1946). A good treatment of the subject.

Symposium, "Standards of Performance," *Personnel Administration*, July, 1948. An outstanding group of articles by seven authors on the subject of work standards as the basis for measuring and reporting on performance.

United States Civil Service Commission, *Recognizing Employees Through Incentive*

Awards (Washington, 1954). An excellent pamphlet prepared by an interdepartmental committee of personnel experts.

CHAPTER 14

STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

See pertinent chapters in works by the following authors listed under "General Books":

A: Jucius; Pigors and Myers; Yoder.

B: American Assembly; Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (1955); Kingsley; Macmahon and Millett; White.

Beckman, R. O., *How to Train Supervisors*, 4th ed. (Harper, New York, 1952). A manual filled with concrete and detailed suggestions for training supervisors, with emphasis on discussion techniques.

Bower, Marvin (ed.), *The Development of Executive Leadership* (Harvard University, Cambridge, 1949). Covers problems faced by modern business leaders and programs of three companies in developing them.

Civil Service Assembly, *Employee Training in the Public Service*, A Report to the Assembly by the Committee on Employee Training in the Public Service, Milton Hall, Chairman (Chicago, 1941). The most comprehensive treatment of the purposes, forms, and methods of in-service training. Based on modern educational philosophy.

Corson, John J., *Executives for the Federal Service* (Columbia University, New York, 1952). Discusses focal questions and a program for action in time of crisis.

Dooher, M. Joseph and Marquis, Vivienne (eds.), *The Development of Executive Talent; A Handbook of Management Development Techniques and Case Studies* (American Management Association, New York, 1952). A good collection of papers and cases by 44 authors on development of executives in industry.

Federal Security Agency (now Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), *Staff Development—The Supervisor's Job*, Training Manual No. 6 (Washington, 1948). One of the best manuals on the inherent responsibilities of supervisors for training and developing employees. Prepared by Milton Hall.

Habbe, Stephen, *Company Programs of Executive Development*. Studies in Personnel Policy No. 107 (National Industrial Conference Board, New York, 1950). A summary of existing practices, university programs, and concise case studies of nine major companies, relating to the growth and development of executives.

Hall, Milton, *Training Your Employees: Suggestions to Executives and Supervisors*, Society for Personnel Administration, Pamphlet No. 3 (Washington, 1940). Practical and competent guidance for the line supervisor in handling employee-training problems.

Igleheart, A. S.; Spates, Thomas G.; and Van Ark, G., *The Job of General Management: A Case History of Executive Development*, American Management Association, General Management Series, No. 138 (New York, 1946). One of the first outstanding books on executive training in industry.

International City Managers' Association, *Training for Municipal Administration: Committee Report* (Chicago, 1936). A useful and suggestive analysis, with special reference to city managers.

Lambie, Morris B., *Training for the Public Service* (Public Administration Service,

Chicago, 1935). An excellent review of the early history of preëntry training.

Laski, Harold J., "The Limitations of the Expert," *Harper's Magazine*, December, 1930. One of the most brilliant articles of the modern age. Indirectly provides a sad commentary on the shortcomings of the overspecialized and narrow education.

Mace, Myles L., *The Growth and Development of Executives* (Harvard School of Business Administration, Cambridge, 1950). Based on a one-year research study in manufacturing companies, this book ably reports objective findings on requirements of executive positions, appraisal and inventory, tests, and techniques and administration of development programs. Emphasizes attention to traits suitable to particular needs, analysis of job requirements, careful appraisal of potential leadership, rotation, and coaching as characteristics of most successful executive-development programs.

Moore, Lyman S., *Public Service Training Notes* (U.S. Office of Education, Washington, 1939). A useful pamphlet containing good counsel on preparing trainers and summarizing vocational educational programs of value to public servants.

Randall, Raymond L., *Developing Management Potential Through Appraisal Panels*, Personnel Management Series No. 8. (U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, 1955). An outline of the groundwork for sound executive development.

Randall, Raymond L. (ed.), *Executive Development in Action: Patterns and Techniques*. Pamphlet No. 9. (Society for Personnel Administration, Washington, 1955). Based upon the proceedings of the first and second annual institutes for executive development, 1953–1954, attended by 150 persons. Representing nearly every Federal agency and twenty industries with significant experience in the field of executive development, "this document attempts to capture in topical outline form the main trends of thought at these sessions."

Riegel, John W., *Executive Development: Fifty American Corporations*, Report No. 5, Bureau of Industrial Relations. (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1952). An analysis and appraisal of actual experience in fifty companies.

Society for Personnel Administration, *A Proposal for a Federal Administrative Staff College* (Washington, 1953). A work group's analysis of the need for such an institution and of the manner in which such need could be met. The first organized American approach to this important idea.

Stahl, O. Glenn, "Public Service Training in Universities," *American Political Science Review*, October, 1937. A critical analysis of the most useful role that the universities can play in public service training. A point of view supported by subsequent experience of the author.

Stahl, O. Glenn, *Training Career Public Servants for the City of New York* (New York University, 1936). One of the first treatments of preëntry and postentry training in a major public service and their relation to local educational institutions and to job opportunities.

United States Civil Service Commission, *How Federal Agencies Develop Executive Talent* (Washington, 1953). Reports of activities of selected major agencies in executive training.

United States Navy, *Personnel Administration at the Executive Level* (U.S. Naval Institute, Annapolis, 1948). A plan of executive rotation, understudy, and development.

CHAPTER 15

HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE

See pertinent chapters in works by the following authors listed under "General Books," A: Moore; Pigors and Myers; Roethlisberger and Dickson; Scott, Clothier, and Spriegel; Viteles; Yoder.

Fay, Lew, and Peterson, Gordon, *Medical Examinations for Public Employees*, Civil Service Assembly Personnel Report No. 545 (Chicago, 1955). A good general discussion for the guidance of public jurisdictions.

Gafafer, William M. (ed.), *Manual of Industrial Hygiene* (Saunders, Philadelphia, 1943). Although focused primarily on war industries, this volume is the first comprehensive work on the subject. Its twenty-four chapters, by sixteen different authors (engineers, physicians, statisticians, and other experts of the U.S. Public Health Service), cover the gamut of services and problems in preventive health programs then existing in industrial situations.

Illuminating Engineering Society, *Recommended Practice of Office Lighting* (New York, 1947). A detailed manual on the subject.

Klem, Margaret C.; McKiever, Margaret F.; and Lear, Walter J., M.D., *Industrial Health and Medical Programs*, Public Health Service Publication No. 15 (Washington, 1950). The most comprehensive and authoritative modern work on the subject. Replete with statistical data on programs in post-war industry.

National Industrial Conference Board, *Company Medical and Health Programs*, Studies in Personnel Policy No. 96. (New York, 1948). A useful summary of industrial health services in 333 private firms.

United States Government, *The Influence of Lighting, Eyesight, and Environment upon Work Production*, Report of a Two Year Study Made Jointly by the Public Buildings Administration and the Public Health Service (Washington, 1947). An interesting survey of the effects of lighting on certain repetitive operations. Results were not conclusive.

CHAPTER 16

HOURS AND LEAVES

See pertinent chapters in works by the following authors listed under "General Books":

A: Mayo; Moore; Pigors and Myers; Roethlisberger and Dickson; Scott, Clothier, and Spriegel; Viteles; Yoder.

B: Commission of Inquiry (Better Government Personnel); International City Managers' Association; Mayers; Meriam.

Gafafer, William M. (ed.), *Manual of Industrial Hygiene* (Saunders, Philadelphia, 1943). Chapter 16, by Robert H. Flinn, M.D., discusses "Industrial Fatigue Causes and Control," including hours of work, rest pauses, and vacations. Chapter 23, by Hugh P. Brinton, M.D., discusses "Women in Industry," including hours of work, rest periods, leave of absence, and absenteeism. Chapter 24, by William M. Gafafer, D.Sc., is a comprehensive discussion of absenteeism, with an extensive bibliography.

Heyel, Carl (ed.), *The Foreman's Handbook*, 2nd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1949). A reference text for foremen, including discussions of industrial fatigue, rest periods, etc.

Krah, Raymond, *Administrative Control of Sick Leave*, Civil Service Assembly Personnel Report No. 544 (Chicago, 1955). General discussion of issues and practices for guidance of public agencies.

Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, Policyholders' Service Bureau, *Reducing Absenteeism Through Employee Education* (New York, 1943). Report of information secured from forty-two companies and gleaned from employee magazines in more than four hundred companies relating to media for enlisting employees' coöperation in improving attendance.

National Industrial Conference Board, *Vacation and Holiday Practices*, Studies in Personnel Policy, No. 75 (New York, 1946). Summarizes vacation and holiday practices in 469 companies in the United States and 94 in Canada.

Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Sick and Annual Leave: Report of Committee on Sick and Annual Leave in the Executive Branch*, Sen. Doc. No. 126, 80th Cong., (Washington, 1948). Report of an investigation of the cost of Federal obligations for annual and sick leave, and the use and abuse of Federal leave privileges at that time. Shows a favorable record.

United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Hours of Work and Output*, Bulletin No. 917 (Washington, 1947). Report of a factual survey covering 3505 workers in thirty-four plants in a variety of industries. The effect of wartime changes in scheduled hours on efficiency, absenteeism, and output was studied by the case method.

Vernon, H. M., *Hours of Work and Their Influence on Health and Efficiency*, British Association for Labor Legislation (British Association for Labor Legislation, London, 1943). Summarizes British experience with long wartime hours in relation to health and output.

Chapter 17

PUBLIC SERVICE ETHICS IN A DEMOCRACY

Leys, Wayne A. R., *Ethics for Policy Decisions* (Prentice-Hall, New York, 1952). A brilliant treatment of the thinking and systems of the great philosophers in relation to ethics, with modern application to cases, including some in public administration.

Lippmann, Walter, *The Public Philosophy* (Little, Brown, Boston, 1955). An excellent treatise on the nature of the "public interest" and the need to awaken to its demands.

United States Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Ethical Standards, *Ethical Standards in Government*, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., 1951. The best official report on the subject. Prepared under the chairmanship of Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois.

All of the following provide penetrating discussions on the difficult and vital problems of ethics:

American Academy of Political and Social Science, *The Annals*, "Ethical Standards and Professional Conduct," January, 1955. A symposium on professional codes of ethics in many occupations, including the public service.

Anderson, Hurst R., "Ethical Values in Administration," *Personnel Administration*, January, 1954.

Appleby, Paul H., *Morality and Administration in Democratic Government* (Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, 1952).

Clapp, Gordon R., "A Credo for the Public Servant," *Public Personnel Review*, January, 1951.

Graham, George A., *Morality in American Politics* (Random House, New York, 1952).

Chapter 18

EMPLOYEE CONDUCT IN THE COMMUNITY

See pertinent chapters in works by the following authors listed under "General Books," B: American Assembly; Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (*Task Force*, 1955).

Barth, Alan, *The Loyalty of Free Men* (Viking, New York, 1951). A powerful critique of post-war security measures as limitations on civil liberties. Chapters V and VI apply to government employees.

Bontecou, Eleanor, *The Federal Loyalty-Security Program* (Cornell University, Ithaca, 1953). An understanding but critical analysis of the first Federal program, under President Truman.

Christopherson, Richard, *Regulating Political Activities of Public Employees*, Civil Service Assembly Personnel Report No. 543 (Chicago, 1954). A survey of political activity regulations in 102 states and cities.

Dotson, Arch, "The Emerging Doctrine of Privilege in Public Employment," *Public Administration Review*, Spring, 1955. A challenge to traditional concepts of limitation on the private actions of civil servants.

Harkness, Richard and Gladys, "How About Those Security Cases," *Readers Digest*, September, 1955, and November, 1955. One of the few published defenses of government security measures as they apply to Federal workers.

Yarmolinsky, Adam (ed.), *Case Studies in Personnel Security* (Bureau of National Affairs, Washington, 1955). An objective analysis of fifty security cases in governmental, military, and industrial employment.

Chapter 19

DISCIPLINE, REMOVAL, AND APPEALS

See pertinent chapters in works by the following authors listed under "General Books," B: Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (1955).

Chapter 20

TENURE AND TURNOVER

See, under "General Books," the titles by the following authors:
A: Maier; Mayo; Tiffin; Yoder.

Mayo, Elton, and Lombard, George F. F., *Teamwork and Labor Turnover in the Aircraft Industry of Southern California*, Harvard University, Business Research Studies, No. 32 (Boston, 1944). A good example of intensive turnover analysis in industry.

Stahl, O. Glenn, "Security of Tenure: Career or Sinecure," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March, 1954, pp. 45–56. An up-to-date perspective on the significance of tenure policies in the public service.

United States Civil Service Commission, *Federal Employment Statistics Bulletin* (published monthly). A thorough report on the location and turnover of Federal manpower.

United States Department of Labor, *The A-B-C of Absenteeism and Labor Turnover*, Special Bulletin No. 17 (Washington, 1944). A leading summary of principles and problems.

United States Department of Labor, *Wartime Employment, Production, and Conditions of Work in Shipyards*, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 824 (Washington, 1945), published as House Doc. No. 149, 79th Cong., 1st Sess. Contains data on comparative condition of private and public shipyards.

Woytinsky, W. S., *Three Aspects of Labor Dynamics* (Social Science Research Council, Washington, 1942). A standard work which deals intensively with problems of turnover.

Chapter 21

RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY

Brannon, Thurza J., *Outline of Federal Retirement Systems* (U.S. Social Security Administration, Washington, 1948). Summary of information on the provisions of twenty-two Federal retirement, disability, and survivor systems in effect December 31, 1947, based on the Federal code and on statutes, rules, and regulations of various retirement systems.

Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, *Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel*, Sen. Doc. No. 89, 83d Cong., 2nd Sess., 1954. Recommendations for a thorough overhauling of Federal retirement systems, including coordination with national old-age and survivors insurance.

Division of State Merit Systems, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Problems of Mandatory and Variable Retirement Ages in State Employment* (Washington, 1954). An interesting discussion of a growing problem.

Municipal Year Book (International City Managers' Association, Chicago). This annual publication contains statistical data on city retirement systems.

McCamman, Dorothy F., *The Scope and Protection of Local Government Retirement Systems*, Bureau of Research and Statistics, U.S. Social Security Board (Washington, 1944). A summary and evaluation of approximately 1700 retirement systems of state and local governments. Includes extensive statistics on coverage, benefits, numbers of beneficiaries, and employee and government contributions.

Municipal Finance Officers Association, *Retirement Plans for Public Employees* (Chicago, 1946). An explanation by the Committee on Public Employee Retirement Administration of principles governing the formulation of retirement plans for public employees, and methods of establishing such plans. Good brief summary.

Chapter 22

STAFF REDUCTIONS

See pertinent chapters in works by the following authors listed under "General Books," B: Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch.

Department of Labor, *Extension of Coverage Under State Unemployment Insurance Laws: Employees of State and Local Governments* (Washington, 1954). Gives pertinent statistics on the situation in public jurisdictions.

CHAPTER 23

THE CENTRAL PERSONNEL AGENCY

See, under "General Books," B, the titles by the following authors: Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch; Reeves and David; White.

Civil Service Assembly, *Public Relations of Public Personnel Agencies*, A Report to the Assembly by the Committee on Public Relations of Public Personnel Agencies, William E. Mosher, Chairman (Chicago, 1941). A general work on the subject. Provides an excellent analysis and stimulating treatment of experiences contributed from a broad field.

Municipal Year Book (International City Managers' Association, Chicago). Each year's issue contains data on the form of personnel organization in city governments.

Ruhl, Eleanor S., *Public Relations for Government Employees: An Action Program*, Civil Service Assembly Personnel Report No. 524 (Chicago, 1952). The outstanding publication on the subject. A model for all public jurisdictions.

United States Civil Service Commission, *The Role of the Civil Service Commission in Federal Employment*, Pamphlet 52 (Washington, 1955). A good outline of the place of the central personnel agency in the Federal scene.

Woolpert, Elton D., *Municipal Public Relations* (International City Managers' Association, Chicago, 1940). Defines the scope and suggests a constructive program of public relations.

CHAPTER 24

THE OPERATING PERSONNEL OFFICE

See pertinent chapters in works by the following authors listed under "General Books":

A: Pigors and Myers; Scott, Clothier, and Spriegel; Yoder.

B: Commissions on Organization of the Executive Branch; Meriam; Reeves and David.

Avery, Robert S., *Experiment in Management: Personnel Decentralization in the Tennessee Valley Authority* (University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1954). A case study on a managerial problem in personnel administration.

Federal Security Agency (now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), *A Personnel Program*, Training Manual No. 3 (Washington, 1944). An outline of personnel aims and processes in an operating department. Treats each item under "What to Do" and "How to Do It."

United States Civil Service Commission, *Evaluating Your Personnel Management*, Personnel Management Series No. 6. (Washington, 1954). Designed as a guide for Federal agencies in appraisal of personnel policies and operations. A comprehensive handbook on the "what" and "how" of evaluation.

United States Congress, *Organization, Functions, and Relative Costs of Personnel Offices*, House Rep. No. 2198, 80th Cong., 2nd Sess. (Washington, June 4, 1948).

A painstaking analysis of the subject but one that loses sight of the nature and purpose of personnel administration because of its preoccupation (perhaps "obsession" is more appropriate) with the notion that the number and function of personnel specialists are something to be limited and controlled rather than something to grow out of the peculiar needs of an agency.

See also numerous articles in *Personnel Administration*, *Public Personnel Review*, and *Public Administration Review*, since about 1944.

CHAPTER 25

INTERNATIONAL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

See articles especially in *Public Personnel Review*, *Public Administration Review*, *Personnel Administration*, and *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives*, since 1945.

Indexes

INDEX OF NAMES

Anderson, Hurst R., 420
Appleby, Paul, 9–10, 48, 54, 545

Belsley, G. Lyle, 179
Beveridge, Sir William, 10, 365–366
Brissenden, Paul F., 469, 471
Brownlow, Louis, 25
Bryce, Lord, 52

Chase, Stuart, 252, 581
Clapp, Gordon R., 418, 420
Corson, John J., 179
Curtis, George William, 22–23

Dickson, William J., 260, 264, 273
Douglas, Paul H., 416, 424
Drucker, Peter F., 254

Eaton, Dorman B., 23
Emmerich, Herbert, 416

Filene, Edward A., 272
Foulke, William Dudley, 513
French, J. R. P., Jr., 249

Garfield, James A., 23
Goode, Cecil E., 258
Graham, George A., 417

Hayes, Rutherford B., 23
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 445

Jackson, Andrew, 17
Johnson, Andrew, 20
Johnson, Eldon, 289, 342
Jump, W. A., 144

Kingsley, J. Donald, 6, 343

La Follette, Robert M., 298
Laski, Harold J., 419
Lehman, Herbert H., 569

Leighton, Alexander, 246
Levitan, David M., 424

Madison, James A., 20
Mayers, Lewis, 153
Mencken, H. L., 247
Meriam, Lewis, 29
Mosher, Frederick C., 132
Myers, Charles A., 253

Pfiffner, John M., 248, 380
Pigors, Paul, 253
Pollock, James K., 255, 527

Roethlisberger, F. J., 260, 264, 273
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 25–26, 289, 299, 440
Roosevelt, Theodore, 298, 515

Sharp, Walter R., 63–64, 471
Short, Oliver C., 184
Spero, Sterling, 276, 289, 304, 305, 309, 310
Stein, Harold, 422

Taft, William Howard, 298
Telford, Fred, 192
Thorndike, E. L., 101
Thurstone, L. L., 101–102
Truman, Harry S., 430

Upson, Lent D., 215

Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, 299
Wells, H. G., 3
White, Leonard D., 5, 8, 42–43, 133, 309, 310–311
Wilson, Woodrow, 11
Worthy, James C., 248, 254

Young, Philip, 46

Ziskind, David, 308

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Absenteeism, factors, 409–411
  losses from sickness, 393–394
Accident prevention and safety programs, 386–389
    See also Working conditions
Accidents, cost per year, 387
  treatment of injuries, 393
Administrative system, development, 3–7
  integration, 33
Administrative work, training for, 340–341, 343–344
Age limits for employment, 68
Allport A-S Reaction Study, 104
American educational system, 64–65
American Federation of Government Employees, 280, 307
American Federation of Labor, 279, 280, 283
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 281, 284, 287
American Federation of Teachers, 283
Anonymity of public servants, 10–11
Appeals, disciplinary action, 459–460
  loyalty, 431, 432
  service ratings, 332
  teachers, 466–467
  tests, 115–116
  veterans, 465
Application blanks, 77–79
Applications, 75–81
  issuance and receipt, 79
  preëxamination audit, 80–81
  purposes, 76–77
  right of appeal, 81
  verification of statements, 79–80
Appointments, apportionment, 137–138
  emergency, 139
  provisional, 138
  temporary, 138–139
Aptitude tests, 98–101
Arbitration of grievances, 305–306
Army Alpha test, 84
Atmospheric conditions, major factors, 382–383

Attendance, 409–411
  standardization of requirements, 403

Bernreuter Personality Inventory, tests, 104
Beyle-Kingsley Evaluation Scale, 327
Boredom, 394
British civil service, permanent undersecretaries, 50
British handbook for civil servants, 423
Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, 33
Bureau heads (Federal), character, 50
Bureau of Labor Statistics, consumer price index, 240
  cost of living index, 238
  wage survey, 217
Bureaucracy, 3–39
  American development, 12–39
  compared with private administration, 8–11
  modern characteristics, 7–11

California State Personnel Board rating plan, 328
Career development, 580
Career services, administrative planning, 175–176
  classifications, 171–174
  closed careers and open careers, 173–174
  coördination, 176–178
  internal selection, 152–159
  job-oriented careers, 174
  patterns, 169–182
  position and rank concepts, 174–179
  program and organization careers, 171–173
  promotion, 148
Central personnel agencies, 511–540
  amateur character, 515
  bipartisan character, 513–514
  commission form, 512–513
  Federal personnel system, 517–520
  functions, 524–526
  in cities and counties, 522–524
  legislative interference, 516–517
  organization, 526–528

Central personnel agencies—(*Continued*)
patronage, 516
public relations, 528–539
state personnel agencies, 520–522
Centralization, characteristics, 34
coöperation, states and municipalities, 35
progress in the personnel field, 34
trend toward, 34–35
Certification and selection, 133–139
apportionment, 137–138
description, 134–135
in various jurisdictions, 138
selective, 136
step in placement, 133–134
U.S. Civil Service Commission, 135–138
Charity concept, effect on merit system, 54–56
effect on public pay schedules, 218
Cities, merit system, 31
training for efficiency, 357–361
Citizenship as a limitation on recruitment, 66–67
City manager movement, 32, 170
Civil servants, anonymity, 10
civil and political status, 440–449
freedom of personal opinions, 441–444
impartiality, 10
personal standing, 440–441
political activities, 442–449
right of suffrage, 441–442
specific restrictions on political activities, 445–449
Civil service, American, beginnings of reform, 19–22
five broad periods, 14
period of relative efficiency, 14–17
period of unmitigated spoils, 17–19
role, 51–52
Civil Service Commission, establishment, 19
functions, 26–27
jurisdiction, 26
staff reduction, 504–505
See also Central personnel agencies; Operating personnel office
Civil service laws, in states, 27–31
jurisdiction, 60–62
Pendleton Act of 1883, 23
Ramspect Act of 1940, 24, 25–26, 188
Civil service reform, Federal service, 22–27
state service, 27–30
Class, definition, 196
specification, 198–200
Classification, 183–207
allocation factors, 197, 204
American and British systems compared, 189–190
Classification—(*Continued*)
appeals, 201
basic principles and uses, 189–191
central personnel agency, 188
continuous administration, 202–205
definition, 183
duties, 184–185
efficiency and economy movement, 186–187
initial allocation of positions, 195–198
job description and analysis, 193–195
job evaluation, 195–198
job standardization, 205
keeping up to date, 204
merit system, 186
movement, origin and development, 185–189
occupational analyses and job description, 192–195
periodic audits, 203
Personnel Classification Board, 188
placement, 183–185
plan, development and installation, 191–202
principal uses and advantages, 189–191
questionnaire, 193–195
recruitment, 189–190
Classification Act of 1949, 188, 296
Classified service, defined, 60–61
political activities prohibited, 445–449
removal procedure, 458–459, 464–465
Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, *see* Hoover Commission
Committee for Industrial Organization, 281, 284
Compensation, average salaries of Federal employees, 210
concept, international agencies, 569–571
cost-of-living analysis, 217
factors in determining general level, 212–214
family allowance system, U.S. and abroad, 216–217
Federal compared with industry, 211–212
general level in public service, 209–212
maintenance allowance, 229–230
market rate, 213–215
minimum living wage, 216–218
morale, 209
Personnel Classification Board, 217, 222, 230
plan, authority responsible for, 220–221
policy and levels, basic, 208–209
rates, determining, 224–226
salary ranges, 227–229
salary standardization, 221–227

Compensation—(*Continued*)
scale, installation and administration, 233–241
standard of living, 216–217
Compensation scale, 233–241
adjustments in plan, 236–241
effect on present incumbents, 234
municipal plans, 238–239
use of minimum, maximum, and graded rates, 234–236
Competition, noncompetitive and exempt group, 61–62
positions subject to, 25
Contact training in public relations, 537–539
Coöperation, Federal Government with local governments, 172
Cost of living, compensation policy, 217
plan, study, 217
Counties, merit systems in, 30–31
County and city commissions, 522–524

Democratic management, 250–255
Democracy, perversion by spoils system, 18
Department heads, shifting body of, 49–51
Discipline, 451–460
agency responsible, 455–459
appeals, 459–460
executive responsibility, 455–459
forms of action, 451–454
French system, 457
notice and hearing, 458
various jurisdictions in 1948, 453
Duties classification, 184–185

Economy and efficiency movement, 31–34, 186–187
Educational system and demands of public service, 63–66
Efficiency rating report, 140
Eligible list, 119–122, 133–139
Emergency appointments, 139
Employee representation, 302–303
Employee welfare, *see* Welfare
Employment lists, 119–122
Federal experiments, 120
publicity, 122
shrinkage, 121
time lapse, 120–122
Environment, safety, health, and welfare, 381–401
See also Welfare; Working conditions
Evaluation of employees, 323–333
comparison scale, 325
Federal rating plans, 328–331
graphic rating scale, 325–327
group approach, 330–331
periodic tests, 324
Evaluation of employees—(*Continued*)
production records, 323–324
psychophysical scales, 327–328
rating schedules and other devices, 324–331
Evaluation plan, administration, 331–333
Examinations, announcements, 70–71
formal tests in 1947–1948, 113
free-answer, 90
initial step in limiting patronage, 19–20
intangible factors, 133–134
methods, 83–118
objectives, 85–86
physical, 392
positions exempt from, 61–62
promotional tests, 157–158
provisional appointments, 138
public notice, 70–71
rating of experience and training factors, 88–89
true-false, 90
use of specialists, 114
written, 89–91
See also Tests
Examining process, steps, 86–88
Executive, lack of experience in personnel field, 47–48
neglect of personnel, 47–48
Executive development, 367–374
Exit interview, 476–477
Experience, rating in examinations, 88–89

Fatigue, overtime work, 404
relation to seating, 385
rest periods, 394, 405
Federal Civil Service Commission, *see* Civil Service Commission
Federal Employee Health Division, 391
Federal Employees Health Act of 1946, 391
Federal personnel system, 517–520
Fingerprinting, 117
Fire prevention, 388, 389
Firemen, training, 355–356, 359
Four Years Law of 1820, 15
Fringe Benefits Act of 1954, 189

George-Deen Act, 337
Government employment, charity concept, 54–56, 218
Government and Civic Employees' Organization Committee, 284
Government Services, Inc., 397
Government Workers Union, 281
Grants-in-aid, 448

Hatch Act of 1939, 21, 430, 438, 445, 448
Hatch Act of 1940, 448

Health and welfare, activities, 389–400
as personnel function, 396
diagnosis and treatment of minor illnesses, 393–394
fatigue and boredom, 394
insurance, 397–399
physical examinations, 392
supervision of sanitation, 395
treatment of injuries, 393
working conditions, 381–386, 395
Health education, 394
See also Environment
Hoover Commission, 33, 37–38, 46, 146, 148, 179, 180, 211, 296, 319, 329, 338, 373, 417, 455, 505, 506–507, 514, 527
Hours of work, *see* working hours
Human relations, 247–255, 579
Humidity, *see* Ventilation

Illness, minor, diagnosis and treatment, 393–394
Illumination, *see* Lighting
Incentives and awards, 314–317
International Association of Fire Fighters, 284, 285, 307
International personnel activities, 569
International Personnel Administration, 561–574
International organizations, basic differences, 563–565
career civil service, 572–573
confusion over position and pay, 569–571
problem of loyalty, 567–569
scope, 561–563
staffing, 565–567
training, 571–572
Interviewers, training, 94
Investigations, *see* Personal investigations

J courses, 338
Jacksonian theory of officeholding, 49
Job analysis, 193–195
Job grading, 224–226
Job standardization, 205, 221–227
Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Salaries, wage survey, 217
Jurisdictional classification, distribution of positions, 40
means of weakening the merit system, 61

Knights of Labor, 278

Laws, *see* Civil service laws
Leadership, 245–274
League of Nations loyalty requirements, 568
Legislative interference, 516–517
Legislative functions, commission, 525
personnel agency, 525
Lighting, 383–384
Living wage, objections, 218–219
various definitions, 216–218
See also Compensation
Lloyd–La Follette Act of 1912, 298, 442, 458, 464
Loyalty and security program, 428–440
British approach, 433–434
current program, 431–433
evaluation, 434–440
Loyalty Review Board, 431
previous programs, 430–431
problems, 428–430

Medical department, function in industry, 390
Medical examinations, periodic, 392
Merit system, appointments, 119–142
charity concept, 54–56, 218
congressional antipathy, 24
counties, 522–524
emphasis on academic training, 341
formal tests, 83–117
future development, 577–578
legislative interference, 516–517
promotion, 146–152
provisional appointments, 138
Ramspect Act of 1940, 24, 25–26, 188
recruitment, 59–82
selection, 119–142
Morale, adjustment of grievances, 269–272
attitude surveys, 267–269
basic emotional needs, 248–250
compensation and, 209
conclusion on employee coöperation, 267
controlled experiments, 252
democratic management, 250–255
effect of attitudes, 251–252
employee counseling, 263–265
employee representation, 273
factors, 246
formal suggestion systems, 260–263
group activities, 265–266
importance of recognition, 247
incentives, 246
informal staff participation, 260
leadership, 255–258, 273–274
mental health, 265–267
significance, 245–247
supervisor employee relations, 255–258
Western Electric Company test, 251–252
Western Electric interview plan, 263
Whitley Councils, 288, 291, 293–294
See also Human relations

National Alliance of Postal Employees, 280
National Association of Letter Carriers, 278
National Association of Postal Supervisors, 280
National Association of Postmasters, 280
National Association of Post Office Clerks, 279
National Association of Railway Postal Clerks, 279
National Civil Service League, 53, 306, 514, 527
National Civil Service Reform League, 23
National Council of Supervisory Officials of the Railway Mail Service, 280
National Customs Service Association, 281
National Federation of Federal Employees, 280, 307
National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 279, 286, 307
National Federation of Rural Letter Carriers, 279
National Industrial Recovery Act, 291
National Labor Relations Board, 291
National League of District Postmasters, 280
National Postal Transport Association, 279
National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 279
National Teachers Association, 277
New York Civil Service Reform Association, 25
New York Police Academy, 358
Noise in working conditions, 385–386
Norms, establishment, 109–110

Operating personnel office, 541–560
  generalized vs. specialist approach, 552–553
  methods of operation, 548–551
  organization and relationships, 551–555
  place of personnel function, 542–545
  problem of chief executive, 544
  records, 555–556
  reports, 556–557
  scope of personnel function, 545–548
  size of staffs, 554
  typical duties, 546–548
Opinion survey, 529–531
Oral tests, 92–97
  cautions in use of, 97
  conduct of, 94
  factors, determination, 92–93
  group, 95–96
  individual, 92–95
  program, 92
  rating procedure, 96–97
  records for review, 97
Oral tests—(*Continued*)
  selection of material, 93
  training of interviewer, 94
Overtime pay, 233

Patronage, 12–14, 17–19, 29–30
  defined, 12
  reluctance of states to abolish, 29–30
Pendleton Act of 1883, 23, 512
Performance tests, 91
Personal investigations, 116–117
  appeals on rating, 117
  methods, 117
Personnel, classification, 183–207
  functions, special fields, 548
  neglect by executive, 47–48
  objectives of proposed new department, 542
  operating office, 541–560
  organization of central agency, 526, 528
  problem of chief executive, 544
  records, 555–556
  reports, 556–557
  research in, 557–560, 581
Personnel administration, changes in emphasis, 37
  flexibility, 578
  new policies and methods, 37–38
  professionalization, 579
  progress, 35–36
  sound policy, 578
Personnel boards in various states, 520–522
Personnel Classification Board, 26, 188, 217, 222, 230
Personnel management, England and continental countries, 511
  role, 578–579
Photography in public relations, 535–536
Physical examinations, 392
Placement, apportionment, 137–138
  certification and selection, 133–139
  formal tests, 83–117
  induction, 351–352
  probation, 139–141
  provisional appointments, 138
  See also Certification and selection
Police training, 355, 357–359
Political assessments on officeholders limited by laws, 21–22
Political influence in civil service, 52–54
Position classification, 183–207
Position concept, 174–179
Positions, arranging into classes, 205
Postal Service, 189
Preëntry training, 339–347
President, removal power contested, 20
Presidential class of Federal officers, 16

Prestige of public service, 580
Probation, 139–141
  efficiency rating report, 140
Probst service rating system, 326–327
Programs to foster good human relations, 255–272
  attitude survey, 267–269
  communication, 258–259
  employee counseling, 263–265
  grievances, 269–272
  mental health, 265–267
  selection of supervisors, 255–258
  suggestion systems, 260–263
Promotion, area of recruitment, 148–152
  bases, 154–159
  comparative performance, 154–156
  examination, 157–158
  methods of selection, 152–161
  opportunity, 146–148
  publicity, 159–161
  seniority, 156–157
  trial on the job, 158–159
Provisional appointments, *see* Appointments
Psychiatric examination, 158
Public administration, behavior problems, 421–423
  external relationships, 418–419
  internal relationships, 419–421
Public employment, attitudes of Federal employees, 44–46
  charity concept, 54–56
  jurisdictional distribution, 40
  neglect of personnel by executive, 47–48
  political influence, 52–54
  positions included, 41
  preference for private employment, 44
  prestige, 42–47
  role of Civil Service Commission, 51–52
Public Law 733, 431
Public relations, 528–539
  analysis, 528–532
  contact training in personnel agencies, 537–539
  information base, 532
  media, 533–537
  official publications, 533–534
  photography, 535–536
  public speeches, 536
  radio and television broadcasting, 535
Public service ethics, 415–426
  in community ethics, 416–418
Public speaking, training, 536
Publicity, employment lists, 122
  promotions, 159–160

Questionnaire, 193–195

Radio and television broadcasting, 535
Railway Mail Association, 279, 280
Ramspect Act of 1940, 24, 25–26, 188
Rating experience and training factors, 88–89
Reassignment, 161–163
Records, for promotion, 155
  of oral tests, 97
Recruitment, 59–82
  age barriers, 68–69
  citizenship requirements, 66–67
  classified service, 60–61
  effect of educational system, 63–66
  field, 62–63
  methods, 70–81
  positions subject to merit system, 60–62
  residence requirements, 67–68
  sex barriers, 69–70
  veteran preference, 69
References of applicant, 78
Register of eligible candidates, 120–122
Reliability of tests, 109
Removal, 453–466
  Federal service, 458–459, 464–465
  notice required, 458, 465
  power of the President, 20
  significance, 454–455
  state service, 465–466
Reporting system, 317–323
  establishment of norm, 323
  factors used, 321–322
  objectives, 317–318
  personal factor, 319–320
  technique, 321–323
  validity and acceptability, 318–319
Requisition form, 134
Residence restrictions, 67–68
Retirement systems, 480–501
  administration, 497–498
  contributory vs. noncontributory, 489–490
  death benefit, 494–495
  disability benefit, 494
  Federal government, 482–483
  foreign countries, 482
  fund provisions, 487–489
  ineligible employees, 498–499
  legislation, 482–485
  purpose, 485–487
  retirement benefits, 495–496
  scope of provisions, 496–497
  states, 484
  superannuation, 491–494
  types, 487–490
Richardson-Kuder Scale, 327
Rights and duties of public servants, campaign activity, 447–448
  campaign contributions, 447
  civil rights, 449

Rights and duties of public servants—(*Continued*)
grants-in-aid, 448
Hatch Acts, 430, 438, 448
political, 440–449
political candidature, 448–449
specific restrictions, 445–449
Rotation theory, 17

Salary differentials, 230–233
geographic, 231
special, 231–233
Sanitation, supervision, 395
working conditions, 386
Scoring of tests, 111–113
Seating, 385
Selection, application procedure, 75–81
basic elements in a positive program, 60
character and habits, 116–117
duties statements, 134
eligible list, 134–139
essentials of sound policy, 145–146
formal tests, 113–116
from inside the service, 143–165
from outside the service, 119–142
limitations on area, 67–68
oral tests, 92–97
personal investigations, 116–117
practical test, 106
probation, 139–141
qualifications, 78
rating experience and training factors, 88–89
recruitment policy, 152–154
references, 78
request for certification, 134
tests, 84–86
veteran preference, 69
Selective certification, 136
Senior civil service, 179–181
Seniority, in promotion, 156–157
veteran preference, 122–133
Sex barriers in recruitment, 69–70
Sick leave, 408–409
Social Security Act, hygiene units, 395
retirement systems, 481
Social Security Administration, basic training, 355
Spoils system, assessments, 21–22
in colonial America, 14–16
in the period 1829–1865, 17–19
Jacksonian democracy, 18
origin and development, 14–17
results, 18–19
Staff reductions, 502–508
Federal experience, 503–505
Staff reductions—(*Continued*)
reëmployment, 505–507
unemployment insurance, 507–508
Standardization of tests, 107–108, 109–111
State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, 284
State merit systems, 27–30
State model civil service law, 522
State personnel agencies, 520–522
Strong's Vocational Interest Blank, tests, 104
Subversion, 428–429
Suggestion systems, 260–263, 315–317
Supervisors, selection, 255–258
training, 361–363

Taft Efficiency and Economy Commission, 482–483
Tenure, Federal service, 464–465
nature, 464–467
security, 463–464
state service, 465–466
teacher, 466–467
Tests, 83–117
achievement, 104–107
administration, 113–116
Allport A-S Reaction Study, 104
appeals, 115–116
Army Alpha and Beta, 84
assembled and unassembled, 114–115
Bernreuter Personality Inventory, 104
classification of, 89–108
clerical, 105–106
competitive and noncompetitive, 115
completion, 90
construction, fundamental principles, 108–113
demonstration, in various jurisdictions, 106–107
emotional and personality, 103–104
essay, 90
establishment of norms, 109–110
evaluation of results, 111–113
general intelligence, 98–100
health and physical, 107
in promotions, 157–158
mechanical aptitude, 101
Multiple Abilities Battery, 103
multiple-choice, 90
oral, 92–97
percentiles, 111–112
performance, 91
practical, 106
principles, 108–113
reliability, 109
scaling of items, 110
scoring, 111–113
short-answer, 90

Tests—(*Continued*)
special aptitudes, 101–103
standardization, 107–108, 109–111
statistics, Federal service (1947–1948), 113
Strong's Vocational Interest Blank, 104
theories, 83
trade, 105
true-false, 90
use of specialists, 114
validity, 108–109
weighting, 112–113
written, 89–91
See also Examinations
Training, apprenticeship and internship, 352–354
Bureau of Standards, 353, 363–364
correspondence courses, 375
Department of Agriculture, 363–364
diagnosing needs, 349–350
employee, facts overlooked, 336–337
evaluation, 376–378
firemen, 355–356, 359
for improving efficiency, Federal service, 357, 363–365
for improving efficiency, states and municipalities, 357–361
for managerial competence, 367–374
for promotion, 364–365
for public service, 344–347
forms and methods, 374–376
function of administration, 335–336
group, 374
improvement in performance, 356–361
in Great Britain, 341, 343, 345, 365–366
in-service, 347–380
induction and orientation, 351–356
management and, 347–348
merit system, 341
objects, 370–373
of interviewers, 94
on-the-job, 374–375
police, 355, 357–359
policy, development, 348–349
preëntry, 339–347
progress in, 337–339
recent trend, 339–340
Social Security Administration, 355
states, 355–356
supervisory level, 361–363
Transfer, 161–163
Turnover, 467–479
control, 476–479
cost, 475–476
death, 468
discharge, 468
Federal service, 471–474
figures, 470–471
Turnover—(*Continued*)
incidence, 471–475
measures, 469–470
resignation, 468
retirement, 468
significance, 467–469
state and municipal services, 474–475

Unionism, accomplishments, 296–297
affiliation, 300–302
arbitration, 305–306
Classification Act of 1923, 296
collective bargaining and agreements, 289, 303–305
contributions, 296–297
disadvantages of civil service unions, 290
employee representation, 290–296
Federal, range of activities, 287–288
Federal service, 278–283
in civil service, 277–285, 580
Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912, 298
objectives and activities, 286–290
political power, 290
President Taft's order, 298
problems involved, 297–312
propagandist activities, 288
recognition of representative agent, 302–303
Reorganization Act of 1939, 297
right to organize, 298–300
right to strike, 306–312
state and local labor organizations, 283–285
state sovereignty and, 298
strike clauses in union constitutions, 307
syndicalist doctrine, 287
T. V. A. plan, 282–283, 294–295
Theodore Roosevelt and gag orders, 298
Welch Act of 1928, 298
Unions, in-service training, 288
United Federal Workers of America, 281
United National Association of Post Office Clerks, 279
United Nations, loyalty requirements, 567–568
United Public Workers of America, 281, 307
University of Kansas, training for city managers, 354

Validity of tests, 108–109
Ventilation, 382–383
Veteran preference, 122–133
Act of 1919, 124
Act of 1944, 125
certification and selection, 133–139
in Canada, 129
in Federal service, 123–127

Veteran preference—(*Continued*)
in state service, 127–129
reforms suggested, 132–133
reward philosophy, 130–133
views on, 129–133
Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, 125, 341

Wage data, collection and assembly, 222–224
conclusions from, 211–212
Wage determination, economic consideration, 212–214
factors other than economic, 219–220
Wage policy, principle of the living wage, 216–219
source and ethical considerations, 215–219
Welfare, activities, 396–400
credit unions, 399–400
function, 396
group health insurance, 397–399
programs in Federal organizations, 396–397
See also Environment; Working conditions
Welfare and Recreational Association of Public Buildings and Grounds, 397
Whitley Councils, 288, 291, 293–294
Work environment, 381–401
Working conditions, accident prevention and safety programs, 386–389
adequate lighting, 383–384
health activities, 389–395
in buildings, 382–386
medical care, 390–391
noise, 385–386
responsibility of personnel agency, 381–382
safety program, 388–389
sanitary facilities, 386
seating, 385
ventilation, temperature, and humidity, 382–383
welfare activities, 396–400
Working hours, 402–409
basic work week, 403
overtime, 404
rest periods, 405
sick leave, 408–409