

membership rules, the circumstances under which they form, the conditions which will determine the kinds of goals that groups will strive toward. This is why some organizations have a total quantity of control greater than others. They manufacture social control by the forming of cohesive groups. They manufacture a power of a kind that can be used for the management of the organization or, for that matter, can be used for the destruction of the organization.

Groups tend to develop a unity of purpose; sooner or later the members will come to agree rather well on what goals they have in common as a group. Now, the interesting question for an organization manager, when groups form in his organization, is not just that they are going to develop a unity of purpose, but, who's purpose? His, or theirs? The manager soon becomes interested, if he puts his mind to this, in the question of how he can create circumstances that will encourage groups to choose goals that are compatible with and supportive of the organization's purposes, rather than choosing group goals that are irrelevant or incompatible. He cannot tell these groups what goals to hold. He has no direct means to do that. But the manager can create circumstances that will increase the probability that groups in his organization will be choosing goals that are supportive to the organization's aims.

Let me make a diversion to illustrate the point. One of the studies I was involved in a few years ago had to do with group cohesiveness in a factory, on the one hand, and productivity, on the other. We were interested in the fact that in a series of studies nobody saw any consistent relationship between work-group cohesiveness and productivity, when the theory indicated there ought to be a relationship.

Well, it turned out in this study, that involved some 8,000 production workers in a machinery factory, that the more cohesive the work group was the more the members produced at the rate that was the norm for this group, and that the cohesive work groups tended to migrate toward either extremely high standards of production or extremely low standards of production. It was as though the cohesive groups elected, with respect to production, either to adopt management's goals or to oppose management's goals. What determined which way the cohesive group would migrate? It had to do basically with the amount of trust and confidence the group members had in the management of this firm to look after the interests of people like themselves. We could make a good