

10th WOSAPEC

Conference Proceedings:

"10th World Safety & Accident Prevention Educational Conference '96"

PART I

- Assembled from papers
- presented at the conference organized by the
- World Safety Organization - World Management Center
- September 23 - 26, 1996, Holiday Inn North Dallas
- Dallas, Texas, USA

'96



Founded and incorporated in 1975 in Manila Philippines

WSO Professional Certification Program opened in 1985 in U.S.A.

Reorganized in 1987 relocated to Missouri, USA

In 1987 WSO World Management Center established in Missouri, U.S.A.

WSO was granted Consultative Status Category II (NGO) to UN ECOSOC

WSO Publications:

World Safety Journal
ISSN 1015-5589

WSO Tech-Letter
ISSN 1017-6810

WSO NewsLetter
ISSN 1070-311X

Conference Proceedings
ISSN 1022-1042

Conferences held annually

Congresses held semi-annually

IACSEET Inc. - International Accrediting Commission for Safety and Environmental Training and Education Inc.

WISER - World Institute for Safety Education and Research

Educational Conference Proceedings - Part I

The Contribution of Irradiation to the Improvement of Public Health in Ghana <i>Victoria Appiah</i>	1
Increasing Awareness in Safety Programs Through Effective Safety Meetings <i>Donald E. Ashton, WSO-CSM</i>	6
Impact of Values on a Quality Safety Program <i>Jerry Cammarata, Ph.D., WSO-CSE</i>	8
An Overview of Traffic Safety in Lebanon <i>Dr. Elias M. Choueiri, Dr. Georges M. Choueiri, Dr. Bernard M. Choueiri</i>	13
An Overview of Traffic Safety in the U.S. and in Selected European Countries <i>Dr. Elias M. Choueiri, Dr. Georges M. Choueiri, Dr. Bernard M. Choueiri</i>	18

Educational Conference Proceedings - Part II

Apiculture Safety - Killer Bees - Sting Prevention <i>J. Peter Cunliffe, P.E., WSO-CSSD</i>	29
Annual Mileage as an Exposure to Primary Safety and Car Mass as a Secondary Safety Factor <i>Dr. Timo Ernvall, Pasi Pirtala, Jani Huttula, Juha Tapio</i>	32
Construction Owners: An Unrecognized Force In Construction Safety <i>Dr. William C. Goetz, WSO-CSM</i>	34
The Safety Professional In The Food Service And Hospitality Industry <i>Carol L. Johnson, WSO-CHME/CST</i>	36
Effective Presentations for the Safety Professional <i>Dr. H. Ray Johnson, WSO-CHME</i>	39
Industrial Fraud . . . The 21st Century Solution <i>Dr. Joseph A. Kleinkort, WSO-RSD</i>	42
(Re) Emerging Infectious Diseases: A Global Safety and Health Problem <i>Dr. Peter A. Leggat, WSO-CSE/CSM/CSS</i>	44
Preparing to work in crisis <i>Dr. Peter A. Leggat, WSO-CSE/CSM/CSS</i>	46
This is the way we do things: The Administrative Policy and the Safety Process <i>Dr. Michael V. Manning, WSO-CSE</i>	49
Total Quality Management for Effective Safety <i>Dr. Albert Mims, WSO-CSE/CSM/CSS</i>	50
ISO9000 and ISO14000 Workshop Sessions <i>Dennis Murphy, WSO-CSE/CSM/CSS</i>	51
A Preparedness Guide to Raiological Emergencies <i>David M. Rhoe, Dr. Sandra C. Gracia López</i>	52
Safety Management System for the Next Millennium <i>James J. Thatcher, WSO-CSSD</i>	57

World Safety Organization

- **Purpose:** . . . to internationalize all safety fields including occupational and environmental safety & health, accident prevention movement, etc.; and to disseminate throughout the world the practices, skills, arts and technologies of safety and accident prevention.
- **Objective:** . . . to protect people, property, resources and the environment
- **Membership:** . . . open to all individuals and entities involved in the safety and accident prevention field, regardless of race, color, creed, ideology, religion, social status, sex or political beliefs.
- **NGO Status:** . . . has a Consultative Status Category II (Non-Governmental Organization - NGO) to Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.
- *The World Safety Organization is a not-for-profit corporation, non-sectarian, non-religious and non-political movement to "Make Safety a Way of Life".*

Impact of Values on a Quality Safety Program

by Dr. Jerry Cammarata, WSO-CSE

Abstract

Whether we realize or not, values are part of our everyday existence. There is much talk today about values - family values, community values, individual values. While value is perhaps an overused word, the fact is that our everyday actions are guided by value judgments. The problem is that these values are implicit in our actions: what we need to do in order to understand them is to bring them out in the open for full viewing.

The paper attempts to do this, and to use our implied values as a way of understanding quality safety programs. I argue that values undergird our organizations just as they do the larger society; particularly, the values found in democracy - equality, liberty, human dignity, autonomy, tolerance, consensus - have profound importance for quality safety programs in the organization.

Just as the time came for democratic values in societies, the time has come to bring these values to bear on safety programs: in the past, the "paradigm" for safety focused on work-centered programs. Today, we need a paradigm for the employee-centered program whereby employees are allowed to actualize their potential through free discussion and exchange of ideas and gearing this toward reaching consensus in safety program procedures. In short, the latest bastion of autocratic decision-making is the organization, and this paper argues that our democratic values have much to say in breaking down these walls.

Introduction

This past January, the United States of America observed a rather ignominious anniversary. On January 28, 1986, the Space Shuttle Challenger erupted into flames just 73 seconds after lift-off from an icy Cape Canaveral launching pad.¹ As the country - indeed the entire world - watched in horror, American aspirations for the space shuttle program were snuffed out as quickly as the lives of the seven-member crew including the high school science teacher Christine McAuliffe, who would have become the first lay person ever to explore space had the mission been a success.

Of course, in the decade since this tragic accident, the space shuttle program has recovered remarkably well.² Space shuttle missions, once they resumed several years later, have become a regular occurrence and a vital part of the world's space exploration efforts. We owe the wonderful images of the edges of the universe that the Hubble space telescope is sending back to us to two successful space shuttle missions (the first to put it up in orbit and the second to fix the telescope's reflective mirrors, a dramatic feat where crew members spent hours on end hanging in the nothingness of empty space). In addition, the space shuttle has recently had a space station rendezvous with Russian cosmonauts and has repaired a malfunctioning Japanese satellite. Indeed, a decade after Challenger, the risks of space shuttle missions seem a thing of the past as mission after mission goes off without a hitch and carries with them the apparent aspirations of many of the world's individuals.

.....

Dr. Jerry Cammarata is a healthcare management consultant specializing in Risk Management, OSHA compliance and innovative medical facility services. He consults to over 120 hospitals and nursing homes in the metropolitan area on healthcare administration, staff development and education. He is an adjunct faculty member of the City University of New York in Safety Technology, Hearing Conservation, Fire Protection, Consumer Protection, and Organization & Management; and enjoys faculty privileges at the Wagner College (New York) in the area of Communications. His professional qualifications include BA and MA from Hofstra University, and Ph.D. from California Coast University, and a Nursing Home Administration Certificate. He is a licensed Speech/Language Pathologist, Audiologist, Hearing Conservationist, Board Certified Audioprosthologist, as well as a Certified Medical Technician.

Yet, the anniversary of the Challenger's failure has, at least momentarily, given us pause to reflect on the risks we take when we stretch to realize our most valued dreams. For, at its core, the story of the Space Shuttle Challenger is one where the values we hold dear were not completely in sync with the safety management procedures that are meant to help us realize our goals. In the wake of the Challenger debacle, the cause was determined to be a faulty "o" ring which held the shuttle's rocket propellers to the manifold. In fact, the "o" rings had been a major concern before the shuttle took off, and many scientists who worked on the mission at the time attempted to warn managers that the weather was simply too cold to guarantee a safe flight of the space shuttle.³ Over the objections of many, the Space Shuttle Challenger lifted off on that cold January morning (after repeated de-icings) when it should never have. In their haste to realize the goal of placing an ordinary American teacher in orbit, NASA disregarded what was perhaps standard safety management procedure.

I bring up the Space Shuttle Challenger not because I think it is something most Americans want to remember. Rather, I mention it here because I think it has something to teach us about the way that the values we cherish and work place quality safety programs interact. In the case of the Challenger, it seems clear that two values which - it must be pointed out - are not necessarily opposed somehow clashed in the open: on the one hand, NASA's value to have a successful shuttle launch and on the other the value of assuring that the work place of its employees - in this case, the space shuttle crew - is as safe as possible. How many times have we seen similar situations happen, though perhaps not to such extremes as the case of the Space Shuttle Challenger? Immediately a case such as Three Mile Island nuclear power plant comes to mind. Expediency is chosen over sound safety, and the results are nearly disastrous for the lives of many citizens both inside and outside the confines of the nuclear power plant.

The point here is that the things we value most not only impact upon a quality safety program of a given organization, but they also undergird it. In other words, the values we hold dear are prior to a safety program initiated at an organization because they are already instilled in us, and as we should hope, in the organization as well. It is true that in 1996 values are a hot topic in the United States, as represented by the popularity of books such as William Bennett's *The Book of Virtues*.⁴ Family values, community values - all types of values are promoted for the cure of every social ill of society, so it seems today. Perhaps the word "values" has indeed become overused in the modern political discourse.⁵ However, what we must realize is that value judgments form the basis of every action we take in this world, and what is more, these value judgments for the most part go unnoticed in the background to our conscious decision making process. Values, whether we like it or not, happen "behind our backs" in every facet of daily existence.

The same is the case when we consider the work place in general, and more particularly a quality safety program that is initiated in the work place. Although values are implicit in our daily actions but nonetheless guide them in a significant way, I should like to bring out some of the values implied in the construction of a quality safety program that has, at least in my opinion, world-wide international implications. As we prepare for the twenty first century, it is clear that the work place for workers all around the world should match technological advancement with top quality safety procedures. Furthermore, values instantiated in the work place must also reflect the values of the society at large. But the question immediately arises: why should this be the case? What calls for the highest safety program in the modern day work place? To this question, one must respond: our value for human dignity.

In this essay, I want to lay out the foundations for a view of quality safety programs that is based on the priority of certain values that we, as individuals, Americans, and world citizens, hold - and rightfully should hold - dear. More specifically, I want to argue three things: that there are standard values which transcend who we are as individuals and where we come from which should be stressed not only in schools and communities but also in the work place and should be possessed by safety managers; that there, in fact, correspond to these standard values certain personality "types" among individuals which coincide with the ongoing transportation of these values; and finally, that we must advocate international, national, or even corporate standards of values to act as guides in assuring a quality safety program will be developed and implemented.

The need for such values and the state of safety today

What is it about today's work place that calls for such a stand on the issue of values? Before delving into the assertions put forth above, I think we best attempt to answer the question at hand first. For the fact is that a majority of the American work force, and an increasing number of the world's work force, has moved to a different type of situation where management must respond in different ways. Safety's emphasis in the past on work-centered management was logical given the manufacturing-orientation of the average work place. Changes in the society have made it increasingly important to redefine safety orientation because we have moved to a service economy era. Alan Garner and Frank Riessman understood this clearly over twenty years ago.⁵

With this fundamental change in the way that the American economy functions, there has been an equally fundamental change in the type of management that an organization conducts. Specifically, increased attention has been given to what might be called the "employee-centered" aspect of safety over the work-centered safety needs. Since a service industry has little machine interaction, safety problems encountered within it are more likely to be seen as "people" problems (notwithstanding the increased presence of carpal tunnel syndrome in the computer age). Whenever people are involved it becomes clear that it is a matter of improving human relations - a clear tool of the employee-centered approach.⁶ Even if an organization is mainly concerned with production of hard goods rather than services, trends have shown that employee-centered approaches are needed because the high tech revolution has replaced semi-skilled workers with robots on the one hand, but has also required the extremely high level of training of the workers who remain on the other.

In a recent book, published on the state of the American work force today, Stanley Aronowitz and Vincent DeFazio⁷ argue that over the last decade or so there has been a progressive destruction of high-quality, well-paid, permanent jobs. The authors cite three reasons for this first - in response to pervasive, long-term economic stagnation and new scientific based technologies, there has been a massive restructuring of the patterns of ownership and investment in the global economy. The global market has indeed made political boundaries almost irrelevant. Second, technological advances have destroyed jobs and reduced living standards by enabling corporations to go "transnational", i.e., deterritorialize production. The authors refer to this phenomenon as "informatics": the transmission of information through electronic and computerized means. And third, even the higher standard jobs were moving according to the globalization of capital because places like India and the Far East had a rich supply of programmers, systems analysts, engineers, etc., that received much lower wages than the same professionals here.⁸ While this perhaps is the sad state of affairs in the labor market today,⁸ the fact is that a higher percentage of jobs that do remain will require more complex job knowledge; of course this entails new and retrained employees receiving a heavy dose of more training and education. This should lead to a more professional status for these workers, and it is reasonable to conclude that safety practitioners will need to be more persuasive in their communications with others.

That education and training are values, in and of themselves, is not in dispute here. I firmly believe, as I have argued elsewhere,⁹ that education is the most important factor to keep a work force productive and safe. However, the point here is that employee-centered programs point to even a larger question of values than education, programs that emphasize human relations training probably will be needed since employees will be better educated, and vice-versa. The reason is that expectations rise when education and training rise. Whereas a less-educated worker might accept a safety suggestion or perform a certain procedure because an authoritarian figure says to do so,¹⁰ the more educated employees will expect to be treated as mature adults. In other words, perhaps there will be more supervision needed, but there will also be more people taking responsibility for their own safety.¹¹

Further evidence has shown that employees, who become financially secure in their job, look to other forms of incentive for safety rather than in the monetary direction.¹² One could make the case that this situation is indeed a direct representation of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, whereby the individual searches for other forms of motivation than basic security when lower types of needs are met.¹³ In other words, as the need for food, clothing, a shelter are taken care of, the individual looks for friendship, esteem, and self-actualization from their peers.¹⁴ Employee-centered safety programs, therefore, have to take into account a very different attitude on the part of the employee because the basic situation - and the values of the work place - have been altered in this high skilled work environment.

Hence, the shift from the work-centered safety program to the employee-centered safety program underlies the fundamental shift in our work world today. In the work-centered safety program, the emphasis was on what many economists call the "cost-benefit analysis". This model comes from the rational factor model in economics where every decision made by an individual is supposedly made in a lucid ordering of benefits or the decision weighed against the cost of the decision. In the field of safety management, William Lowrance's *Of Acceptable Risk: Science and the Determination of Safety*¹⁵ is perhaps the most persuasive book on the matter. Lowrance argued twenty years ago that benefits, costs and risks could be measured and in fact had to be measured in order to come up with "acceptable" risks in safety management. Lowrance stated that:

"Risk is a measure of the probability and severity of adverse effects. Efficacy is a corresponding measure of the probability and intensity of beneficial effects . . . Safety is the degree to which risks are judged acceptable. Benefit is the degree to which efficacies are judged desirable . . . The above notions are logically symmetrical: safety is to risk as benefit is to efficacy. Risk and efficacy are matters of measurable empirical fact; safety and benefit are matters of value judgement."¹⁶

Perhaps we should leave to one side Lowrance's methodological analysis of how one gets to empirical (i.e., measurable) fact from value (i.e., nonmeasurable) judgments. Lowrance seems perfectly comfortable with the assertion that values can, in the end, be quantified and hence placed within the realm of risk and efficacy. This is nothing new, to be sure: economics, as stated above, has been treating the active life of the individual - homo economicus in economic parlance¹⁷ - in terms of measurable identifications. All I will say here is that the social sciences have sought to come to grips with this very issue ever since the advent of the modern scientific method of inductive empiricism began three hundred years ago. In the early twentieth century, the great German sociologist Max Weber decidedly argued - persuasively I might add - that the bridge between facts and values was quite simply insurmountable.¹⁸ To say that value judgments could be derived from empirical observations, or vice versa, was simply out of the question to a great mind like Weber.

My inclination here is to say that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. If the greatest philosophers of the age - the problem of empirical facts versus value judgments has been the topic to the likes of David Hume, Immanuel Kant, Heinrich Rickert, Nietzsche, Marx and his disciple George Lukacs, Weber, and today the German sociologist Jurgen Habermas - could not settle the issue decisively in thousand of pages of writing, then I do not believe Lowrance can get on a grip on the relation between empirical facts and value judgments in just a few pages. However, the fact is that the cost-benefit model has long been used in safety management whereby acceptable risks to worker safety were calculated, measured, and weighed against the possibility of either improving profit or raising costs. My argument here is that the work-centered safety program of the past went hand-in-hand with the cost-benefit analysis in safety management.

About thirty five years ago, the scientific historian Thomas Kuhn wrote an influential book entitled *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* that sent shockwaves through the social sciences.¹⁹ Kuhn's argument was that there are two kinds of science that stays within a given paradigm, a given set of beliefs that the scientific community cherishes; normal science, in other words, is safe.

Revolutionary science, on the other hand, challenges the given set of beliefs concerning science. When the explanatory power of normal science fails, revolutionary science takes its place and becomes the dominant paradigm. The Copernican Revolution, which took a heliocentric view of the universe and replaced the Ptolemaic's geocentric view, is an example of revolutionary science.²⁰

The point here is that cost-benefit analysis and the work-centered safety program have been the dominant paradigm in safety management for years. They are our equivalent to Kuhn's "normal science". The employee-centered understanding of safety programs is the new paradigm emerging, and with it must come a "revolutionary" way of looking at how to best structure work safety programs. This leads me back to the question of values. And we ask again: how do values fit into the work place as I have advocated? We need not look far, for as I have also indicated values are something that happens "behind our backs" so to speak. The way, in which we interact in everyday society, is an expression of values that we hold dear, and yet

these values are so ingrained that we know not that they are at work. The values I speak of are those implied in a democratic society: freedom, equality, human dignity, civility, etc.

We have gone a long way in universalizing democratic values across the world in the two hundred plus years since the Declaration of Independence appeared here in this country and the Declaration of the Rights of Man appeared in France across the Atlantic thirteen years later. How ironic it is that for the most part democratic values have not made their way into the very economic system that has proven to sustain democracy - capitalism. We know that businesses are rather autocratic in the sense that decision making is made at the top. But does this have to be the case? Is there a way to bring democratic values to an organization in a proper and professional way such that they both impact upon the organization positively and undergird the very belief system of the organization? My response is not only yes, but that the time is exactly right given the move to employee-centered safety programs. The basic values of democracy we hold dear are the "revolutionary" science to the paradigm of the employee centered safety program.

The Values Implicit in Modernity and Democracy

In the tradition of the West, democracy has conventionally been defined in political terms - that is, in terms of the relation of the individual to government. When all, or almost all, adult citizens participate in the process of selecting representatives who are charged with the responsibility for legislating, including the levying of taxes, democracy is said to prevail. It does not follow necessarily that every voter has exactly the same weight as every other in determining governmental policy. As modern conservatives, over the course of the last several decades - such as Barry Goldwater, William Bennett, and Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, insist on emphasizing, the United States is a constitutional republic in which each state, irrespective of the number of its inhabitants, shares equally in sending representative to the upper legislative change of the federal government; and, further, each state, within certain limits, can determine for itself the conditions under which the members of the legislature are chosen. In terms of formal structure, American democracy is limited by the separation of powers within the federal government, by the reserved powers of the states, and by the basic rights retained by the individual under constitutional guarantees.

However, the point here is that a representative democracy is limited by the separation of powers within the federal government, by the reserved powers of the states, and by the basic rights retained by the individual under constitutional guarantees.

However, the point here is that a representative democracy, for the first time in human history, gave the power of governance to the majority broadly stated, rather than to the few of the one - the latter two being oligarchy on the one hand and tyranny on the other.²¹ Furthermore, it is no coincidence that the values of democracy made their historical appearance at a time when the individual qua individual made his/her historical appearance. In other words, the modern period - and here I have in mind from the middle of the seventeenth century - issued in what we know as popular government because the values of the time called for individuals to be the caretakers of government themselves instead of a class who was given this responsibility by birth right.²²

We could go back in intellectual history and trace the onward march toward democratic values and the rise of liberal philosophy with great ease to find our roots for what we cherish today as the popular form of government. The "contract theorists" of seventeenth and eighteenth centuries²³ made popular the idea that society was based on a compact between the individuals themselves - not the rulers - whereby those individuals gave up certain liberties of a "state of nature" to gain the "inalienable" rights of civil society.²⁴ The underpinnings for this view lay in the fact that every man was endowed with "reason" and therefore could be trusted to understand fully his (since only men at this time were included) role and place within civil society. The origins of democratic values were found in this fact.

Perhaps the two biggest proponents of this view, that the individual was not capable of governing himself through representative government, were Immanuel Kant in the late eighteenth century and John Stuart Mill in the nineteenth century. Kant's ideas reflected what we know as the Enlightenment: the success of modern science which accounted for the spirit of optimism that was characteristic of the political and philosophical thought of the age. The discoveries of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo and Newton appeared to inaugurate a new age of scientific promise, individual's capacity for reason. The laws of rational in-

quiry were to seem to be the replacement of the dictates of prejudice, custom, authority: Kant was on the cutting edge of this change in values. The individual played a large role in his moral philosophy - the individual as the autonomous rational being who lives or should live in accord with the categorical imperative. Without individual autonomy, or freedom, there was to be no morality in the true sense of the word for Kant. In his influential essay *What is Enlightenment?*²⁵ Kant challenged the modern world to shake off its "immaturity" and "have the courage to know"; because we were all endowed with reason, we have the ability to understand the nature of the world, ourselves, and the political realities that surrounded us.

With this underpinning to the spirit of democratic values, John Stuart Mill came along in the nineteenth century and added his own twist to liberty, equality, and human dignity. In 1859 Mill published *On Liberty*²⁶ which attempted to examine the necessary conditions of human happiness. Yet, the spirit of progressivism pervaded the work, and Mill theorized that humankind was an evolving rather than a fixed being.²⁷ If this was the case, then all calculations concerning political order and human happiness had to take into account the prospect for human improvement. Mill advocated programs which promoted the advance of civilization and social excellence. In Mill we find the standard liberal theme that forms of government were only legitimate as far as the society around them had progressed, and as society progressed the time would come for values to progress as well. For instance, he believed that despotism was legitimate for those societies which had not yet evolved beyond the level of barbarism in the West of his time however, the citizenry had become capable of being improved by freedom and equal discussion. The only way this could come about for Mill was through a social education of the citizenry: in Mill, one hundred and thirty years ago, in other words, we find one of our most forceful values as the people of the late twentieth century - the notion that human dignity, equality, freedom and civility were contingent upon continuing self-improvement through education. The reason, as Mill states,²⁸ is "grounded on the permanent interest of man as a progressive being."

Personality, Values and Quality Safety Programs

This brief review of the origins of our democratic values is neither meant to be extensive nor meant to take us too far afield of the task at hand. To reiterate, we are concerned with bringing out into the open the impact of values on safety management, more particularly those everyday values of democracy we hold dear. My point is emphasizing democratic values in modern political and philosophical thought is twofold: on one hand, to show that many of the thinkers of the past realized that the stage had been set for the move to these values through a progression of ideas. My point is that we have arrived at the same crossroads in the field of safety management, and that the values, implied in the larger move to democracy throughout modern human history, can be brought to bear on the work place as the employee-centered model takes shape.

I said at the outset that I wished to argue three things: 1) that there are values that we can call universal; 2) that there are certain "personality" types which sustain these values; and 3) that standards must be put in place in safety management procedures to reinforce the first two. I have put the first piece to the puzzle in its place: we need to learn from the democratic values we already cherish - human dignity, autonomy, freedom, equality - for quality safety management. I should like to move to personality types now to see if we can find a particular individual who is more apt to hold these values.

There is a debate in philosophical thought dating back to Plato that is concerned with reaching consensus in society versus understanding the conflicts of society. For instance, it can be said that Plato was concerned with conflict between the ruling group and other groups in society and thereby mediating between them.²⁹ On the other hand, Aristotle argued that there was a consensus among men who were rational and virtuous and a need to suppress conflict by any means necessary.³⁰ We could trace this debate throughout the history of philosophy up to relative present: in the Middle Ages, Augustine on the side of Plato and Aquinas on the side of Aristotle; in the early middle modern period, Machiavelli describes human nature in conflictual terms and Hobbes in consensual terms;³¹ in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Locke in the consensual tradition and Rousseau in the conflictual tradition;³² in the nineteenth century, Auguste Comte in the consensual tradition and Karl Marx in the conflictual tradition;³³ and in the twentieth century, Talcott Parsons in the consensual tradition and John Rawls in the conflictual tradition.³⁴

The point here is that I believe it is possible to go back and trace this debate to find the undercurrents in the conflictual and consensual tradi-

tions; if we do this, I also believe that we will come up with theories of personality which reinforce both of these traditions. In other words, we might look to psychology to find some of the clues as to what type of individual better undergirds the conflictual theory of society and what type of individual better undergirds the consensual theory of society.

At the outset, it should be pointed out that the individual involved with safety management, in the ideas I have put forth here anyway, should be a consensus-builder. The values of liberty, equality, human dignity and autonomy that take their hold in a democratic setting imply that individuals must come to some common understanding or agreement about the issues at hand; if not, then there must at least be the civility to agree to disagree. The only way civility can take root is if actions geared toward consensus are promoted - not only in society a whole but also within the work place setting. Therefore, types of personality which are geared toward consensus might prove desirable for those who are in charge of carrying out safety management.

As we all know, there are giants in the field of personality theory from which we might take our bearing. Sigmund Freud served as the first great psychoanalyst.³⁵ However, Freud's theory of personality emphasized the eternal battles that the individual waged within him/herself between the id, the superego, and the ego. In short, Freud's theory of personality was a conflictual one; furthermore, Freud postulated that all individuals were susceptible to this ongoing conflict, whether they were aware of it or not (since the role of the psychoanalyst was to extract out the exigencies of this conflict³⁶).

In the years after Freud's death, there arose a movement which counteracted Freud's domination of psychology. It became known as existential psychology and found its greatest voices in the philosophers Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, Martin Heidegger, Franz Kafka, and Nietzsche and Kierkegaard in the last century.³⁷ It was Sartre who perhaps best summed up existentialism:

Existentialism simply means that man first is, and only subsequently this or that. In a word, man must create his own essence: it is in throwing himself into the world, suffering there, struggling there, that he gradually defines himself."³⁸

Existential psychology propagates the idea that man is the product of his choices; the individual is not subjected to the psyche and its conflicts as in Freudian terms, but rather is the master of the determination of these choices.³⁹ There is no subconscious conspiracy in existential psychology. In fact just the opposite situation occurs: the individual is not only in harmony with him/herself in the decisions that he/she makes, but the individual also seeks to reach consensus with others as they seek to realize their potential as well.

We can see how the existential view of personality fits well within the democratic values of our society - autonomy, freedom, equality, and most importantly, the attempt to reach consensus between individuals. At its core, this idea holds that the individual is motivated by a sense of wanting to actualize his/her potential.⁴⁰ At the same time this autonomy is being realized, the individual looks to other individuals in the same manner. Consensus is then reached because an agreement on how to attain their goals. Free discussion of ideas and hearing out all opinions are the main ingredients of this view of personality.

In 1962, Robert Presthus theorized three general types of personality types in organizations.⁴¹ He stated that there were such types in the organization as the "upward mobiles", the indifferent", and the "ambivalents". In the scheme we are fleshing out here, it would seem that the upward mobiles are the personality types that best coincide with the existential psychology I feel best describes the work safety situation of today's work place. In other words, those who are motivated to realize their full potential but do so while acting in a consensual fashion are perhaps the best situated in the safety programs of the twenty first century.

Conclusion: Setting Standards to Achieve These Ends

I have argued here that we all have values implied in every action we take. If we stop to realize these values, we will see that the basic characteristics of democracy - equality, liberty, autonomy, human dignity, reaching consensus - are what guides out daily lives, both in the work setting and out. I have argued also that there has come a time in the safety management era, with its emphasis on employee-centered programs, to let these values take hold decisively. Reaching consensus among employees in a work setting is contingent upon each being allowed to realize their potential; this can only come through education,

training and a free discussion of ideas in the work place. Decision making, as it is done in our democratic society, is technically in the hands of the people: I argue that the standards we put in place in safety management must reflect the values of society as a whole.

We have reached the point in our economic history that the values of society must be extended to the businesses that drive the economy. Capitalism has been the sister of democracy since the latter's inception but capitalism does not operate according to the principles and values of democracy. Now is the time to extend these values into the work place because the work force is "mature" enough to handle it, as Immanuel Kant would say. Having more decision-making power at the employee level in terms of safety programs not only reflects the larger trend toward employee-centered safety programs, but it also reflects our values as a whole.

Bibliography

- Abbot, Lawrence. *Economics and the Modern World* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World: 1967.)
- Aristotle. *Politics*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall 1978.
- Aronowitz, Stanley and Vincent DeFazio. *The Jobless Future: Sci-Tech and the Dogma of Work*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Bennett, William. *The Book of Virtues: A Treasury of Great Moral Stories*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993.
- Brubaker, Roberts. *The Limits of Rationality*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1984.
- Cammarata, Jerry. "NAFTA Future: Education vs. Exploitation." *Staten Island Advocate*, December 21, 1993.
- Comte, August. *The Positive Philosophy*. Harriet Martineau, trans. London: George Bell, 1896.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works, ed. J. Strachey. London: Hogart Press, 1953-1974.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Instincts and Their Vicissitudes*. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works, ed. J. Strachey. London: Hogart Press, 1953-1974.
- Gartner, Alan and Frank Riessman. *The Service Society and the Consumer Vanguard*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Ghiselli, Eric. *The Concept of Role and Theoretical Basis for Understanding Organizations*. Bologna: University of Bologna Publications in Business Science, 1963.
- Glüner, Brian. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*, ed. by Michael Oakeshott. New York: Collier Books, 1962.
- Jones, D.F. *Occ. Safety Programs: Are They Worth It?* Ontario, Canada: Labour Safety Council/Ontario Ministry of Labour 1973.
- Kant, Immanuel. *The Philosophy of Immanuel Kant*, ed. Carl Friedrich. New York: Modern Library, 1949.
- Koehler, Jerry, Karl W. E. Antol, and Ronald L. Applebaum. *Organizational Communications: Behavioral Perspectives*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1987.
- Kuhn, Thomas. *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Second Edition. Chicago: University Press, 1970.
- Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. by Peter Laslett. New York: New American Library, 1965.
- Longworth, William. *Of Acceptable Risk: Science and the Determination of Safety*. Los Altos, California: W. Kaufmann, 1976.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince and the Discourses*. New York: Modern Library 1950.
- Markin, Ronald. *The Psychology of Consumer Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Press, 1969.
- Marx, Karl. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. New York: International Publishers, 1970.
- Maslow, Abraham. *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- Mill, J.S. *On Liberty*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Autobiography*. Indianapolis: Bobs-Merrill, 1957.
- Parson, Talcott. *Structure of Social Action*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937.
- Plato, *The Republic*, trans. A. Bloom. New York: Basic Books 1968.
- Presthus, Robert. *The Organizational Society*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The First and Second Discourses*. trans. Roger D. and Judith R. Masters. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *A More Precise Characterization of Existentialism*. The Writings of Jean-Paul Sartre, eds. Michael Contact, Michael Rylbalka. Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1974.
- Smith, Michael, J.H. Harvey Cohen, Alexander Cohen, and Robert J. Cleveland. Characteristics of Successful Safety Programs. *Journal of Safety Research*, vol. 10 No.1 Spring 1978, pp.14-15.
- Startle, C.L. and R.M. Stodgill. *Studies of Naval Leadership*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Research Foundations, 1952.
- Stodgill, R.M. Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. *Journal of Psychology*, vol. 25, 1948, pp35-71.
- Weber, Max. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1954.
- Wiser, James L. *Political Philosophy: A History of the Search for Order*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1983.
- Yankelovich, David. *The Meaning of Work*, in Jerome M. Rosow's *The Worker and the Job: Coping with Change*. New York: Columbia University, 1974.

Footnotes:

1. New York Times, "Americans Mark the Tenth Anniversary of Challenger." January 28, 1996.
2. On the night of January 21, 1996, CBS's *Sixty Minutes* ran a story in making the tenth anniversary of the disaster. In addition, National Public Radio discussed the Challenger disaster on Sunday, January 28, 1996, exactly ten years to the day; two scientists working for NASA at the time recounted their stories of the failed "o" rings there.
3. William Bennett. *The Book of Virtues: A Treasure of Great Moral Stories* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993).
4. Ibid.
5. Gartner, Alan and Frank Riessman. *The Service Society and the Consumer Vanguard*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
6. R. C. Longworth and Bill Nikers, "Changing American Workers," *Chicago Tribune*, September 16, 1979.
7. Stanley Aronowitz and Vincent DeFazio, *The Jobless Future: Sci-Tech and the Dogma of Work* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994).
8. I do not necessarily argue with the premise of these authors' assertions; the *Jobless Future* is a powerful and rich analysis of today's labor situation, even if the expressed view of Aronowitz and DeFazio are decidedly Marxist and hence ideologically bound. The case for stemming and even reversing the situation they see is beyond the scope of the present essay; what interests me more is attempting to provide safe working conditions anywhere, no matter how many employees are left in a work situation.
9. See my "NAFTA Future: Education vs. Exploitation" in the *State Island Advocate*, Dec. 21, 1993. There I argued that education and humanitarian goals were the only things keeping NAFTA from turning into a huge case of exploitation perpetrated on the Mexican worker. It is clear that a standard of living commensurate with Western industrialized countries is conditioned by a well-educated work force that in turn enforces these humanitarian goals. We must "export" these ideas as well as the products from our companies in the NAFTA agreement.
10. Jerry W. Koehler, Karl W. E. Anatol, and Ronald L. Applebaum, *Organizational Communication: Behavioral Perspectives* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1987), p.85.
11. D. Yankelovich, "The Meaning of Work," in Jerome M. Rosow's *The Worker and the Job: Coping with Change* (New York: Columbia University, 1974), p. 23.
12. Ibid.
13. Abraham Maslow, *Motivation and Personality* (New York: Harper and Row, 1954).
14. Ibid.
15. W. Lowrance, *Of Acceptable Risk: Science and the Determination of Safety* (Los Altos, California: William Kaufmann, 1976).
16. Ibid, pp. 94-95.
17. Cf., Lawrence Abbott, *Economics and the Modern World* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World: 1967).
18. Weber's entire corpus was directed at understanding of "rationalization" of the West and how empirical means-ends action dominated the question of values. But, in the, values got a hearing and perhaps even won out for Weber. "even such simple questions as the extent to which an end should sanction unavoidable means, or the extent to which undesired repercussions should be taken into consideration . . . are entirely matters of choice or compromise. There is no (rational) scientific procedure of any kind whatsoever." Max Weber *The Methodology of the Social Science*, quoted in Rogers Brubaker's *The Limits of Rationality* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1984), p.59.
19. Thomas Kuhn, *Structure of Scientific Revolution*, Second Edition, Chicago: University Press, 1970.
20. Ibid.
21. Of course these categorizations of political regimes go back as far as our traditions in Western Philosophy will allow us, all the way back to Plato. Cf., *The Republic*, trans. Allan Bloom (New York: Basic Books, 1968)./
22. Even though monarchies existed way beyond the advent of democracy as a popular form of government and to an extent exist today (as for instance in England, Spain, etc.), the notion that birth right gave the monarch the power to govern fell away in the West beginning in the early eighteenth century. Charles X in France in the 1820's was the first King of France to state that there was no such thing as the "Divine Right of Kings". This was an important milestone in and of itself in the march toward popular government.
23. Cf., Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. by Michael Oakeshott (New York: Collier Books, 1962), John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. by Peter Laslett (New York: New American Library, 1965), and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. *The First and Second Discourses*, trans. Roger D. and Judith R. Masters (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964).
24. The inalienable rights put forth by Thomas Jefferson in our Declaration of Independence, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" actually found their origin one hundred years before in the writings of John Locke, who in the Second Treatise on Government claimed that the move to civil society from the state of nature nonetheless guaranteed: life, liberty, and estate." op.cit.
25. In *The Philosophy of Immanuel Kant*, ed. Carl Friedrich (New York: Modern Library, 1949).
26. J.S. Mill, *On Liberty* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989).
27. It is perhaps no coincidence that Mill's work was published the same year as Charles Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, the most influential book of the century in arguing for evolution and progression.
28. John Stuart Mill, *Autobiography* (Indianapolis: Bobs-Merril, 1957), p. 107.
29. Plato, *Republic*, op. cit., 369b-c.
30. Aristotle/*Politics*. Englewood Cliffs/New Jersey Prentice-Hall 1978
31. Hobbes, op.cit., Machiavelli, *The Prince and the Discourses* (New York: Modern Library, 1950).
32. Locke, *Two Treatises on Government*, op. cit., Rousseau, *First and Second Discourses*, op.cit.
33. Auguste Comte, *The Positive Philosophy*, Harriet Martineau, trans. (London: George Bell, 1896); Karl Marx, *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (New York: International Publishers, 1970).
34. Talcott Parson, *Structure of Social Action* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937); John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971).
35. For a complete set of Freud's writings, see *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works*, ed. J. Strachey. London: Hogart Press, 1953-74.
36. Freud, "Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis", in *Standard Edition*, op.cit., vols. 15 and 16.
37. J.L. Wiser, *Political Philosophy: A History of the Search for Order* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1983) p.385
38. Jean-Paul Sartre, "A More Precise Characterization of Existentialism", *The Writings of Jean-Paul Sartre*, eds. Michael Contat and Michael Rylbalka (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974), p. 157.
39. Markin, Ronald. *The Psychology of Consumer Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Press, 1969.
40. This goes back to Maslow's hierarchy of needs mentioned above. op.cit.
41. Robert Presthus, *The Organizational Society* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962). []