**Name of Metaphor Before Merger**

Cultural Metaphors

**Justification of Cultural Metaphors**

The Cadburys embedded their ethos by ritual, myth, and symbol. The culture of the company, was to be the culture of the employer family. Cadburys was a family firm in style as well as name. Family news-births, marriages, and deaths-was dutifully reported in the Bournville Work Magazine, which was founded in 1902 to promote the Bournville spirit. Mr. George, Mr. Richard, and their sons after them were the "center round which everything moved." The Cadbury family presence was felt in the Works and in the surrounding neighborhood. At the heart of Bournville mythology were the figures of George and Richard Cadbury. The brothers partnership embodied the cooperative ideal they advocated.

George Cadbury preached the Christian life he practiced, sobriety, thrift, and respectability. Addressing young Bournville workers at a party in 1918, he exhorted them to lead pure lives of renunciation and service. But, in the same speech, he said: "I want to see those who create the wealth of the world having a larger share of the wealth they create. Cadbury perpetuated the founders as symbols after their deaths. More than 16,000 mourners attended the memorial service held for George Cadbury on the Bournville village green in 1922. A special number of the Bournville Works Magazine, distributed to employees, customers, and suppliers, idealized his life and work. In this publication, leading managers praised the qualities that made George Cadbury a model employer, notably his wide vision, sympathy with labor, and personal touch. At the suggestion of the Works Councils, a bust of George Cadbury was commissioned. Founder's Day in Bournville village was also celebrated at the Works. Rituals unified the Cadburys and their employees. In the early years at Bournville, the atmosphere was decidedly religious, though nondenominational. Social occasions dotted the Bournville calendar: Christmas, New Year's, and summer parties, Suggestion Scheme awards, and visits to the Cadburys' homes. Gift giving celebrated the bonds of employer and employed. When a woman

worker married and thus left the firm, "Mr. George" bestowed on her a flower, a Bible, and a small sum of money. The flower and the Bible were appropriate symbols of a man devoted to religious truth and natural beauty. They were visible tokens of the "spiritual partnership" the Cadburys beckoned their employees to join. That the amount of money depended on the age of the employee and the years of service was a characteristic concession to practicality. Great occasions brought more dramatic gestures. The firm celebrated its centenary in 1931 with a gift of 250,000 to its employees-distributed, I might add, in the form of National Savings certificates, which they were encouraged, but not required, to keep-and the gift to Birmingham of an open site for public playgrounds and a hospital extension. Not to be outdone, employees bestowed "counter-gifts" such as the Bournville Rest House commemorating the silver wedding anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. George Cadbury, an appropriate echo of the firm's traditional marriage gift. Gift giving involved public affirmations of loyalty to a common cause rather than

Fealty to a master.

**Name of Metaphor After Merger**

Democratic

**Justification of Metaphor**

The Cadburys greeted industrial democracy with enthusiasm. As usual, they were "eager to be among the first" and "set an example" for other manufacturers. To Edward Cadbury, industrial democracy "was not a new principle for us"; it fulfilled the promise of the Suggestion Committee and the Cardbox Shop Committee. Nevertheless, it was more of a departure than he believed. Although the scheme enjoyed strong support from the managers and workers who helped devise it, the reservations of other workers are telling. One foreman noted that the Works Councils would make his position increasingly difficult. As it was, he was not "top dog" and was unable at Bournville to use the force regularly employed elsewhere. Certain trade unionists feared that the scheme would undermine union power. Cadburys instituted a three-tier constitutional scheme with Shop Committees representing various trades, Group Committees composed of workers' representatives from the Shop Committees, and Works Councils. Men's and women's committees were separate, but there was also a joint Works Council. Workers elected and the Board appointed representatives. George Cadbury, Jr., sat on the Men's Works Council, on the workers' side of the table; Edward and Dorothy Cadbury on the Women's Works Council. The key provision of the scheme was that nothing should be done to contravene union rule or custom; negotiation on wages and conditions was a union preserve. The scope of the Councils included social, welfare, and educational work as well as aspects of industrial production. But the Councils did not make policy. Their purpose was "to encourage and establish good relations between Workers and Management and to maintain a spirit of co-operation, and in this way to promote the welfare and prosperity of the Bournville community." That was no easy task in the 1920s, as recession, labor unrest, and "rationalization" disrupted dreams of a land fit for heroes. Piecework rates and wages, dismissals and promotions were all subjects of workers' grievances.And deeper questions of good faith and mutual trust arose. Despite the commitment of the directors to frank discussion and open dealing, some workers feared victimization: "If they urge a particular point and cross their Foremen, some day they will find themselves outside the factory." The workers seem to have directed their hostility toward supervisors and managers rather than directors. Politically, this was a useful tactic to gain the Cadburys' sympathy and appeal to their sense of fair dealing. Psychologically, it represents "splitting": ascribing evil intentions to the supervisors while idealizing the motives of the Cadburys.

**The Psychological Contract**

The psychological contract refers to the unwritten set of expectations of the employment relationship as distinct from the formal, codified employment contract. Taken together, the psychological contract and the employment contract define the employer-employee relationship.

https://www.hrzone.com/hr-glossary/what-is-a-psychological-contract

Description

Psychological contracts are a set of ‘promises’ or ‘expectations’ that are exchanged between the parties in an employment relationship. These parties include employers, managers, individual employees and their work colleagues. Unlike formal contracts of employment, they are often tacit or implicit. They tend to be invisible, assumed, unspoken, informal or at best only partially vocalized. Because of this, you have to make a determined effort to find out what they are.

Psychological contracts consist of unofficial assumptions and perceptions, often untested, of the workplace relationship that exists between employer and employee. Although they are rarely written down formally and explicitly, they have a powerful impact on employee motivation and performance. They are closely bound up with notions of employment, employability and ‘career’

**Review of Cadbury Welfare to Workers**

**Main feature of the approach**

* Cadbury wanted their employees to have the pleasure of working in the country amid green fields and clean air instead of toiling in the smoky city center of Workers initially commuted from the city to the country housing was provided for only a few foremen, and workers were reluctant to move to Bournville permanently.
* Cadbury finance the creation of the suburb from his own funds but he also planned almost every aspect of the village, from houses and roads to parks and trees. Each cottage had a generous yard, or garden, often with trees and flowers already planted.
* No one was excluded on the grounds of religious or political belief.
* Edward Cadbury's researches revealed the necessity of providing greater security and a living wage for workers. Security meant protection in sickness, old age, and unemployment; a living wage meant enough money to provide adequate food, shelter, and clothing for an average-size family-husband, wife, and three children. This base wage represented the minimal amount necessary for "physical efficiency" rather than mere subsistence.
* Edward maintained that men "needed" a higher wage than women: they had to support a family, and, at Cadburys, their work caused greater physical strain or required greater skill.
* Cadburys fostered the "all-round development" of workers by extensive educational programs. After completing a compulsory academic course, workers could pursue commercial or technical training. The firm provided physical education and sports facilities.
* Characteristic of the Cadburys' commitment to social work was the Women Workers Social Service League, dedicated to improving the condition of women workers in neighboring factories. Cadburys gave workers an active voice in the firm. The spirit of

involvement and cooperation resulted in the Suggestion Scheme (1902), the Cardbox Shop Committee (1912), and, ultimately, the Works Councils (1 9 18), which were composed of equal numbers of managers and workers.

**How many appropriate today?**

* Now it is very difficult to buy a much large land.

**Brook’s Framework outlined including each of the 6 elements**

* Language
* Political system
* Education
* Religion
* Values
* Legal system

**Examination of Cadbury culture using relevant elements**

* A family atmosphere founded on religion and the personal touch prevailed in the firm. The working day began with a nondenominational morning service. "Mr. George" and "Mr. Richard" called the employees by their Christian names.
* Cadburys fostered the "all-round development" of workers by extensive educational programs. After completing a compulsory academic course, workers could pursue commercial or technical training. The firm provided physical education and sports facilities.3
* The chasm dividing "traditional" and "modern" institutions and values in classic sociology obscures nearly as much as it reveals. The pre-modern, "household" values of community, loyalty, and responsibility did not disappear as Cadburys became a large firm; the master confectioners blended them with such modern values as efficiency, innovation, and autonomy.

**Socio-Technical Review of Culture**

Socio-technical systems design (STSD) methods are an approach to design that consider human, social and organizational factors, as well as technical factors in the design of organizational systems. They have a long history and are intended to ensure that the technical and organizational aspects of a system are considered together. The outcome of applying these methods is a better understanding of how human, social and organizational factors affect the ways that work is done and technical systems are used. This understanding can contribute to the design of organizational structures, business processes and technical systems. Even though many managers realize that socio-technical issues are important, socio-technical design methods are rarely used. We suspect that the reasons for their lack of use are, primarily, difficulties in using the methods and the disconnect between these methods and both technical engineering issues, and issues of individual interaction with technical systems.

The underlying premise of socio-technical thinking is that systems design should be a process that takes into account both social and technical factors that influence the functionality and usage of computer-based systems. The rationale for adopting socio-technical approaches to systems design is that failure to do so can increase the risks that systems will not make their expected contribution to the goals of the organization. Systems often meet their technical ‘requirements’ but are considered to be a ‘failure’ because they do not deliver the expected support for the real work in the organization. The source of the problem is that techno-centric approaches to systems design do not properly consider the complex relationships between the organization, the people enacting business processes and the system that supports these processes

19th and 20th Century organizational Culture

**Brook’s Framework outlined including each of the 6 elements**

"Bournville Works Magazine, 16 (1918):

*Bournwille Works Magazine, 12 (1912): 239.*

*Edward Cadbury, Experiments in Industrial Organization (London, 1912), xvii.*