

THE GAIN WAS ALWAYS SHARED · CHAPTER EIGHT

The Field Manual

Chapter Eight of The Gain Was Always Shared

Ammanuel Santa Anna

Santa Anna, A. (2026). The Field Manual. In The Gain Was Always Shared (ch. 8). Luminous Prosperity Inc. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23989517
Luminous Library Licence 1.0 · business.hautelumiere.life/library/the-gain-was-always-shared

THE LICENCE

The Field Manual
Chapter Eight of The Gain Was Always Shared

The Gain Was Always Shared · Chapter Eight. The Haute Lumière edition, 2026. © 2026 Ammanuel Santa Anna.

Released under the Luminous Library Licence 1.0 (hautelumiere.life/library-licence): free to read, share, quote, translate and teach, non-commercially, for ever. The Author keeps every other right, including every commercial right.

Published by Luminous Prosperity Inc. for Haute Lumière. Author ORCID 0009-0008-3244-0306.

DOI 10.5281/zenodo.23989517 · this record's page: business.hautelumiere.life/library/the-gain-was-always-shared/08-the-field-manual/

Please cite as: Santa Anna, A. (2026). The Field Manual. In The Gain Was Always Shared (ch. 8). Luminous Prosperity Inc. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23989517

Chapter Eight of The Gain Was Always Shared. The whole book, with every chapter, is at business.hautelumiere.life/library/the-gain-was-always-shared (DOI https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23989502).

A NOTE BEFORE YOU READ

This work is offered for education and leadership development. It is not legal, financial, accounting, investment, medical or psychological advice; take the advice of a qualified professional who knows your circumstances. Companies and events are described from the public record as the author understands it; characterisations are the author's analysis. Examples are illustrative, and no particular outcome is promised to any reader.

ABSTRACT

The chapters before this one read gainsharing from four directions: its origin in a mill that asked first (Chapter 2), the five ways it fails (Chapter 3), the living-systems reading of it as a circulation (Chapter 4), and the published cases, figure by figure, with a composite packaging plant laid out month by month (Chapter 5). This chapter turns all of that into a sequence a leader can run. It is written for the person who will actually do the work: a plant manager, a hospital department head, the owner of a firm of eighty, the director of a public agency. It covers roughly the first eighteen months, in phases, with the weeks marked where the timing matters and left loose where it does not. For each phase it names who is involved, what is decided, and who decides it. It ends with a single page that holds the whole sequence.

CHAPTER EIGHT

The Field Manual



The Field Manual

HAUTE LUMIÈRE · THE GAIN WAS ALWAYS SHARED · CHAPTER EIGHT

How to use this chapter

The chapters before this one read gainsharing from four directions: its origin in a mill that asked first (Chapter 2), the five ways it fails (Chapter 3), the living-systems reading of it as a circulation (Chapter 4), and the published cases, figure by figure, with a composite packaging plant laid out month by month (Chapter 5). This chapter turns all of that into a sequence a leader can run.

It is written for the person who will actually do the work: a plant manager, a hospital department head, the owner of a firm of eighty, the director of a public agency. It covers roughly the first eighteen months, in phases, with the weeks marked where the timing matters and left loose where it does not. For each phase it names who is involved, what is decided, and who decides it. It ends with a single page that holds the whole sequence.

Three things should be said before the first week.

First, this is a sequence for building a participation system, and it treats a shared reward as one late stage of that system. Where the sequence reaches the design of a reward, it says only that the design is the organisation's own, made with the people it would cover and put to their vote. This book does not describe how a gain is calculated or divided. That is not modesty. The research read in Chapters 3 and 5 is consistent on the point that the design of the formula explains less about whether a plan lives than the participation around it, and the formula is the part most specific to each firm's accounts. A manual that told you how to divide a gain without knowing your books would be telling you the one thing it could not know.

Second, the timings are a recommendation drawn from the studies cited, not a finding of any one of them. Some organisations will move faster; most will find that one phase needs repeating. The order matters more than the pace.

Third, the sequence assumes the leader means it. Ammanuel Santa Anna's *Ecstatic Economics* states the condition for any practical framework in two short sentences that serve as the epigraph for this whole chapter:

> *A theory that cannot be practiced is a poem. A practice without theory is a reflex.*[59]

The previous chapters were the theory. What follows is the practice. Neither stands without the other.

The roles

Before the phases, the people. A participation system has seven roles. In a small organisation one person may hold two of them; in a large one, a role may be held by several people. What matters is that each is named, in writing, before the work begins.

The sponsor. The person with the authority to commit the organisation for at least two years: an owner, a chief executive, a board, a director-general. The sponsor's job is not to run the system. It is to protect it: to

keep it funded through a bad quarter, to stop it being cancelled by someone who arrives later, and to say in public, at the start, that it will be given time. Dong-One Kim's survey of 211 organisations with gainsharing experience associated survival with sound financial health and major capital investment alongside the plan.[60] Both are sponsor decisions. A sponsor who will not commit for two years should not start.

The unit leader. The person who runs the plant, department, clinic or office the system covers. The unit leader answers ideas the committees cannot decide, chairs the screening committee in its first months, and speaks first at the weekly meeting. This is the role that costs the most time, and the time cannot be delegated in the first ninety days, because the people covered are watching whether the person in charge actually reads what they write.

The supervisors. The people who manage the daily work of teams. Chapter 3 named the supervisor as the person a participation system most often threatens, because ideas arriving at a committee make visible what a supervisor knew and did not fix. In this manual the supervisors are briefed before anyone else, their role is redesigned before the system starts, and they are measured on one thing in the first phase: the share of their team's ideas answered on time.

The committees. A production committee for each team, shift or area, and a screening committee above them. Members from the floor are elected, not appointed; each production committee includes its supervisor; the screening committee includes the unit leader, the finance person and elected members. Committees are formed in the middle of the sequence, not at the start. The answer rule comes first, so that the committees inherit a habit rather than having to invent one.

The secretary. One person, elected from the floor, who keeps the record: every idea received, the date, the person, the answer, the date of the answer, whether it was implemented, and what happened to the measure afterwards. The secretary is the memory of the system. Chapter 5 described a firm becoming its own case study; the secretary's ledger is that study. The role should carry protected time, at least two hours a week, and the secretary should be someone the floor trusts to record a declined idea as faithfully as an adopted one.

The finance person. The person who can open the books far enough for the measure to be believed. Chapter 2 argued that both the Scanlon and Rucker plans required the firm to show its people a number they could check, and that a shared measure people cannot inspect is a promise rather than a measure. The finance person's job is to make the chosen number inspectable: where it comes from, how it is calculated, what moves it that the unit does not control. They sit on the screening committee and explain the number, in plain words, every month.

The union, where there is one. Kim's survey associated union participation in running a plan with its survival, and Jeffrey Arthur and Dong-One Kim's comparison of two plants found employees more willing to share high-risk knowledge where labour and management cooperated.[6061] Where a union represents the people covered, it is invited in before the supervisors are briefed, not after the plan is announced, and it

holds seats on the screening committee by right. Where there is no union, the elected committee members carry the same function, and the sequence should not be used to argue that a union is unnecessary.

One further role is temporary. Outside help, if it is used, is a facilitator who builds the committees and trains them, then leaves on a date set in advance. Chapter 5 resolved the disagreement between Robert Bullock and Mark Tubbs, who found outside practitioners associated with success, and Kim, who found reliance on outside consultants associated with failure to survive: use outside help to build the system, never to operate it.[6260] The leaving date is written into the facilitator's terms on the first day.

Phase one · Readiness (weeks one to four)

What happens. The sponsor and unit leader decide whether to begin. They do not announce anything.

Week one. The unit leader runs the Origin Reading from Chapter 2 with two people who do the work. One hour. The four questions: what do the people doing this work know that management does not; how is an idea answered today; is there a number this group could move and see; and is the group drawn around cooperation or around the organisation chart. The answers are written down. They become the baseline every later review returns to.

Week two. The finance person and the unit leader look at the last two years of whatever operational data exists: defects, rework, downtime, errors returned by the next team, waiting times, complaints, overtime, grievances, absence, voluntary leavers. They do not choose a measure yet. They find out what is already counted, how reliably, and how far back. A firm with eighteen months of clean monthly data has a baseline; a firm with none must start collecting now, because Chapter 9 will show that a change cannot be seen without a before.

Week three. The Five-Critique Pre-mortem from Chapter 3, run by the unit leader with one supervisor and two people the system would cover. Imagine the system abandoned two years from now; write the most likely reason under each critique; write the step that would prevent it. Any critique without a preventing step is a reason to wait.

Week four. The sponsor's decision. Four questions, answered in writing. Will the organisation commit to the system for at least two years, including through a weak quarter? Can it make a credible promise about what happens to a job that an idea removes? Is the unit financially sound enough that the system will not be read as a rescue that becomes a cut? Is there any obvious inequity in pay or treatment within the unit that a visible measure would expose?

That last question matters more than it looks. Santa Anna's book, in its discussion of pay transparency, warns that an unjust system made visible produces suspicion rather than trust, and Chapter 3's critiques and Chapter 4's reading both point the same way. A unit with a known inequity either fixes it first or names it at the start with a date for fixing it. Starting silently over it is the one choice that reliably fails.

Who decides. The sponsor decides whether to begin. The unit leader decides whether the unit is ready. If either says no, the work for the next ninety days is whatever made them say no.

What can go wrong here. Beginning because a competitor has, or because a consultant has proposed it, or because the unit is in crisis and something must be seen to happen. Chapter 2 noted that crisis can open the door to participation and cannot keep it open. A system begun in panic has to find a reason to continue once the panic passes. Write that reason down in week four.

Phase two · Supervisors first, and the union with them (weeks five to eight)

What happens. The people most able to make the system work, and most able to quietly stop it, are brought in before anyone else.

Week five. Where there is a union, the unit leader and sponsor meet its officers. They bring the Origin Reading, the pre-mortem and the sponsor's four answers. They say what they intend: a rule that every idea will be answered, a measure made visible, committees with elected members, and only later, if the first three work, a shared reward designed with the people it covers and put to their vote. They ask what the union would need for this to be something it helps run rather than something done near it. They write the answer down.

Weeks five and six. The unit leader meets each supervisor alone. One conversation each, forty-five minutes, with three parts.

The first part is the honest description of what will change. Ideas will arrive at a committee without passing only through the supervisor. Some of them will describe problems the supervisor knew about.

The second part is the new role. The supervisor becomes the person who brings the team's ideas forward and is named when they are adopted. In the first ninety days the supervisor is measured on one thing: the share of the team's ideas answered on time. Not their content, not their volume, not the defect rate.

The third part is a question: what would you need for that to be true? Time, training, cover for the shift while you attend committee, a guarantee that an old problem surfaced by a card will not be held against you. Write down each answer and give a reply to each within a week. The supervisor is about to be asked to trust a promise that every idea gets an answer. Answer theirs first.

Santa Anna's book names the principle under this phase in three words, at the head of its design principles for the workplace:

> *Vitality requires agency.*[63]

The supervisor's agency is the first to be threatened by a participation system and the first to be rebuilt. A supervisor who has been given a part to play and the means to play it is an ally. A supervisor who has been told the system exists is a closing valve.

Weeks seven and eight. All supervisors together, with union officers where present. The unit leader presents the answer rule in draft, the reporting line for ideas, and the supervisors' measure. The draft is changed by what they say. It is then fixed.

Who decides. The unit leader decides the supervisors' role and measure, after hearing them. The union decides its own participation.



Phase three · The answer rule (weeks nine to twenty-two)

HAUTE LUMIÈRE · THE GAIN WAS ALWAYS SHARED · CHAPTER EIGHT

Phase three · The answer rule (weeks nine to twenty-two)

What happens. One rule is announced to everyone, and nothing else. This is the longest phase and the most important. Everything after it depends on the habit it builds.

Week nine: the announcement. The unit leader speaks to everyone covered, in person, by shift. Five things are said and nothing more.

- Any idea, from anyone, about cost, quality, safety, waste or how the work is organised can be written on a card or entered at a terminal, and it will receive a written answer within ten working days, with a reason if it is declined.
- Who will answer it: in this phase, the supervisor for ideas within the team's own work, and the unit leader for anything wider.
- Where the answers will be posted: a board in a place everyone passes, and the same list wherever the organisation keeps its shared documents.
- What happens to a job an idea removes: the promise the sponsor made in week four, said aloud. If the promise is that nobody will lose employment because of an idea, say so and say how long it holds. If the organisation cannot promise that, say what it can promise. Do not leave it unsaid. The plant in Michael Schuster's study of up to nine years kept employment and turnover stable while productivity rose, and people will not volunteer the idea that removes their own place.[64]
- What is not being announced: there is no bonus scheme. If one is ever proposed, it will be designed with the people it would cover and put to their vote.

The last sentence costs nothing to say and removes the suspicion that the answer rule is a preliminary to a target. People who suspect a target hold back their best ideas until they see it.

Weeks nine to twenty-two: answering. The secretary is elected in week nine, from the floor, by whatever simple method the unit already uses. From the first card, the secretary records every idea and every answer.

The unit leader reads every answer before it is posted, for the first eight weeks. Not to change it. To learn what the people covered are noticing, and to see which supervisors decline without reasons. A declined idea with a reason is a good answer. "No, because the line is being replaced in March" tells the person they were heard and teaches them something about the system. A decline with no reason is the commonest way an answer rule dies.

At the weekly meeting, the unit leader speaks first, and speaks about something uncertain. Chapter 10 returns to this habit and Chapter 12 reads it as the beginning of the circulation; here the practical point is that a leader who wants ideas to move upward must show, every week, that saying something unfinished is safe.

Week fourteen: the first count. The secretary reports four numbers to everyone covered: ideas received, from how many different people, the share answered on time, and the share implemented. Post them by the board. These are the vital signs Chapter 4 named for the up-current and the answer. In the composite packaging plant of Chapter 5, ideas rose from eleven in the first month to forty in the third; a real unit

may see more or fewer. What matters is the direction, and whether the number of different people writing is rising, which shows the channel is being trusted beyond the few who would have spoken anyway.

Week twenty-two: the readiness review. The sponsor, unit leader, supervisors, secretary and union meet for two hours. Three questions. Is the answer rule being kept: is the on-time share above nine in ten? Is the number of people writing rising? Have any supervisors stopped answering? If the answer to the first is no, phase three continues until it is yes. Do not proceed to the measure while ideas wait unanswered; a visible number posted beside unanswered cards tells everyone the organisation values the number more than them.

Who decides. The unit leader decides when the answer rule is being kept. The secretary's record is the evidence, and nobody overrules the record.

Phase four · The measure, collected before anything is shared (weeks twenty-three to forty)

What happens. A number the unit can move by changing how it works is chosen, made inspectable and posted weekly. No money is attached to it.

Weeks twenty-three to twenty-six: choosing. A small group chooses the measure: the finance person, one supervisor, two people from the floor chosen by the others, and the secretary. They start from the operational data assembled in week two and the ideas received in phase three, which show where the people covered see waste and error. They apply the test from Chapter 2: if the people in this unit changed how they work, would this number move, and would they be able to see why?

Kaufman's study of 112 Improshare firms and the Hatcher and Ross plant both located much of the gain in fewer defects and less downtime.[65] Those are good candidates because the people doing the work can usually see what causes them. A financial ratio may come later. In this phase choose something close to the work and countable weekly: defects per thousand, rework hours, minutes of downtime, errors returned, waiting time, complaints.

The group also writes down, in advance, the things outside the unit's control that move the measure, and how each will be noted when it happens. A supplier change. A new machine bought by head office. A change in case mix. A contract won or lost elsewhere. Writing these down now is the defence against the fourth critique of Chapter 3, the number that moves with the weather.

Week twenty-seven: opening the books. The finance person explains the measure to everyone covered: where it comes from, how it is counted, who counts it, what it was last year. Anyone can ask to see the underlying record. Santa Anna's book, writing about pay transparency, puts the effect of this step in a single sentence:

> *The nervous system relaxes when it can see the landscape clearly.*[66]

Weeks twenty-seven onwards, the measure is posted weekly by the board where the answers go, broken down by team or line where it can be. When an implemented idea is connected to a movement in the number, the name of the person who had it is written beside the line. Chapter 4 called this the down-current reaching the person, not only the group.

Weeks twenty-seven to forty: collecting. Collect for at least three months before anything further. Six is better; twelve, counted together with whatever historical data exists, is better again. Chapter 9 explains why. A change can only be seen against a before, and a before collected deliberately, with the outside events noted, is worth more than any later argument about what the number would have been.

Week forty: the expectation. Before the committees are formed, the unit leader, secretary and finance person write down what they expect to change over the next year, by how much and by when: ideas per month, median days to answer, share implemented, and the measure. They seal it, in the sense that it is dated and filed where it cannot be revised. At the first review it is opened and compared with what happened. This one page is the most useful defence against the survivorship problem Chapter 3 described, because it prevents a firm from deciding afterwards what it had hoped for.

Who decides. The measurement group chooses the measure; the finance person decides how it is counted; nobody may change either without saying so on the board.

Phase five · The committees (weeks forty-one to fifty-two)

What happens. The answering habit passes from individuals to elected bodies, with help to build them if help is wanted.

Week forty-one: elections. Each team, shift or area elects members to its production committee. Two or three from the floor plus the supervisor is a workable size. The screening committee is formed from elected members of each production committee, the unit leader, the finance person, the secretary and, where present, union officers. The union may nominate its own seats; it should not be asked to compete for elected ones.

Weeks forty-one to fifty-two: building, with a leaving date. If outside help is used, this is when. A facilitator trains the committees to read the measure, to evaluate an idea against cost, safety and quality, to write a declined answer with a reason, and to run a meeting in which people from the floor speak as much as managers. The facilitator's leaving date was set in their terms; by week fifty-two the committees run themselves. The facilitator's last task is to watch a meeting they do not chair and say afterwards, privately, to the unit leader, what they saw.

The handover of the answer rule. From week forty-four, production committees answer ideas within the team's own work, and the screening committee answers anything wider. The unit leader answers only what the screening committee cannot decide, and says why in the answer. The ten-day rule does not lengthen. A committee that cannot meet often enough to keep it meets more often or delegates to two members between meetings.

What committees decide. Which ideas are implemented within an agreed budget limit per idea, without further approval. The limit is set by the sponsor in week forty-one and posted. Ideas above it go to the unit leader with the committee's recommendation. A committee that can implement nothing is a reporting meeting, and Chapter 3 described where those end: in the common reading of Denis Collins's six plans, plans fail less often because the formula is wrong than because participation is never real.[67]

The second-order ideas. Jeffrey Arthur and Lynda Aiman-Smith's study of four years of suggestions at one plant proposed that a maturing plan should see ideas move from fixes within a process towards ideas that question the process itself, and Arthur and Kim's comparison of two plants found that willingness to offer that riskier kind of knowledge depended on trust between labour and management.[6861] The committees should count both kinds. The secretary can mark each idea as a fix or as a question about the process. If the second kind does not grow over the year, the committee asks why, and the usual answer is that it is not yet safe to say a manager's design was wrong.

Santa Anna's book names the condition in its list of workplace design principles:

> *Vitality requires information.*[63]

The passage goes on to describe organisations that suppress feedback as losing the ability to adapt and self-correct. A committee that receives only safe ideas is receiving less information than the unit holds. The remedy is not to exhort people to be braver. It is for the unit leader to answer the first process-questioning idea with visible thanks, whatever its fate, and for the committee to implement one such idea quickly enough that everyone sees it.

Week fifty-two: the first annual review. Open the sealed expectation. Compare it line by line with the secretary's record. Write down, plainly, what was expected and did not happen, and what happened that nobody expected. Post the comparison. This is the first page of the organisation's own case study.

Who decides. The people covered decide who sits on the committees. The sponsor decides the budget limit. The committees decide within it.

Phase six · The design and the vote (months thirteen to fifteen)

What happens. If, and only if, the first year has shown the circulation working, the people covered are invited to help design a shared reward and to decide by vote whether to adopt it.

The gate. Four conditions, checked at the first annual review. The answer rule kept at nine in ten or better for six months. The number of different people contributing ideas steady or rising. The measure visible weekly for at least six months, with outside events noted. Committees meeting as scheduled and implementing ideas within their limit. If any condition is not met, the design waits. The work is whatever condition is unmet. Chapter 2's test applies: a firm that has not learned to ask and answer will find that a formula imposed on silence produces mostly suspicion.

The design group. Elected members of the screening committee, the finance person, the unit leader, union officers where present, and anyone the committees co-opt. Outside help may advise; it does not draft.

What the group decides. The design of the shared reward is the organisation's own. It is made with the people it would cover, from the organisation's own books, and this book does not describe how a gain is calculated or divided. What the group must also decide, and write down before any vote, are the rules around the design, because these are where Chapter 3 found trust is won or lost:

- the base the design compares against, and the evidence that it was a normal period;
- the written rule for when and how that base may change, including how capital investment and new equipment will be treated;
- the outside events that will be adjusted for, and how, using the list written in phase four;
- who is covered, drawn around the people whose cooperation produces the gain;
- what happens to the design on a change of ownership or management;
- the date of the first review and who conducts it.

Kim's survey associated survival with employee approval by vote, union participation and a small bonus group; Bullock and Tubbs found employee involvement in design and employees' favourability towards the plan among the predictors of success.[6062] Christine Cooper, Bruno Dyck and Norman Frohlich's 1992 article in *Administrative Science Quarterly* gave its subject in its title: improving the effectiveness of gainsharing through fairness and participation.[69] And Luis Gomez-Mejia, Theresa Welbourne and Robert Wiseman's theoretical model of gainsharing, published in 2000, framed a plan as an arrangement in which employees accept a share of compensation risk.[70] Read together, these sources point the same way. People are being asked to accept a measure of risk in exchange for a share of something they help create. They will accept it more readily, and defend it longer, when they wrote the rules about how the risk works.

The vote. Everyone the design would cover votes, by secret ballot, on the design and its rules together. The threshold for adoption is set before the ballot and posted. If the vote fails, the design group asks why, in writing, and either revises or stops. A failed vote is information, not defeat. The answer rule, the measure and the committees continue whatever the result. They were never conditional on it.

Who decides. The people covered decide by vote. The sponsor decides whether the organisation can afford the design the group proposes, and says so before the ballot, not after.



Phase seven · The first review, and the plateau (months sixteen to eighteen, and after)

HAUTE LUMIÈRE · THE GAIN WAS ALWAYS SHARED · CHAPTER EIGHT

Phase seven · The first review, and the plateau (months sixteen to eighteen, and after)

The first review. Three to six months after any design takes effect, the screening committee, sponsor and union review it against its written rules. The questions are factual. Were the rules kept? Did any outside event move the measure, and was it adjusted for as agreed? Did the answer rule hold, or did attention move to the money? Did employment hold? Did any role disappear because of an implemented idea, and where did the person go? The review is posted.

The plateau. Robert Kaufman's Improshare firms reported gains that rose to a cumulative seventeen and a half per cent by the third year and then levelled off.[65] Every system reaches the point where the obvious ideas have been found. Chapter 3 named this as the moment a plan becomes a fixed cost with no visible return, and is cut in the first bad quarter.

The response is to widen what people can see and change. Kim's survey associated retraining and new-employee training with survival, through their effect on performance.[60] In practice this means three things.

- Training that teaches the economics of the next process up and down the line, so that a team that has exhausted ideas about its own work can see the waste at its boundaries.
- Rotation of committee members across areas, so that people carry knowledge between teams.
- A deliberate search, led by the committees, for second-order ideas: questions about whether a process should exist at all.

New arrivals. Every person who joins the unit is told, in their first week, how ideas are answered, where the measure is posted and how the committees work. They are given the secretary's last three months of records to read. A system that is only understood by those who were present at its founding ages with them.

Surviving a change of control

The last phase is not a phase in time. It is a provision made at the start that matters only on the day it is needed.

Plans end because firms are sold, departments are merged, leaders leave and new ones arrive who did not choose the system. Chapter 4 described the supervisor as the closing valve inside a unit; a new owner or chief executive is the closing valve above it. Santa Anna's book, writing about workplaces that move from hierarchy towards distributed authority, gives the reason a plan is vulnerable at exactly this point:

> *The transition from traditional hierarchy to distributed authority is a developmental process, not a structural flip*[71]

A new leader who has not lived through the development sees only the structure, and a structure whose reasons are invisible looks like cost. Four provisions make the reasons visible.

A written charter. A document, adopted by the sponsor and the screening committee in phase five, that records why the system exists, what it has done, and what any future leader must do before ending it: at least ninety days' notice, a meeting with the screening committee, and a written answer to the committee's reply. It cannot bind a future owner absolutely. It can make ending the system a deliberate act rather than an oversight.

The record. The secretary's ledger, the sealed expectations and the posted reviews are the evidence a new leader will need. Keep them where they will be found, in plain language, with the before-and-after figures for the measure and for employment.

The union, or the elected committee. Where a union helps run the system, its role does not depend on management's continuity. Kim's association between union participation and survival may partly reflect this.[60] Where there is no union, the elected committee members should hold the charter jointly with management.

Ownership. The most durable protection is a structure that changes who holds the firm. The companion book in this lineage on employee ownership, employee ownership, reads the evidence on what happens when people own part of the firm as well as share in a measure, and the companion on patient capital, patient capital, reads how ownership horizons shape what firms keep. A leader who wants a participation system to outlast them should read both.

The calendar on one page

PHASE	WEEKS	WHAT HAPPENS	WHO DECIDES
1 · Readiness	1–4	Origin Reading; data inventory; Five-Critique Pre-mortem; sponsor's four answers	Sponsor; unit leader
2 · Supervisors first	5–8	Union officers met; each supervisor met alone; supervisors' role and measure fixed	Unit leader; union
3 · The answer rule	9–22	One rule announced; secretary elected; every idea answered in ten working days; first count at week 14; review at week 22	Unit leader, on the secretary's record
4 · The measure	23–40	Measure chosen; books opened; weekly posting; outside events noted; collection; sealed expectation	Measurement group; finance person
5 · Committees	41–52	Elections; outside help builds and leaves; answer rule handed to committees; first annual review	People covered; sponsor sets limit
6 · Design and vote	Months 13–15	Gate checked; design group; rules written; secret ballot	People covered, by vote; sponsor on affordability
7 · Review and plateau	Months 16–18 and after	First review; training across boundaries; second-order ideas; induction	Screening committee; sponsor; union
Change of control	From phase 5	Charter; record; union or committee holds the charter; ownership considered	Sponsor and screening committee

What this sequence is for

Read quickly, eighteen months of procedure can look like caution. It is closer to the opposite. Each phase gives the people covered time to discover that the previous one was safe before the next asks more of them: to write an idea and see it answered, to see a number and believe it, to elect a committee and watch it decide something, and only then to accept a measure of risk in a design they helped write. Phase by phase, the organisation is building the circulation Chapter 4 described, and building it in the order in which trust can carry it.

Chapter 9 turns to the other half of the practice: how to know whether any of it worked, and how to read the evidence honestly when the result is mixed. Chapter 10 gives the conversations this sequence requires, with the board, the union, the supervisors and the sceptics, in words a leader can use. The Appendix gathers every Tool in this book into one workbook, with a ninety-day plan that matches phases one to three.

The leader who runs this sequence will spend most of the first year doing small things: reading cards, writing answers, posting a number, sitting in meetings where someone from the night shift explains a machine. That is the work. The cheque, if one ever comes, will only confirm what the record already shows.

The Tool: The Eighteen-Month Field Sheet

One sheet, kept by the unit leader and the secretary together, reviewed at the end of each phase. Every line is a date, a name or a count.

Roles (named in week one)

Sponsor: · committed until (date, at least two years):

Unit leader:

Supervisors:

Union officers, if any:

Secretary (elected week nine): · protected hours per week: ___

Finance person:

Outside help, if any: · leaving date written in their terms:

Phase one · Readiness (weeks 1–4)

Origin Reading done (date): · with whom:

Operational data available, measure by measure, and months of history:

Pre-mortem done (date): · critiques without a preventing step:

Sponsor's four answers: two-year commitment yes / no · promise on removed jobs (in words): · financially sound yes / no · known inequities and the date they will be fixed:

Decision to begin: yes / not yet · if not yet, the reason and the work for the next ninety days:

Phase two · Supervisors first (weeks 5–8)

Union officers met (date): · what they asked for:

- Each supervisor met alone: ___ of ___ · requests made: ___ · requests answered within a week: ___
- Supervisors' first-phase measure, as fixed: share of team's ideas answered on time

Phase three · The answer rule (weeks 9–22)

Announcement date: · the five points said by shift: yes / no

Answer window: ___ working days · where answers are posted:

- Week 14 count: ideas ___ · different people ___ · answered on time ___ % · implemented ___ %
- Week 22 review: on-time share ___ % (proceed at nine in ten or better) · different people rising yes / no · decision: proceed / continue phase three

Phase four · The measure (weeks 23–40)

Measure chosen: · who counts it: · books opened to all (date):

Outside events that move it, and how each will be noted:

- Months of baseline collected before phase five: ___

Sealed expectation filed (date): · where:

Phase five · Committees (weeks 41–52)

Elections held (date): · committees formed: ___

Committee budget limit per idea, set by sponsor:

Outside help left on (date): · as planned yes / no

- Ideas this year marked as fixes ___ · as questions about the process ___

First annual review (date): · expectation opened and compared yes / no · posted yes / no

Phase six · Design and vote (months 13–15)

- Gate: answer rule ≥ nine in ten for six months yes / no · contributors steady or rising yes / no · measure posted six months yes / no · committees implementing yes / no

Design group members:

- Rules written before the ballot: base and evidence · base-change rule · capital investment · outside events · who is covered · change of control · first review date (tick each)

Sponsor's statement on affordability, before ballot (date):

Ballot date: · threshold set in advance: · result:

Phase seven · Review and plateau (months 16–18)

First review (date): · rules kept yes / no · employment held yes / no · roles removed by ideas and where each person went:

Boundary training started (date): · committee rotation yes / no

- New arrivals inducted into the system in their first week: ___ of ___

Change of control

Charter adopted (date): · held jointly by:

Record stored at:

Ownership options considered (date, and by whom):

A note on method

The sequence, timings, roles and thresholds in this chapter (ten working days, nine in ten answered on time, the phase lengths) are this book's recommendations drawn from the studies cited. They are not findings of any one study.

References

1. Santa Anna, A. *Ecstatic Economics: Wealth Creation Rooted in Vitality, Not Extraction*, chapter 4, "Practical Applications of Ecstatic Economics". The Luminous Developmental Canon, Luminous Prosperity Inc.
2. Kim, D.-O. (1999). Determinants of the survival of gainsharing programs. *ILR Review*, 53(1), 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/001979399905300102. A 1992 survey of 211 organisations; its associations are correlational and cannot show that any factor caused a plan to survive. The phasing in this chapter is this book's, not Kim's.
3. Arthur, J. B., & Kim, D.-O. (2005). Gainsharing and knowledge sharing: The effects of labour–management co-operation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(9), 1564–1582. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190500239077. Two locations with similarly structured plans; the authors report that results "generally support" their hypotheses, and two sites cannot establish a general rule.
4. Bullock, R. J., & Tubbs, M. E. (1990). A case meta-analysis of gainsharing plans as organization development interventions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 26(3), 383–404. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886390263011. Thirty-three published cases; published cases over-represent successes, and the review cannot test a sequence of implementation.
5. Santa Anna, A. *Ecstatic Economics*, chapter 4, "Design Principles for Vitality-Centered Workplaces".
6. Schuster, M. (1984). The Scanlon Plan: A longitudinal analysis. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 20(1), 23–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/002188638402000107. One plant; stable employment there does not show that a plan guarantees it elsewhere.
7. Kaufman, R. T. (1992). The effects of Improshare on productivity. *ILR Review*, 45(2), 311–322. https://doi.org/10.1177/001979399204500208. Self-reported results from 112 firms still known to use the plan in 1988; firms that had abandoned it are under-represented. The Hatcher and Ross plant is cited in Chapter 5 and Chapter 9.
8. Santa Anna, A. *Ecstatic Economics*, chapter 4, "Compensation Transparency and Felt Fairness".
9. Collins, D. (1998). *Gainsharing and power: Lessons from six Scanlon plans*. Cornell University Press. https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501722622. Six plans; the characterisation here follows the book's chapter structure and its common reading, and the full text was not re-read.
10. Arthur, J. B., & Aiman-Smith, L. (2001). Gainsharing and organizational learning: An analysis of employee suggestions over time. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 737–754. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069413. One plant over four years; the distinction between fixes and process-questioning ideas follows the framework the article proposes, not a re-reading of its results.
11. Cooper, C. L., Dyck, B., & Frohlich, N. (1992). Improving the effectiveness of gainsharing: The role of fairness and participation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(3), 471–490. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393453. Cited for its stated subject only; its methods and findings were not read for this chapter, and nothing here should be taken as reporting them.
12. Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Welbourne, T. M., & Wiseman, R. M. (2000). The role of risk sharing and risk taking under gainsharing. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 492. https://doi.org/10.2307/259306. A theoretical model offering propositions; it presents no new data, and the practical reading here is this book's.
13. Santa Anna, A. *Ecstatic Economics*, chapter 4 (variant), "Self-Management and Distributed Authority".

The Field Manual

Ammanuel Santa Anna · Luminous Prosperity Inc. · Haute Lumière

Set in Cormorant Garamond and Manrope.

Read the Business Library at business.hautelumiere.life/library.

Luminous Library Licence 1.0 · hautelumiere.life/library-licence

REQUEST A CONVERSATION

business.hautelumiere.life/book/?kind=gainshare

The Business Library

business.hautelumiere.life/library/

The packages

hautelumiere.life/pricing/