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ADVANTAGES OF PARTICIPATION

Advantages that can be derived from the participative concept if applied properly has been grouped under two different heads:

a) Sharing of information; and
b) Sharing of decision.

a) Sharing of information

Sharing of information is an essential part for the successful implementation of the concept of Participative Management. The employer who fails to welcome the union and the workers' representatives on the board of management as a channel of information is injuring himself both directly and indirectly. He creates the suspicion that his facts will not stand up under examination by the workers' representatives and provides reasons for ill will and resentment on the part of union and workers' representatives whom he tries to by-pass.

There are examples of facts twisted to suit a programme of agitation or facts half told in order to create conflict between employer and employee. The more restrictions imposed on the sources of information to workers' representatives, the more dramatic and
unfavourable has been their use of the fragments they did obtain, and the more persistent and circuitous have been their methods of obtaining what they could use. Frankness toward the so-called labour politician helps the manager to become a labour statesman.

Sharing of information also helps toward improved quality of managerial decisions. It is seldom if ever possible for managers to have knowledge of all alternatives and all consequences related to the decisions which they take. Because of existence of barriers to the upward flow of information in most enterprises, much valuable information possessed by subordinates never reaches their managers. Participation tends to break down the barriers, making the information available to managers, to the extent that such information alters the decisions which managers take and the quality of their decisions may thereby be improved.

b) Sharing decision

Since managers are those who accomplish results through subordinates, the latter are always directly and intimately affected by managerial decisions and therefore, they may have considerable interest in them. Because of this possible interest, subordinates may have a strong desire, particularly in a nation like India with
deeply ingrained democratic traditions, to participate in the
determination of matters affecting them.

A question may crop up in mind, whether it will be beneficial
on the part of an enterprise to share the managerial decisions with
the workers. To answer this question, it will be necessary to indicate
the fact that a manager of an enterprise will attempt to make a selec-
tion from alternatives related to any problem which will maximize
results at a given cost. Guided by this criterion of rationality,
managers will find it advantageous to use participation. Advantages
which may stem from the use of participation as a managerial device
are:

a) Higher rate of output and increased quality of products
   (including reduced spoilage and wastage) as a result of
greater personal effort and attention on the part of
workers, reduction in turnover, absenteeism and
tardiness.

b) Reduction in the number of grievances and more peaceful
   manager-subordinate and manager-union relations.

c) Participation makes people more mature and responsible
   individuals, both on and off the job, by being allowed
to express himself in his work, rather than being absorbed
into a complex system of procedures and systems. The
individual assumes a feeling of dignity and status. If
he knows he can express his opinions and ideas, a personal
sense of gratification and involvement takes place within
him and tends to manifest itself in his personality.

d) It also leads to increased understanding throughout the
organization. People learn that others have also problems
besides themselves. If the workers are invited to share
in these problems and to work towards common solutions,
a great degree of organizational balance occurs because
of decreased misunderstanding and individual and group
conflict.

e) Individual creativity and response to job challenges are
also enhanced by participation. If given the opportunity
to question and suggest instead of always having to follow
a rigid set of instructions, an employee's natural ingenuity
and ability are allowed expression. Hence, he is given the
opportunity to grow and to develop himself.

f) People who are consulted about changes, who are allowed to
participate in decisions about the changes, are normally
people who best adjust to such decisions. When changes
are arbitrarily introduced from above without explanation,
subordinates tend to feel insecure and take counter measures
aimed at a sabotage of the innovations.

g) It generates greater ease in the management of workers.
Fewer managers may be necessary, the need for close
supervision may be reduced and less disciplinary action
may be called for. Workers who have participated in the
process leading toward a determination of matters directly
affecting them may have a greater sense of responsibility
with respect to the performance of their assigned tasks
and may be more willing to accept the authority of their
superiors.
CONCLUSION

Management generally interprets participation as joint consultation prior to decision making. In fact, administrators and experts regard it as association of workers with management without the final authority or responsibility in decision making. But there should be no confusion that participation is different from consultation. There may be a strong and powerful consultative machinery established in factories, but it can never serve as a machinery for participation since the power to decide will rest with the employer. If it is participation, the power to decide should only rest with the machinery established for this purpose. Its essence lies in the firm belief and confidence in the individual, in his capacity for growth and earning, in his ability to contribute significantly with his hands, head as well as his heart — and this implies discarding the narrow conventional out-look of antagonism of interests and substituting in its place a community of purpose and extending unqualified co-operation in promoting the well-being of the worker, management and industry.
Participation helps to develop two-way psychological and social relationship among people; it is more than a procedure for imposing ideas from above. On the above, it uses the creativity of all employees. The worker is to feel that the unit is his and that the success of the unit is his main concern. The manager is to be a friend and guide of the worker, he has to get best out of him by being not an autocrat or an unfailing critic but a great helper and promoter of the workers' good.

If the desire of self-expression and recognition of the worker can be channelised properly it will take a constructive form and enhance the production. On the other hand, if it is restrained it will turn to destructive and effect the industrial harmony. While considering the participative concept we should not forget that we are reaching a stage when there would be no sharp line of difference between the management and the workers and both would like to associate themselves in every phase of activity. For a healthy development of this concept it is essential that all information both technical and general should be available to both sides for having better industrial relation and better production. It should be an open diplomacy rather than a concealed one in man-management relations.

The main conclusion of this study is that Indian managers are not yet ready to welcome the concept of participative management and
if the present policy of voluntary implementation is allowed, workers' will not have a sound foothold in the management within 20th century. Along with other steps government should immediately try to implement this scheme with mandatory provisions at least initially in the Government owned enterprises numbering over 514 and holding 48% of the total paid-up capital. Participation should be allowed at all level - from Board room to the shop floor and workers' representatives should have the right to question every action of the management. Experts and specialists must take decisions in consultation with the council. While management will have full right to manage, it will be their duty to execute collective decisions and translate them into action.

In the absence of sufficient information it will not be proper to comment that the Indian experience on Joint Management Councils has proved unsuccessful. However, it can be said that till now concerted effort has not been made either by the government or by the managements of public and private enterprises to implement this concept. No new industrial law has been framed by the government for its improvement, which is much needed - an action which has been taken by most countries of the world where this concept has been successfully applied. Some of the problems encountered in the implementation of the scheme are similar to the more general experience.
with Works Committees, hence it cannot be said that special 
problems cropped up only in the case of Joint Management Councils. 
It is also quite possible that in the units where JMCs have not 
succeeded up to the mark, it is not unlikely that in the absence 
of JMC system situation in these industries might have been worse. 

It remains a fact that the scheme of Workers' Participation 
in Management which National Commission on Labour proposed has not 
been implemented by the authorities in letter and spirit. In the 
industrial units studied, it was my common experience that most 
of the people from top manager to worker, have very little idea 
about the working of joint management system. This shows that either 
no steps have been taken to educate the workers and managers about 
the system or steps taken are inadequate. 

While considering the best means of encouraging the deve-
lopment of Participative Management practices it is necessary to 
assume that willingness on the part of the administrators and managers 
to delegate or share authority will continue to be limited for a 
long time to come and there will be a limited willingness on the 
part of the unions to take responsibility for the conduct of the 
organisation. This unwillingness is due not only to potential
conflicts of interest between management and unions, but also to the unions' internal limitations. Some of these conditions will definitely change with the general economic development of the country.

From the present analysis and past experience, the first impression may be very discouraging but a comparative analysis with the conditions of other countries of the world shows that its future is not so bleak as apprehended by certain quarters. In the early stage of industrialisation, it is natural to have strained relation between workers and managers but this condition has improved in all the developing countries through co-operation of both the groups. In those countries government regulations have played a vital role to make the joint management a success. In India everything is left at the discretion of the industrialists who due to their prejudices will never like to give up their power voluntarily to the joint management council, even in the greater interest of the country.

Today the whole concept of man-management is undergoing a fundamental change, the trade union leaders and the managers have a greater role to play to stabilise the industrial harmony of the
country through industrial democracy. For the Managers the
code should be - make the workers partner, give them respon-
sibility and let them feel as owner while trade union leaders
should ensure peace in the industry and prosperity of the nation.