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Introduction
Workers’ participation in management is an important part of human relations because it offers an enormous potential for higher productivity. The term participation” has different meanings for different purposes in different situations. McGregor are of the view that participation is one of the most misunderstood ideas that has emerged from the field of human relations. Keith Davis has defined the term “participation” “as the mental and emotional involvement of a person in a group situation, which encourages him to contribute to group goals and share responsibilities in them” In general terms, the object of workers’ participation implies the mental and emotional involvement of a worker in a group situation which encourages him to contribute to group goals and share responsibilities in them. Labor participation in the management of the business provides some ‘status’ and a feeling of self importance to the employees of the organization. Such participation leads to better industrial relations. Workers are encouraged to give their best to the organization. Productivity increases and a sense of belonging to the industry grow. Hence, for peaceful evolution of the economy on democratic basis, it is essential that the workers’ participation in the management should be recognized as a fundamental principle.

Objectives of Participation
The scope and the extent of workers participation depends on the objectives set to be achieved from the participative machinery in an organization. The aims of participation will tend to vary among countries due to differences in political, social and economic contexts. For instance, in India, the expectation of workers from participation will tend to vary among countries due to differences in political, social and economic contexts. For instance, in India, the expectation of workers from participation is to maximize profits; the government considers it as a means of increasing productivity and a part of dispute-resolving machinery. In our country, it has been mainly viewed as a means of information sharing concerning balance sheet, production, and economic condition of the plant and a process of consultation on certain matters such as welfare programmers, safety, and methods of work.
Pre-Requisites for Effective Participation
The pre-requisites for the success of any scheme of participative management are
- Firstly, there should be a strong, democratic and representative unionism for the success of participative management.
- Secondly, there should be mutually agreed and clearly formulated objectives for participation to succeed.
- Thirdly, there should be a feeling of participation at all levels. The working environment must be congenial enough to create a participatory culture.
- Fourthly, there should be effective consultation of the workers by the management to inculcate enthusiasm in them in the formulation of policies that affect them directly.
- Fifthly, a relationship based on mutual trust and respect is essential for effective participation.
- Sixthly, education and training make a significant contribution to the purposeful working of participative management. Employers, trade unions and the government can play a major and meaningful role in organizing and conducting training programs and in developing the necessary skills in the representatives of workers and employees.
- Lastly, forums of participation, areas of participation and guidelines for implementation of decisions should be specific and there should be prompt follow-up action and feedback.

Objectives of the Study
1. To know the opinion of respondents towards Workers’ participation in Management.
2. To compile the profile of the respondents.
3. To know the opinion of respondents towards their working conditions and their Job Satisfaction.
4. To measure the loyalty status of employees.
5. To relate workers’ participation with organizational efficiency.
6. To study the relationship between the employer and employee.
   To make suggestions.

Scope of the Study
Workers’ participation can serve a number of purposes, all geared to achieve organizational effectiveness and the satisfaction of the employees. Workers’ participation can encourage communication at all levels. Joint decision making ensure that there will be minimum industrial conflict and economic growth can be free from distracting strike.
Participation is possible at all levels of management. It depends upon the nature of functions; the strength of the workers, varieties of depends upon the nature of function, the strength of the worker, varieties of departments, attitudes of trade unions and the management. There are four stages of participation they are informative and associative participation, consultative participation, administrative participation and decision participation.

**Research Methodology**

As for the research design, **Descriptive research** is used in this research. Descriptive research is a research which specific prediction is made, the percentage of units in a specified population exhibiting a certain behavior is measured and the characteristic of relevant group is described.

**Sampling Design**

The way of selecting a sample is known as the sample design. Here the researcher used simple random sampling.

**Sample Size**

A sample of 85 was taken from the total population (425).

**Data Collection**

The study is based on the collection of primary data from different participative workers. An Interview schedule is prepared to elicit information from different workers. Required data collected on personal observation apart from the oral information. Secondary sources are used to support the primary data; percentage bar diagram and chi-square test are also used for analysis of data.

**Data Collection**

- Primary data is collected by means of interview schedule.
- Secondary data are collected through the booklets, websites and company reports.

Structured schedule was designed with the guidance of the organization for getting information from the workers. The respondents were met personally at the time of data collection. The schedule of interview was filled by the research himself in this survey method.

**Tools Used for Analysis**

In this study statistical tools are used

- Percentage analysis
- Correlation analysis
Chi-square test
One-way analysis of variance

Theoretical Background

Workers’ Participation in Management

Workers’ participation in management is an essential ingredient of Industrial democracy. The concept of workers’ participation in management is based on Human Relations approach to Management which brought about a new set of values to labour and management.

Traditionally the concept of Workers’ Participation in Management (WPM) refers to participation of non-managerial employees in the decision-making process of the organization. Workers’ participation is also known as ‘labour participation’ or ‘employee participation’ in management. In Germany it is known as co-determination while in Yugoslavia it is known as self-management. The International Labour Organization has been encouraging member nations to promote the scheme of Workers’ Participation in Management.

Workers’ participation in management implies mental and emotional involvement of workers in the management of Enterprise. It is considered as a mechanism where workers have a say in the decision-making.

Definition

According to Keith Davis, Participation refers to the mental and emotional involvement of a person in a group situation which encourages him to contribute to group goals and share the responsibility of achievement.

According to Walpole, Participation in Management gives the worker a sense of importance, pride and accomplishment; it gives him the freedom of opportunity for self-expression; a feeling of belongingness with the place of work and a sense of workmanship and creativity.

The concept of workers’ participation in management encompasses the following:

- It provides scope for employees in decision-making of the organization.
- The participation may be at the shop level, departmental level or at the top level.
- The participation includes the willingness to share the responsibility of the organization by the workers.

Features of WPM

1. Participation means mental and emotional involvement rather than mere physical presence.
2. Workers participate in management not as individuals but collectively as a group through their representatives.

3. Workers’ participation in management may be formal or informal. In both the cases it is a system of communication and consultation whereby employees express their opinions and contribute to managerial decisions.

4. There can be 5 levels of Management Participation or WPM:
   a. **Information participation**: It ensures that employees are able to receive information and express their views pertaining to the matter of general economic importance.
   b. **Consultative importance**: Here workers are consulted on the matters of employee welfare such as work, safety and health. However, final decision always rests with the top-level management, as employees’ views are only advisory in nature.
   c. **Associative participation**: It is an extension of consultative participation as management here is under the moral obligation to accept and implement the unanimous decisions of the employees. Under this method the managers and workers jointly take decisions.
   d. **Administrative participation**: It ensures greater share of workers’ participation in discharge of managerial functions. Here, decisions already taken by the management come to employees, preferably with alternatives for administration and employees have to select the best from those for implementation.
   e. **Decisive participation**: Highest level of participation where decisions are jointly taken on the matters relating to production, welfare etc.

**Objectives of WPM**
1. To establish Industrial Democracy.
2. To build the most dynamic Human Resources.
3. To satisfy the workers’ social and esteem needs.
4. To strengthen labour-management co-operation and thus maintain Industrial peace and harmony.
5. To promote increased productivity for the advantage of the organization, workers and the society at large.
6. Its psychological objective is to secure full recognition of the workers.

**Essential condition for WPM**

The success of workers portion in management depends upon the following conditions.
• The attitude and outlook of the parties should be enlightened and impartial so that a free and frank exchange of thoughts and opinions could be possible. Where a right kind of attitude exists and proper atmosphere prevails the process of participation is greatly stimulated.

• Both parties should have a genuine faith in the system and in each other and be willing to work together. The management must give the participating institution its right place in the managerial organization of the undertaking and implementing the policies of the undertaking. The labor, on the other hand, must also whole heartedly co-operate with the management through its trade unions. The foremen and supervisory cadre must also lend their full support so that the accepted policies could be implemented without any resentment on either side.

• Participation should be real. The issues related to increase in production and productivity, evaluation of costs, development of personnel, and expansion of markets should also be brought under the jurisdiction of the participating bodies. These bodies should meet frequently and their decisions should be timely implemented and strictly adhered to. Further,

• Participation must work as complementary body to help collective bargaining, which creates conditions of work and also creates legal relations.

• There should be a strong trade union, which has learnt the virtues of unit and self-reliance so that they may effectively take part in collective bargaining or participation.

• A peaceful atmosphere should be there wherein there are no strikes and lock-outs, for their presence ruins the employees, harms the interest of the society, and puts the employees to financial losses.

• Authority should be centralized through democratic management process. The participation should be at the two or at the most three levels.

• Programs for training and education should be developed comprehensively. For this purpose, Labor is to be given education not to the head alone, not to the heart alone, not to the hands alone, but it is dedicated to the three; to make the workers think, feel and act. Labor is to be educated to enable him to think clearly, rationally and logically; to enable him to feel deeply and emotionally; and to enable him to act in a responsible way.

Implications of Workers Participation in Management
The implications of workers’ participation in management have been summarized by the International Labour Organization thus:

1. Workers have ideas which can be useful.
2. Upward communication facilitates sound decision-making. Workers may accept decisions better if they participate in them.
3. Workers may work more intelligently if they are informed about the reasons for and the intention of decisions that are taken in a participative atmosphere.
4. Workers may work harder if they share in decisions that affect them.
5. Workers participation may foster a more cooperative attitude amongst workers and management thus raising efficiency by improving team spirit and reducing the loss of efficiency arising from industrial disputes.
6. Workers participation may act as a spur to managerial efficiency.

Worker’s participation in management has assumed great importance these days because of the following advantages:

1. **Reduced industrial unrest**: Industrial conflict is a struggle between two organized groups which are motivated by the belief that their respective interests are endangered by the self-interested behavior of the other. Participation cuts at this very root of industrial conflict. It tries to remove or at least minimize the diverse and conflicting interests between the parties, by substituting in their place, cooperation, homogeneity of objects and common interests. Both sides are integrated and decisions arrived at becomes “ours” rather than “theirs”.

2. **Reduced misunderstanding**: Participation helps dispelling employee’s misunderstanding about the outlook of management in industry.

3. **Increased organization balance**: If worker are invited to share in organizational problems, and to work towards common solutions, a greater degree of organizational balance occurs because of decreased misunderstanding of individual and group conflict. Participation leads to increased understanding throughout the organization. People learn that others have problems beside themselves.

4. **Higher productivity**: Increased productivity is possible only when there exists fullest co-operation between labor and management. It has been empirically tested that poor ‘labor management relations’ do not encourage the workers to contribute anything more than the minimum desirable to retain their jobs. Thus, participation of workers in management is essential to increase industrial productivity.

5. **Increased Commitment**: An important prerequisite for forging greater commitment is the individual’s involvement and opportunity to express himself. Participation allows individuals to express themselves at the work place rather than being absorbed into a complex system of rules, procedures and systems. If an individual knows that he can express his opinion and ideas, a personal sense of gratification and involvement takes place within him. This, in turn, fortifies his identification with the organization resulting in greater commitment.
6. Industrial democracy: Participation helps to usher in an era of democracy in industry. It is based on the principle of recognition of the human factor. It tends to reduce class conflict between capital and labor. It also serves as a support to political democracy.

7. Development of Individuals: Participation enhances individual creativity and response to job challenges. Individuals are given an opportunity to direct their initiative and creativity towards the objectives of the group. This facilitates individual growth.

8. Less resistance to change: when changes are arbitrarily introduced from above without explanation, subordinates tend to feel insecure and take counter measures aimed at sabotage of innovations. But when they have participated in the decision making process, they have had an opportunity to be heard. They know what to expect and why. Their resistance to change is reduced.

The realization of workers’ need for participation in the management is influenced by the following factors:

1. Technology adoption leading to complexity in production process calls for increased worker cooperation.
2. Employees are no longer treated as subservient but are treated as equals.
3. Growing influence of union prevents exploitation of employees by management.
4. There are regulations and legislations that facilitate increased workers participation in management.
5. Higher levels of productivity and efficiency can only come through motivated and committed employees.

Workers’ Participation in Management in India

Workers’ participation in Management in India was given importance only after Independence. Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was the first step in this direction, which recommended for the setting up of works committees. The joint management councils were established in 1950 which increased the labour participation in management. Since July 1975 the two-tier participation called shop councils at shop level and Joint councils were introduced.

Workers’ participation in Management Bill, 1990 was introduced in Parliament which provided scope for upliftment of workers.

Reasons for failure of workers participation movement in India

1. Employers resist the participation of workers in decision-making. This is because they feel that workers are not competent enough to take decisions.
2. Workers’ representatives who participate in management have to perform the dual roles of workers’ spokesman and a co-manager. Very few representatives are competent enough to assume the two incompatible roles.

3. Generally Trade Unions’ leaders who represent workers are also active members of various political parties. While participating in management they tend to give priority to political interests rather than the workers’ cause.

4. Schemes of workers’ participation have been initiated and sponsored by the Government. However, there has been a lack of interest and initiative on the part of both the trade unions and employers.

5. In India, labour laws regulate virtually all terms and conditions of employment at the workplace. Workers do not feel the urge to participate in management, having an innate feeling that they are born to serve and not to rule.

6. The focus has always been on participation at the higher levels, lower levels have never been allowed to participate much in the decision-making in the organizations.

7. The unwillingness of the employer to share powers with the workers’ representatives, the disinterest of the workers and the perfunctory attitude of the government towards participation in management act as stumbling blocks in the way of promotion of participative management.

Review of Literature

Salyadein, (1973) says that Worker participation is different and there seems to be general agreement that participation means Sharing, in an appropriate way the decision making power with the lower level in the organization. It provides Workers a sense of importance pride, freedom, and opportunity for self expression, a feeling of belongingness so as to create positive condition for industrial relation.

Dessler (1977) Worker participation in management is a mental and Emotional involvement of a Worker in a group situation which encourages him to contribute to goal and share responsibilities in them. It crystallizes the concept of industrial democracy and indicates an attempt on the part of Workers to build his Workers into a team which work towards the realization of common objectives to achieve a common goal.

Memorial, (1991) stated that Worker participation in management is attaining industrial democracy by ensuring the total involvement of the Workers in achieving the organizational goal of the enterprises. It results which increase the scope for workers share of influence in decision making at different of the organizational hierarchy with concomitant assumptions of responsibility.

Henema, (1993) briefly describes that Worker participation is a geared to achieve organizational effectiveness and the satisfaction of Worker is a method designed to
generate among Workers and this helps in motivating Worker to achieve organizational goal, it ensures joint responsibility and co-operation to optimally utilize the limited resources available to the management.

Srivastava, (1994) stated that, Worker participation is of institutional and formal arrangements resulting into the creation of various participative forms to associate Worker representatives with management, participation management refers to managers specific style in which he interacts with the Workers, it can mutual trust, information sharing and problem solving.

Mannan (1994) explains that Worker participation is to authorize Workers to take part in managerial functions and they may be given power to plan to make decision about their own work. These are formal ways in which Worker can participate in the management process, Workers are active in the process of decision making, provides education to Worker. It fosters initiative and creativity among them.

Mittal, (1996) Worker participation is to considered imperative for organization to cope with the myriad changes in the environment and make the rising expectation of Workers compatible with the requirements of high performance needs to identify centre of responsibility of decision implementation in the existing organizational structure so as to avoid situations where management may give their priority and time frame for implementation of the decision.

Mathur (1998) suggested that Worker participation occurs when superiors are required to share with subordinates the authority for making decision, which affect them or their work output. It may occur at the work group level or it may involve in organizational decision making. The effect or participation of Workers in decision making will increase the motivation of individual.

Michael, V.P. (1998) describes Worker participation in management is to increasing good will and co-operation which is a precondition to encourage the Worker to give more than minimum necessary to retain the work. A feeling of belonging to the place of work and a sense of workmanship and creativity. They resist group think, because they prefer only the expert in the areas to make the decision.

According to International Institute of Labour Studies is that Worker participation in management is resulting from practices which increase the scope for Workers share of influence in decision making at different their of organization hierarchy with concomitant assumption responsibility an instrument for increasing the efficiency of enterprises and establishing harmonious industrial relations.
Data Analysis and Interpretations

Data analysis and interpretation is an attempt to organize and summarize data in order to increase the results in such a manner that enables the enumerator to relate critical point, with the study objectives.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by their Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>No. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above &gt;45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Inference

The above table exhibits the age of the respondents Majority (49.4%) of them where of between 25-35 years of age 30.6% and 20% of them where of between 35-45 & above 45 year of age.

Figure 1: Distribution of Respondents by their Age
Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by their Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Inference

Majority (48.2%) of them were of between 5-10 year of experience

Figure 2: Distribution of Respondents by their Experience

---

Table 3: Distributions of Respondents by their Qualification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALIFICATION</th>
<th>NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10std</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12std</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Inference

The above table exhibits the Qualification of the respondents. Majority (34.1%) of them was of diploma and degree qualification & 22.4% & 9.4% of them were of 12 & 10 standard of qualification.
Figure 3: Distributions of Respondents by their Qualification

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by their Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>No. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Inference

From the above table, it reveals that, 23.5% of the respondents strongly agree, 48.2% of the respondents agree, 10.6% of the respondents neither agree nor disagree, 15.3% of the respondent’s agree. 2.4% of the respondents strongly disagree with job satisfaction.

Figure 4: Distribution of Respondents by their Job Satisfaction
Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by the Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>No. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Inference

From the above table, it reveals that, 21.2% of the respondents strongly agree, 29.4% of the respondents agree, 28.2% of the respondents neither agree nor disagree. 10.6% of the respondent agree.10.6% of the respondents strongly disagree with the Relationship.

Table 6: Distribution of Respondents by their Level of Partipation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>No. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data
Inference

From the above table, it reveals that, 45.9% of the respondents opined ‘high’, 34.1% of the respondent opined ‘medium’, 20.0% of the respondents opined ‘low’ with the level of participation.

Table 7: Distribution of Respondents by their Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>No. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Inference

From the above table, it reveals that, 21.2% of the respondents strongly agree, 42.4% of the respondents agree, 27.1 % of the respondents neither agree nor disagree. 5.9% of the respondent agree.3.5% of the respondents strongly disagree with the decision.
Figure 7: Distribution of Respondents by their Decisions

Table 8: Distribution of Respondents by their Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>No. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

Inference

From the above table, it reveals that, 23.6% of the respondents strongly agree, 31.8% of the respondents agree, 28.2% of the respondents neither agree nor disagree, 12.9% of the respondent agree, 3.5% of the respondents strongly disagree with the welfare.
Figure 8: Distribution of Respondents by their Welfare

Table 9: Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Loyal</th>
<th>Flextime</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flextime</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inference

From the above analysis, there exists a negative relationship between the factors job satisfaction, loyal, welfare, after flextime, participation & Environment. Other pair of factors as positively correlated.

Square Test

There is no relationship between gender and level of participation.
Table 10: Cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Participation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculation of $x^2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>O - E</th>
<th>(O - E)^2</th>
<th>(O - E)^2/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0.5625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculated value $x^2 = 10.4606$

Table value of $x^2$ at 5% level of significance and at 2 degrees of freedom = 5.991.

Since the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value, the null hypothesis will be rejected and hence gender has no impact in participation.

One Way Analysis of Variance

Table 11: Cross Tabulation Between Age and Level of Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of participation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>25 - 35</th>
<th>35 - 45</th>
<th>&gt;45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T = 25+14+........+9=85$;

$\frac{\sum \frac{(O^2)}{N}}{N} = \frac{85^2+85^2+7225+9}{9}$

$\frac{\sum \frac{(O^2)}{N}}{N} = 802.78$

$SST = (25^2 + 14^2 +........+9^2) - 802.78$

$= (625+196+9+121+100+25+9+25+81) - 802.78$

$= 1191 - 802.78$
\[ \begin{align*}
&= 388.22 \\
SSC &= \left( \frac{42^2}{3} + \frac{26^2}{3} + \frac{12^2}{3} \right) - 802.78 \\
&= \left( \frac{1764}{3} + \frac{676}{3} + \frac{289}{3} \right) - 802.78 \\
&= (588+225.33+96.33) - 802.78 \\
&= 909.66 - 802.78 \\
&= 106.88 \\
SSE &= \text{SST} - \text{SSC} \\
&= 388.22 - 106.88 = 281.34 \\
MSC &= \frac{\text{SST}}{K-1} \\
&= \frac{106.88}{3-1} = \frac{106.88}{2} = 53.44 \\
MSE &= \frac{\text{SSE}}{N-K} \\
&= \frac{281.34}{9-3} = \frac{281.34}{6} = 46.89 \\
\end{align*} \]

Degrees of freedom 
\[ = (K-1,N-1) = (3-1,9-3) = (2,6) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>D.O.F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Squares</td>
<td>SSC = 106.88</td>
<td>K-1=2</td>
<td>MSC=53.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With in Squares</td>
<td>SSE=281.34</td>
<td>N-K=6</td>
<td>MSE=46.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = \frac{53.44}{46.89} = 1.1369 \]

Table value of F at 5\% level of significance for (2,6) degree of freedom is 5.14. The calculated value of F is less than the table value. Hence the null hypothesis will be accepted. Therefore, Ages do not have different impacts.

**Findings**

- 49.4\% of the respondents belong to the age group of 20-25.
- 48.2\% of the respondents have 5-10 years of Experience.
- 34.1\% of the respondents have Diploma & Degree of qualification.
- 48.2\% of the respondents agree with the Job satisfaction.
- 40.0\% of the respondents strongly Agree with the Job Responsibilities.
- 29.4\% of the respondents (29.4\%) agree with the employee relationship.
- 42.4\% of the respondents agree with the working environment.
- 34.1\% of the respondents neither agree nor disagree with the organization status.
- 46.3\% of the respondents agree with the working very hard.
45.9% of the respondents the level of participation is high
48.2% of the respondents strongly agree with the trustees.
42.4% of the respondents agree with the decisions.
36.5% of the respondents neither agrees nor disagrees with the skills.
Of the respondents (40%) neither agree nor disagree with the cooperation.
28.2% of the respondents neither agree nor disagree with the welfare.
From the correlation analysis there exits negative relationship between the factors job satisfaction, loyal, welfare, flextime, participation and environment. Other pairs of factors are positively correlated.
From the regression analysis it’s found that the variable such as working very hard, trustness increases the level of participation. On the other hand efficiency, loyal, cooperate decreases the level of participation. This conforms a significant negative predictor.

Suggestions
Proper motivation factors have to be followed to increase the level of participation of workers.
The Management should share their views with workers.
Management should take initiative for effective communication with the workers.
Workers have to co-operate with management.
Employer should adopt a progressive outlook. They should consider the industry as a joint endeavour in which workers have an equal say. Workers should be provided and enlightened about the benefits of their participation in the management.
Employers and workers should agree on the objectives of the industry. They should recognize and respect the rights of each other.
Workers and their representatives should be provided education and training in the philosophy and process of participative management. Workers should be made aware of the benefits of participative management.
There should be effective communication between workers and management and effective consultation of workers by the management in decisions that have an impact on them.
Participation should be a continuous process. To begin with, participation should start at the operating level of management.
A mutual co-operation and commitment to participation must be developed by both management and labour.
Conclusions

The study helped the researcher to know about the factors that contribute to Workers’ participation in management and relationship between management and employees. The employer and employee relationship in the company is very strong due to the Workers’ participation in management.

Management should be prepared to give all information connected with the working of the industry and labor should handle that information with full confidence and responsibility. The workers should become aware of their responsibilities. The leaders should initiate this in them. Similarly, the top management should make the lower echelons to show a new attitude in the light of the new relationship. Modern scholars are of the mind that the old adage “a worker is a worker, a manager is a manager; never the twain shall meet” should be replaced by “managers and workers are partners in the progress of business
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