

**AN OPINION STUDY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF LABOUR PARTICIPATION IN MANAGEMENT AT GOLDEN ROCK (RAILWAYWORK SHOP), PONMALAI, TRICHIRAPALLI**

**by**

**Hemakumar. M**

Assistant Professor, Dept.of Human Resource Management,  
Madras School of Social Work, Chennai

**ABSTRACT**

In the context of organization, the democracy lies on the part of how the employees are freely expressing their views, ideas, suggestion in the decision making process and how employers are receptive towards that. Industrial unrest takes place when there is no amicable relationship between employees and employers especially poor understanding between them. However, it can only be resolved through mutual understanding and transparency in decision making process. The employer should give up stereotype and provide room for participation. Better cooperation leads to harmony and industrial peace. It is an attempt to find out how far the concept of Labour Participation in Management takes place in the central government organization.

**KEYWORDS**

Workers' Participation, Industrial Democracy, Committees of Management, Quality circle, Shop Council

**INTRODUCTION**

Royal commission on labour In India(1931) when there is a trade union the employer should seek its collaboration and cooperation in the establishment and working of these committees, which should not be regarded or used as rivals to its or separate as well as for joint meetings, such meetings should ordinarily count as working time. The range of the subjects should be as wide as possible. Finally and the most important principle is the representatives of the management should be in the sympathy with idea and determined to do their best to make the committee success. The main object of participation in management is

to develop the harmonious industrial relation for the common interest of the organization. In this regard the employer should create conducive environment for better participation. This participation makes the employees to feel themselves as owners of the organization. Their main part of contribution takes place in decision making process. They can criticize the present policy and offer suggestions for the progress of the organization. In the same way, the Golden Rock Workshop, Ponmalai, is also receptive towards the suggestion from various committees to implement.

**Johnson, M & Abisek** (2013) the changes in labour market, worker participation has emerged out be a strong contender in enhancing competitiveness and there by firm development. Moreover, whatever little involvement that was witnessed among the employees accounted for the position that they held in the production procedure.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Aryee & Samuel (1988) perceived that participation can be perceived in as involvement in decision making or involvement so as to influence decisional outcome. Either way is to eke out a say of the workers in the decision making process.

Sarma A.M. (1990) pointed out that the concept of workers participation in management is shrouded with much ambiguity connoting different meaning to different persons. Of course, this would be varying and would be different for different firm. The crucial point of inequity however is being the effort it has on the industrial relations climate in a particular firm.

Kaler, J. (1999) opined participation in its various forms on one hand when its spears of having participation us have share of employees in business and it's not prescriptive firm would means employee involvement in Joint decision making, it does not solely refer to it. He also goes on to define participation, in its dual form, one being operation where in it give the employees a share in running the business while the other financial describes as one being profit sharing.

Leelavathy, K (2009) pointed out that the employee participation in management should be approached to the employee as employee

friendly concept in quality improvement rather the strictly technical concept. Grievance of employees may overcome with the employee participation. In her study she found the 155 respondents out of 200 agreed that there exists commitment of top management in building employee participation in management and half of the respondents (50%) (105) agreed that there has been an improvement in the quality of employees in employee participation in the management of the company

Rajasekar, K.V (2010) pointed in his article that the voices of employees will help to enhance the productivity in organization He pointed out some points for better participation.

- 1) **Consider Change:** Organization will perform better if they create a participative management model. The ideas of the employees must be allowed from the shop floor level in order to enhance productivity of the organization. In this connection they must have transparent management policy.
- 2) **More Benefit:** This point insisting transparent management policy which will actually rake in more benefit for the company. When the employees became part of the decision they tend to be highly motivated and consequently became more engaged in their roles. This will improve cordial relationship between the employer and the employee.

Rathnakar, G. (2012) found from his study at BHEL Hyderabad, the employees in the organization demonstrated high interest in decision making process whereas the management has shrunk the scope for participation in decision making process and there is a significant relationship between education and employees' involvement in decision making process. The researcher used simple random technique and adopted percentage analysis to find out the results.

## OBJECTIVES

- To study the demographic profile of the respondents.
- To evaluate the participation of various departments in the committees.

- To study the opinion of various categories of employees about the functioning of the committees

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The success of production and profitability of any business rely on continuous working process, which could be accomplished by any industry only when the workers are cared by the management. Many workers may have the knowledge to improve the production, but there must be a congenial atmosphere to take part in decision making process. Being the central government organization, the prevalence of participation in management is found to be a million dollar question. The researcher has selected this organization to find out the level of participation in management in its various committees.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS**

- There is a significant association between respondents from various departments and their overall participation in management under various committees.
- There is a significant association between age of the respondents and their overall participation in management
- There is a significant difference between gender of the respondents and their overall participation in management.
- There is a significant association between the opinion of various categories of employees and their overall participation in management.

The researcher adopted questionnaire method for the purpose of conducting the study. The researcher used descriptive design and had discussions with the personnel branch, office superintendents, senior section officers and employees in Railway Workshop, Ponmalai in Trichy. The Universe consists of 6000 employees and the Basic Training Centre has allotted 10 Departments to collect data which consist of 2100 employees. Simple random sampling method was adopted to collect data only from the 120 respondents. This has been collected at Central Workshop, Ponmalai, through questionnaire method. The secondary data was collected from the books, journals,

websites and earlier cases etc. Questionnaire for the study was given to a few field experts and their suggestions were incorporated. The questionnaire covered all the aspects of participative machinery. The collected data were analyzed and interpreted by using the statistical tools such as Chi square and T test.

### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The data collected were carefully analyzed and processed. Statistical techniques, that is chi-square tests, t-test were applied to draw meaningful references.

**Table No.1**

**Association between age of the respondents and their overall participation in management**

Sl. No	Various committees	Department					Statistical inference
		Wheel shop (n=25)	CMS (n=25)	EMW (n=28)	HEV (n=28)	Diesel (n=14)	
1	Safety committee						X <sup>2</sup> =6.067 Df = 4
	Low	3 (20%)	5 (33.3%)	0	5 (33.3%)	2 (13.3%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	22 (21%)	20 (19%)	28 (26.7%)	23 (21.9%)	12 (11.4%)	
2	Canteen committee						X <sup>2</sup> =14.539 Df = 4
	Low	11 (27.5%)	13 (32.5%)	4 (10%)	5 (12.5%)	7 (17.5%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	14 (17.5%)	12 (15%)	24 (30%)	23 (28.8%)	7 (8.8%)	Significant
3	Staff benefit committee						X <sup>2</sup> =10.849 Df = 4
	Low	1 (14.3%)	0	0	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	24 (21.2%)	25 (22.1%)	28 (24.8%)	25 (22.1%)	11 (9.7%)	Significant

4	Shop council committee						X <sup>2</sup> =14.073 Df = 4
	Low	4 (26.7%)	8 (53.3%)	0	2 (13.3%)	1 (6.7%)	P > 0.05 Not
	High	21 (20%)	17 (16.2%)	28 (26.7%)	26 (24.8%)	13 (12.4%)	Significant
5	Decision making						X <sup>2</sup> =2.749 Df = 4
	Low	4 (26.7%)	5 (33.3%)	2 (13.3%)	1 (20%)	3 (6.7%)	P > 0.05 Not
	High	21 (20%)	20 (19%)	26 (24.8%)	25 (23.8%)	13 (12.4%)	Significant
6	Relationship						X <sup>2</sup> =7.619 Df = 4
	Low	2 (16.7%)	6 (50%)	2 (16.7%)	2 (16.7%)	0	P > 0.05 Not
	High	23 (21.3%)	19 (17.6%)	26 (24.1%)	26 (24.1%)	14 (13%)	Significant
7	Overall Participation						X <sup>2</sup> =14.658 Df = 4
	Low	12 (27.9%)	14 (32.6%)	3 (7%)	8 (18.6%)	6 (14%)	P < 0.05
	High	13 (16.9%)	11 (14.3%)	25 (32.5%)	20 (26%)	8 (10.4%)	Significant

The above table shows that the calculated value is less than the table value. Hence, there is a significant association between the respondents from various departments and their overall participation management. So the research hypothesis is accepted and proved that there is a significant association between the respondents from various departments and their overall participation in management.

**Table No.2**

**Association between Department of the respondents and their overall participation in management**

Sl. No	Various dimensions of participation management	Age					Statistical inference
		Below 25yrs (n=13)	26 to 35 yrs (n=26)	36 to 45 yrs (n=29)	46 to 55 yrs (n=45)	Above 55yrs (n=7)	
1	Safety committee						X <sup>2</sup> =1.448 Df = 4
	Low	2 (13.3%)	4 (26.7%)	3 (20%)	6 (40%)	0	P > 0.05 Not
	High	11 (10.5%)	22 21%)	26 (24.8%)	39 (37.1%)	7 (6.7%)	Significant
2	Canteen Committee						X <sup>2</sup> =12.798 Df = 4
	Low	9 (22.5%)	11 (27.5%)	8 (20%)	9 (22.5%)	3 (7.5%)	P > 0.05 Not
	High	4 (5%)	15 (18.8%)	21 (26.3%)	36 (45%)	4 (5%)	Significant
3	Staff benefit committee						X <sup>2</sup> =6.788 Df = 4
	Low	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	0	2 (28.6%)	0	P > 0.05 Not
	High	12 (10.6%)	22 (19.5%)	29 (25.7%)	43 (38.1%)	7 (6.2%)	Significant
4	Shop council committee						X <sup>2</sup> =3.397 Df = 4
	Low	2 (13.3%)	5 (33.3%)	1 (6.7%)	6 (40%)	1 (6.7%)	P > 0.05 Not
	High	11 (10.5%)	21 (20%)	28 (26.7%)	39 (37.1%)	6 (5.7%)	Significant
5	Decision making						X <sup>2</sup> =12.992 Df = 4
	Low	0	8 (53.3%)	1 (6.7%)	6 (40%)	0	P > 0.05 Not

	High	13 (12.4%)	18 (17.1%)	28 (26.7%)	39 (37.1%)	7 (6.7%)	Significant
6	Relationship						X <sup>2</sup> =2.301
	Low	0	2 (16.7%)	3 (25%)	6 (50%)	1 (8.3%)	Df = 4 P > 0.05
	High	13 (12%)	24 (22.2%)	26 (24.1%)	39 (36.1%)	6 (5.6%)	Not Significant
7	Overall participation						X <sup>2</sup> =9.861 Df = 4
	Low	9 (20.9%)	11 (25.6%)	10 (23.3%)	12 (27.9%)	1 (2.3%)	P > 0.05
	High	4 (5.2%)	15 (19.5%)	19 (24.7%)	33 (42.9%)	6 (7.8%)	Not Significant

The above table shows that the calculated value is greater than the table value. Hence, there is no significant association between the age of the respondents and their overall participation management. Therefore, the research hypothesis is rejected.

**Table No.3**

**Difference between gender of the respondents and their overall participation in management**

Sl.No	Various committees	Mean	S.D	Statistical inference
1	Safety committee			T = .457
	Male (n=108)	1.8796	.32691	P > 0.05
	Female (n=12)	1.8333	.38925	Not significant
2	Canteen committee			T = .641
	Male (n=108)	1.6759	.47021	P > 0.05
	Female (n=12)	1.5833	.51493	Not significant
3	Staff benefit committee			T = 1.694
	Male (n=108)	1.9537	.21111	P > 0.05
	Female (n=12)	1.8333	.38925	Not significant



4	Shop council committee			T = 1.380
	Male (n=108)	1.8889	.31573	P > 0.05
	Female (n=12)	1.7500	.45227	Not significant
5	Decision making			T = -.457
	Male (n=108)	1.8704	.33746	P > 0.05
	Female (n=12)	1.9167	.28868	Not significant
6	Relationship			T = -.201
	Male (n=108)	1.8981	.30386	P > 0.05
	Female (n=12)	1.9167	.28868	Not significant
7	Overall participation			T = 1.720
	Male (n=108)	1.6667	.47360	P > 0.05
	Female (n=12)	1.4167	.51493	Not significant

**Df = 118**

The above table shows that the calculated value is greater than the table value. Hence, there is no significant difference between gender of the respondents and their overall participation in management and rejected the research hypothesis is greater than table value. So the research hypothesis is rejected.

**Table.4**

**Association between various categories of workers and their participation in management under various committees**

Sl. No	Various committees	Workers category				Statistical inference
		Semi-Skilled (n=18)	Skilled (n=37)	Highly skilled (n=35)	Un skilled (n=30)	
1	Safety committee					X <sup>2</sup> =6.715 Df = 3
	Low	5 (33.3%)	6 (40%)	2 (13.3%)	2 (13.3%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	13 (12.4%)	31 (29.5%)	33 (31.4%)	28 (26.7%)	

2	Canteen committee					X <sup>2</sup> =.771 Df = 3
	Low	7 (17.5%)	12 (30%)	10 (25%)	11 (27.5%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	11 (13.8%)	25 (31.3%)	25 (31.3%)	19 (23.8%)	
3	Staff benefit committee					X <sup>2</sup> =3.877 Df = 3
	Low	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	0	2 (28.6%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	17 (15%)	33 (29.3%)	35 (31%)	28 (24.8%)	
4	Shop council committee					X <sup>2</sup> =1.468 Df = 3
	Low	1 (26.7%)	4 (6.7%)	5 (33.3%)	5 (33.3%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	17 (16.2%)	33 (31.4%)	30 (28.6%)	25 (23.8%)	
5	Decision making					X <sup>2</sup> =2.231 Df = 3
	Low	1 (6.7%)	6 (40%)	3 (20%)	5 (33.3%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	17 (16.2%)	31 (29.5%)	32 (30.5%)	25 (23.8%)	
6	Relationship					X <sup>2</sup> =2.897 Df = 3
	Low	1 (8.3%)	3 (25%)	6 (50%)	2 (16.7%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	17 (15.7%)	34 (31.5%)	29 (26.9%)	28 (25.9%)	
7	Overall participation					X <sup>2</sup> =2.499 Df = 3
	Low	7 (16.3%)	11 (25.6%)	11 (25.6%)	14 (32.6%)	P > 0.05 Not Significant
	High	11 (14.3%)	26 (33.8%)	24 (31.2%)	16 (20.8%)	

The above table shows that there is no significant association between various categories of workers and their overall participation management. Hence, the calculated value is greater than the table value. So the research hypothesis is rejected and the null hypothesis accepted.

## **FINDINGS**

- The participation of various departments in the management is high in overall dimensions however only very few departments have lower participation. The departments, wheel shop and HEV have majority of the respondents. These two shops have major strength and moreover the majority of them are in different committees as members.
- There is no significant association between the age of the respondents and their overall participation management. Majority of the employees who fall under the age group of above 50 are in the overall participation in management. It is because the employees who are above 50 years of age have more than 25 years of experience in the various committees.
- There is no significant difference between gender of the respondents and their overall participation in management. It shows that the women have less privilege than men.
- There is no significant association between various categories of workers and their overall participation in management

## **SUGGESTIONS**

Based on the study, the researcher has proposed the following suggestions.

- The organization may create awareness about workers' participation and to ensure the maximum participation from various departments.
- The younger generation employees may be given more opportunity to take part in various committees.
- The organization predominantly comprises of male employees.

The organization may take steps to involve more women employees.

- The organization shall ensure that all the categories of employees to understand their rights and impart workers' education.

## CONCLUSION

The organization may ensure maximum participation of employees irrespective of age, gender, and categories of employees because this will give due recognition and sense of belongingness and enable them to contribute their best to improve the organization. However, the major limitation for the researcher is that the workers are reluctant to respond due to fear of losing their jobs although they are working in government enterprise. It is clear that the workers are unaware of their rights to participate in decision making process with management. The workers participation in the management has taken different forms like, Works Committee, Shop council, Quality circle, etc which exists in the organization in the absence of proper legislation. In order to exercise the workers power freely, the Government of India, has introduced the participation of workers in management bill (1990) pending approval in the Parliament. If it is approved, there will be a wider scope and this concept will percolate to every industry and also the workers will be aware of their right to participation in management. This concept is more relevant in today's context in which more of foreign national companies are venturing in our Indian market.

## REFERENCE

1. Aryee, S. (1988). Structural precondition for Employee involvement and influence in managerial decision, *Indian Journal of Industrial relations*. Vol.24 No.2. Pp 198-212.
2. Johnson M. A (2013) Workers Participation in Management an Insights from a case study, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol 49. Month July, pg55.
3. Kaler, J (1999). Understanding Participation. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol 21 No.2. Pp. 125-35.

4. Leelavathy, K.(2009). Employee Participation in Management , *HRD Times*. Vol.11.
5. Rajasekar,K.V.(2010). Listen to Dissenting Voices for Better Productivity. *The Hindu*, Opportunity, Feb 17.
6. Rathnakar.G. (2012). A study of workers participation in management decision making at BHEL, Hyderabad. *www.Indian Research Journals.com*
7. Royal commission of Labour Report. (1931). Great Britain
8. Sarma, A.M.(1990). Workers Participation in Self Management and Workers, *Indian Journal of Social Work*. Vol.51 No.2. Pp 279-90.