

**A STUDY TO EXAMINE THE DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING IN FOOD & BEVERAGE DEPARTMENTS OF SELECTED HOTELS IN MIAMI DADE AREA AND DEVELOP AN EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION PROGRAM FOR THEIR USE**

**Ahmet Ferda SEYMEN**

ORCID:0000-0001-5708-1559



**Article Type** : Review Article / İnceleme Makalesi

**Doi Number** : <http://dx.doi.org/10.26449/sss.996>

**Reference** : Seymen, A.F. (2018). "A Study To Examine The Degree Of Participation In Decision Making In Food & Beverage Departments Of Selected Hotels In Miami Dade Area And Develop An Effective Participation Program For Their Use", *International Social Sciences Studies Journal*, 4(25): 5338-5350

**ABSTRACT**

The study was conducted to measure the degree of participation in decision making in food & beverage departments of selected hotels in the Miami Dade area and develop an effective participation program for their use. The information pertaining was derived through the research of relevant literature. In the selection process, two hotels from four different categories were drawn. Data was collected through questionnaires which management and non-management employees of these selected hotels completed. The significant finding of the study was that the management style in these departments is much closer to authoritative than to participative management. The conclusion was that participative management is essential to increase the degree of participation in decision making in these departments.

**Keywords:** Participative Management, Management Styles, Communication Systems, Organizational Structure

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

Organizations are an essential part of everyday life. They affect almost every aspect of one's life in meaningful ways. They employ us, sell to us and protect us. Regardless of its nature or size; each organization consists of people. For any organization to function, to produce its particular goods or services, the members must behave in certain ways so that the organization fulfills its purpose. (Herbert, *Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*, 1976, p. 4)

**Definition**

Traditionally, the organization is viewed as a vehicle for accomplishing goals and objectives. Human beings are a vital part of any organization. No organization could exist without human beings to manage and create its goods and render its services. What is surprising is the newness of our understanding of the importance of the individual and social relationships to the functioning of an organization. (Herbert, *Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*, 1976, p. 5)

**The Effects Of The Industrial Revolution**

The foundation of steam power opened new markets for producers. As the market expanded, mass production based on the interchangeability of parts and division of labor, became more feasible. The lowered costs of transportation and the new markets helped breakdown regional monopolies and barriers, stimulating entrepreneurs to explore and develop new production techniques. (Wren, 1979)

At the turn of the century, many smaller firms merged as it became apparent that scale production distribution, as well as competitive position, created enormous benefits to the industrial firms. (Alfred D. Chandler, 1968)

The old tried-and-true management techniques were found to be less effective when the firms became more bureaucratic. Improper production techniques were keeping production from attaining the higher levels potentially available. (Herbert, Dimensions of Organizational Behavior, 1976, p. 12)

It seemed that at this time scientific management had the cure to these problems.

#### Scientific Management School

Frederick W. Taylor was the founder of this doctrine. He was a pioneer in advocating a deliberate approach to designing jobs and their procedures. Through the use of time study and methods analysis, he developed work standards, more efficient tool designs, incentive system based on worker productivity, methods introduction and work specialization. Proper job instruction and standardization of work methods were integral parts of his approach to increasing productivity and decreasing costs while raising workers wages. The interplay of individual personality, informal groups, intra-organizational conflict, and the decision-making process in the formal structure appears mostly to be neglected by scientific management. (Hackman, 1977)

#### Human Relations School

The Industrial Revolution was a revolution not only in technology but also in human relations. As technology grew more and more complex, people became more depended on one another. (Rogers, 1975)

The move to industrialization and the discovery of the non-rational side of human nature put the impetus on the Human Relations School. This is identified with the human relations movement. One of the main contributions of this school is the introduction of behavioral sciences in an integrated fashion. (Hackman, 1977, p. 55)

This school also recognized the influence of the informal group. The inspiration of the human relations school was the Hawthorne studies. The purpose of the experiments in the studies was to assess the illumination on the worker and his work. In essence, a group was segregated for observation for the effect of various changes in conditions of employment. The results showed that the workers could perform efficiently if given a certain degree of responsibility for themselves. In this sense, the scientific management approach was viewed as lacking in its understanding of the specific composition of man (the social needs of man). If one is to organize man effectively, one has to take account of these other (social need) satisfaction. (Rogers, 1975, p. 52)

Before the human relations school came in existence organizations of the past tended to be static and characterized by traditional bureaucracy. Under the influence of the human relations school, industrial humanism movement was applied to the complex problems of the organizations. The organization itself is in an environment which is subject to rapid changes and, internally, are in a state of constant flux. This change creates new demands, new questions, new roles; it calls for new systems of organization. Many others have suggested that the form of system best suited to cope with dynamic change is one based on participatory.

(Rogers, 1975, pp. 36-39)

#### Industrial Humanism

The industrial humanist William G. Scott suggests that:

Assume the dignity of man plus the need protecting and cultivating personality on an equal rather than hierarchical basis.

Assume that change in organizations should be the result of full awareness of alternatives, and consensus by participants.

Assume that the organizational gains are the gains of people in them.

The primary orientation of modern humanism is democratic. Therefore, it is concerned with the development, the welfare, the happiness or the dignity of the individual. At the organizational level, McGregor's association with the industrial humanism school becomes apparent when he notes:

The motivation, the potential for development -, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are all present in people. It is the responsibility of the management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves. (Rogers, 1975, p. 37)

## PARTICIPATIVE MANAGEMENT

In theory, Participative management involves management consulting with employees and letting them participate in the decision-making process in the hopes of achieving greater personal satisfaction on the part of the employees and more significant goal achievement for the manager and the organization. The manager continues to retain the final authority and responsibility for the decision reached by this group process. (Wadia, 1980)

### Definition

Participative management starts by making clear to each manager that the primary reason he or she is employed is to help carry out the requirements of the organization. Then, each manager is asked how he or she can help carry out the organization's objectives and priorities. In responding to this question, each manager is given the highest possible (practical) latitude or participation in determining his or her future within the organization which is consistent with the requirements of the organization. (McConkey, 1980)

Participative management is the same as "democratic" management.

Democratic management requires a higher level of control to permit subordinates to vote on all decisions and be bound by the majority vote. However, any attempt to practice democratic governance would be particularly chaotic at present when more and more people are demanding greater participation but are often not trained to exercise it properly.

Participative management replaces responsibility for individual decision-making by a group. In decision-making, the participation should take place before the decision. The decision is made after the participation and always by the higher level manager in charge of the unit.

An effectively functioning participative approach requires that each manager at each level of management make the decisions for which he or she is accountable. To hold otherwise would result in destroying the individual accountability which is the cornerstone of the whole approach. (McConkey, 1980, p. 68)

In practice the definition of participative management implies the following:

Responsibility - Major voice in determining the job content and its scope or parameters.

Accountability - Major voice in determining results which must be achieved.

Planning - Do their planning for their units.

Authority - Major voice in clear-cut authority for themselves.

Decision-making - Decisions made at the lowest possible levels at which all the information competence necessary to make the decision come together.

Supervision - Emphasis is on self-supervision with minimum from above.

Management - Wide latitude to manage their resources.

Communication & Feedback - Tailored to their individual needs on a need known basis. (McConkey, 1980, p. 69)

### Benefits

There are many potential rewards or benefits which a manager may expect from participative management when it is properly understood and practiced. These potential benefits include:

- ✓ A significant voice in determining future.
- ✓ Greater commitment.
- ✓ Greater motivation.
- ✓ Appraisal based on results.
- ✓ Rewards based on results.
- ✓ Agreement on what is expected.
- ✓ Know, where heading as a manager.
- ✓ Better development.

- ✓ Prepared for greater responsibility.
- ✓ Better planning closer to the “seen of the action.”
- ✓ Less supervision required when objectives are clear.
- ✓ Self-discipline.
- ✓ Greater authority.
- ✓ Better decisions nearer the time and scene of the action.
- ✓ Greater satisfaction in completing a job which a manager helped to determine.
- ✓ Less criticism of matters for which manager is not accountable.
- ✓ More respect from subordinates.
- ✓ Better feedback and control. (McConkey, 1980, p. 69)

#### The Demands

As could be expected from any situation which promises rewards to the manager, participative management also makes demands upon each manager. Participative management requires the manager to accept accountability, and plan for the unit. The manager must also make recommendations relative to the operation of the group, make decisions as called for by the level of authority, and seize the initiative in problem-solving. (McConkey, 1980, p. 70)

On top of all, managers must be effective leaders. The successful participative manager must believe that:

- ✓ People are creative, responsive and responsible.
- ✓ People function better in an open work environment with supervisors who are supportive, employee centered and democratically oriented.
- ✓ People work better in groups to which they belong and in which they have good standing.
- ✓ People who participate in decision-making that affects their work lives are more likely to feel involved and give their best. (H-Khozhan, 1978)

Supervisor style is also important. It is noted that supervisors who are employee-centered and democratically oriented have more effect on workgroups, both regarding higher production and employee satisfaction. To be effective supervisors have to give orders or to behave in a structuring way, which is seen as supportive or at least as non-threatening by subordinates. (H-Khozhan, 1978, p. 79)

#### Techniques

A wide variety of participative methods have been used in many different job environments, but the range of such is primarily limited to those that are relatively traditional in concept, representing a “bottom-up” approach, and a group of more recently developed techniques that involves “top-down” participation.

The bottom-up approaches embody the goal of providing the worker with managerial values through participation in operational decisions, communications, or benefits. These programs include such well-understood and often used techniques as job enlargement, job enrichment, management by objectives, team building, and profit sharing.

The top-down approach envisages the worker or groups of workers in an executive role, participating directly in decision-making in such areas as long-range planning. This participation involves the worker in actions and responsibilities traditionally reserved for the board of directors or the chief executive officer.

#### **Bottom-up Approaches**

**Job Enlargement:** The process of providing more variety in the number of tasks contained in a given job. Moving from the specific individual job description to increased responsibility for a broader scope of activities is the primary objective of the job enlargement process.

**Job Enrichment:** Strategies for enhancing the employee's identification with a job are called job enrichment. The technique attempts to build employee motivation by loading a person's with components of responsibility and autonomy so that the individual identified with important managerial goals.

**Management by Objectives:** A strategy for involving lower-level managers and rank and file workers in the planning and evaluation process that controls employee efforts toward organizational objectives.

**Team Building:** A concept that assumes, that group participation in work activities will develop positive job attitudes and motivation for individual members of the work groups.

**Profit Sharing Approaches:** This concept is based on the assumption that, although employee participation varies considerably, they do share a common assumption—a belief that workers will be motivated to excel in their jobs when their compensation depends on the organization's profits.

### **Top-down Approaches**

Top-down management is usually defined as a situation wherein top management makes decisions, sets the rules, enforces standards, and in general exercises all the traditional powers of the owner/entrepreneur. “Top-down participation” on the other hand, implies sharing by the employee/worker in this process. Major decisions concerning the direction of the firm, products and markets, plans and policies, and conditions of work and employment, are set by or with significant input from the worker/employment. (Kovach, 1981)

Applications:

Harman Auto Parts Factory, Bolivar, Tennessee:

In 1973, at the Harman auto parts factory in Bolivar, Tennessee, a management-union program was implemented to improve the quality of work life. The new program meant increased respect and a better atmosphere by encouraging people to speak out for the first time. The project began to change the roles and behavior of workers and managers and eventually their attitudes toward each other. The first experimental groups in polish and buff assembly brought workers and management together to vent their feelings about the work and to consider ways of making it fairer and more satisfying. Unlike “work-enrichment” programs, this was not a case of experts redesigning work, but of the workers themselves considering and trying out job rotations or other ways of reapportioning the tasks. The purpose of the experiment was:

- ✓ To give people in the work area a chance to gain experience for opportunities for advancement in the future.
- ✓ To provide the management with a way of recognizing talent when new supervisors are needed in the future.

Participation was voluntary and limited to ten people, and there were two phases of the program, which lasted six months. During the first phase, each participating worker spent half a day with their supervisors, observing him at work and asking questions. Half the time was gained by the employees covering for each other or by banking time; half was paid by management. Participants saw their supervisors receive the day's schedule of what output was expected, make job assignments, write reports on production, negotiate with other departments for parts, help to fix machines, talk to people whose work was not satisfactory, instruct them, respond to complaints and special requests. During the second stage, each participant spent half of their shift for five consecutive days assisting the supervisor with all tasks, except disciplining employees, which would have violated the union contract. By the end of the experiment, the group was managing itself cooperatively, freeing the supervisor to work with other groups. The group was tested for a month working without a supervisor, taking turns and handling supervisory functions. There were no disciplinary problems, and the output was high. (McCoby, 1982)

Work Improvement Plan in a Textile Plant:

At Malden Mill's Lawrence plant, a \$200 million-a-year textile manufacturer wanted to improve its work relationships due to the possibility of a shrinking labor pool in Lawrence as more high technology companies move into the area. The International Ladies Garment Workers Union agreed to cooperate in setting up problem-solving groups, and the company brought in the Northeast Labor-Management Center, a Boston-based organization with experience as a “facilitator” of work innovations.

Malden Mill's first established seven core groups with about fifteen members each in its Retail Division, where fabric manufactured in the mills is inspected, packed and shipped. This division had had high turnover and absenteeism and other labor problems, and it was decided to allow the workers to raise issues of importance to them when the core groups started meeting last year. The first six months was a purgative period the workers focused on long-festering complaints about working conditions, apparently testing management's commitment to solving problems.

But several months later the groups suddenly began addressing problems involving cost reductions and improved quality.

The workers made suggestions about the use of materials and tools, and a couple of months later the percentage of correct fabric inspections had risen to 94%, up from 88% a year ago. One group of 17 inspectors formed a semi-autonomous team and set their own weekly goal of inspecting 13,500 Lb.'s of cloth—a target 1,500 Lb.'s higher than management had previously set—and met it. (The New Industrial Relations, 1981)

Kalmar Auto Factory -Sweden:

New approaches to work design and participative management were adopted by Volvo of Sweden to be used in its new auto factories. The concept of this approach was that if work were patterned according to people, rather than the other way around, people could act in cooperation, discuss more, and decide among themselves how to organize the work. In essence, the whole approach was based on stimulation rather than restriction.

The design for Kalmar incorporated pleasant, quiet surroundings, arranged for group work, with each group having its rest and meeting areas. The work itself is organized so that each group is responsible for a particular, identifiable portion of the car-electrical systems, interiors, doors and so on. Individual cars are built upon self-propelling “carriers” that run around the factory following a removable conductive tape on the floor. Each item also does its inspection; this produces a sense of identification for the group with its work. As a result of this program, almost all workers were in favor of the new working patterns, and there was an increase in productivity with an increase in the quality of the work. (Gyllenhammar, 1977)

St. Jorgen Hotel-Malmö, Sweden:

In 1972 a participative management program was introduced to spur the St. Jorgen Hotel's (Malmö, Sweden) food and beverage profitability.

The methods utilized to turn a deficit into a profit was shortly called Management, Decision-sharing, and Profitability. The first step was to define participation, which is the development of attitudes and ideas on the part of both staff and management, decision-sharing, and profitability.

Decision-sharing

The only solution at hand, to lift the hotel's food and beverage operations from their all-time economic low, was to increase sales volume, thereby also increasing employee productivity. By doing so would require extensive re-organization that involved the cooperation of the entire staff. Such collaboration could only be achieved through decision-sharing.

To initiate the program, a Management Committee of nine members, selected

from all employee categories including a union representative, was appointed. When the group first met in April 1973, it was decided that its initial step should be to do a detailed survey of Hotel St. Jorgen's food and beverage facilities.

Staff Organization

The Management Committee concluded that the most effective way to bring about the changes they were suggesting would be to delegate them to autonomous groups within each department who would plan and carry through the needed alterations.

How to reduce other costs was another topic considered by the Management Committee. It was recommended that direct departmental orders and controls could replace the traditional method for purchasing, stocking, and controlling food and beverage supplies.

Every department would function as an “autonomous” group, including every employee and the union representatives. The group meets monthly to discuss the budget. Since all employees and their unions are represented at the meeting, practically all the problems can be discussed, and a final decision reached.

Results

The principal for decision-sharing for autonomous groups should lead to improved profits because a flood of suggestions come from employees at the lower echelons, where the work is performed. At Hotel St. Jorgen

this can be verified. The system has prompted numerous employee suggestions as to how guests could be better served, productivity improved, and operational cost reduced. (Dermody, 1976)

#### Participatory Management at a Paris Hotel:

At three hotels—George V, Plaza Athenee, and La Tremoille in Paris where upper-crust travelers are tun with a degree of employee involvement regarded as remarkable, even in a country where worker participation is required by law. By the early 1960's these hotels were faced with some operating problems; staff morale had dropped along with occupancy rates. By 1967 the business was in red ink. It was in that time the Parliament required all French companies with more than fifty employees to give workers a voice in the running of things, and a modest cut of the profits.

The heart of each hotel's system is its "staff committee." Made up of an elected representative of each department where the staff committee regularly consults with top management on operations and results in all three hotels. These committees are given active roles as idea sources and sounding boards for management, forums for sharing business information, and discussion groups for solving problems. The system has even been expanded; similar committees within each hotel department set the procedures and solves the problems. Of course, managers still make operating decisions. Later, however, they must be prepared to explain to employees and respond to opposing views.

The Plaza's system sets aside a full third of the pre-tax profit each year—leaving the rest of the annual gain to be split equally between the government and the corporation. At the Plaza, the employees can follow the state of the business through a daily bulletin board posting of its occupancy rate and other vital signs. The financial performance of the house is posted every month and the results for each year are explained at meetings attended by all employees. Besides all this, to raise profits massive expenditures were made on both facilities and people, wages are increased, and the work hours were cut; as a result, in the first three years, staff turnover fell from 60% a year to 8%. A better service was gained, enough to influence the occupancy from below 70 to over 80% in ten years, even with more rooms and despite an average 10% annual hike in room rates. (Nelson, 1982)

#### U.S. Failures

One of the most exciting experiments in industrial democracy was carried out at Non-Linear Systems, Inc., (NLS) of Delmar, California. Early in the investigation, some changes were introduced into the NLS-managed organizational system to facilitate a more-human relations orientation towards work. Hourly rates of pay were abolished, and no deductions were made for arriving late or leaving early. Time clocks were abolished because clocking-in was held to be degrading.

In organizational terms, the company developed some project teams; an eight-member executive council provided the operating policy, plan, and coordination. The company also made extensive use of induction programs to familiarize new people with this novel set up.

By early 1965 NLS was not performing either regarding productivity or profitability. The experiment failed. Partly because business conditions had changed and made nonsense of the over-optimistic predictions of sales. The investigation had been a great success while the company was experiencing phenomenal growth rates from 1960 to 1963.

In 1965 the rate of increase diminished sharply, the company was unable to get the productive efficiency that it needed to cope with new and vigorous competition. (H-Khozhan, 1978, pp. 76-77)

Another experiment was conducted by General Foods Corporation, which opened a dog food plant in Topeka, Kansas, in the early 1970's, designed to run with minimum supervision. Workers were allowed to make job assignments, schedule coffee-breaks, interview prospective employees, and even decide pay raises. While at first General Foods described the experiment as very successful, it is now discouraging publicity about the Topeka plant.

Briefly, what happened was that the team system, which is the basis of the experiment, came squarely up against the General Foods bureaucracy. The Topeka system eliminated some levels of management and team members worked under the direction of a "coach" rather than a foreman. (H-Khozhan, 1978, p. 77)

#### CONCLUSION

The study was conducted to measure the degree of participation in decision making in food & beverage departments of selected hotels in the Miami Dade area and develop an effective participation program for

their use. In the selection process the researcher concentrated to cover at least two hotels from four different categories which consisted of Downtown, Airport, Beach and Suburban hotels. The population list from which the sample hotels were drawn was compiled by going through the Meetings and Conventions periodical of March 1984, Florid's Miami Section, and the selection was done by random picking those hotels that had more than 250 room.

The researcher prepared two sets of questionnaires which were to be distributed to management and non-management employees. Questionnaire number one which was presented to the non-management employees consisted of six closed-ended questions and a ranked question. The questions were prepared in order to bring out the degree of participation in decision making by non-management employees. On the other had questionnaire number two, which was presented to management employees, consisted of four closed-ended questions along with the same ranked question that was asked to non-management employees. Furthermore. A breakdown of the type of employees was indicated on the questionnaire sheets.

Questionnaire number one was to be filled out by six non-management employees, who were: A restaurant waiter, waitress, cook, dishwasher, a cocktail waitress, and a bartender. While questionnaire number two was to be filled out by the F&B Manager, Assistant F&B Mng. And the Maitre D. As a result, a total of nine questionnaire sheets were distributed to ten different hotels. The researcher arranged his appointments through the telephone by getting in touch with all the F&B Managers of the selected hotels. All the hotel participated in the survey completed the questionnaire sheets, and therefore a hundred percent participation was gained.

#### The Test of the Hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. The first hypothesis is that there is little participation in decision making in F&B departments of the selected hotels. The results of the survey indicate that the first hypothesis is being proved through the questionnaires. A total number of non-management employees accounted to sixty employees in total:

Total of sixty-two percent indicated that "the decisions were being made by management in their department for the first question.

Total of sixty-four percent indicated that "the decisions were being made by management in their department for the second question.

Total of seventy-seven percent indicated that "the decisions were being made by management in their department for the third question.

Total of sixty-one percent indicated that "the decisions were being made by management in their department for the fourth question.

Total of fifty-nine percent indicated that "the decisions were being made by management in their department for the fifth question.

Questionnaire number two concerns management employees. The total of thirty management employees has responded to the questions in the following order.

Total of fifty-eight percent indicated that "the decisions were occasionally arrived by discussions, while thirty percent indicated they were the ones taking the decision. When the answers of management and non-management employees in compared their seem to be a controversy among the two groups. While the management feels they are more participative, the non-management feel more authoritative approach is being applied by the management. The same controversy is seen in the second question where seventy-four percent of the management employees indicate that they occasionally take in consideration the opinions and ideas of their subordinates, while the sixty-four percent of the non-management employees indicated that their opinions and ideas were not being taken into consideration.

The most interesting response was given by the management employees concerning question number three, where ninety-five percent of the of all the managers indicated that the subordinates should not have a word in the final decision concerning their work. This suggests that managers are skeptical of subordinates decision-making competence and commitment to organizational goals., and therefore may view participative approaches too risky.

In question number four, sixty-one percent of the total respondents indicated that decision-making was based on both by man-to-man and group pattern of operation. Only twenty-two percent indicated that decisions

were solely made by management. It is apparent that the way the management employees perceive participative management is different from the non-management employees.

The last question that was asked to both management and non-management employees, where the respondents from both sides were told to list the seven items that motivate the employees today, the results from both groups are as follows:

Pay/salary was listed as number one by the management employees, in other words, the management perceived that money was the most important motivator for the non-management employees, while the non-management employees listed responsibility as that which motivated the most, and pay/salary was listed as the fourth important motivator to the non-employees. Managers rated job satisfaction as second, while non-management employees listed career advancement as the second important motivator. Third important motivator listed by the managers was career advancement, while the non-management employees listed job satisfaction as the as the third important motivator. Fourth important motivator listed by managers was work conditions (sanitary, physical environment and settings), while it was rated as the seventh important motivator by non-management employees. The fifth most crucial motivator was rated as recognition by managers, while it was rated the sixth by the non-management employees. Sixth most important motivator was rated as good relations with superiors and peers, while it was rated the fifth by non-management employees. Finally, the managers rated responsibility as the last motivator, while subordinates rated this as their number one motivator.

The comparison indicates that the management is not aware of the needs and wants of their subordinates. If a management team fails to understand what motivates their employees, then it is hard to expect the subordinates to be motivated in the achievement of the organizational goals. Therefore, managers should be receptive to the ideas and opinions of their subordinates; they should respect and have faith in them, give them a chance to be heard, and make them a part of the organization.

The Development of an Effective Participation Program: - Hypothesis 2.

The second hypothesis is that an effective participation program could be developed to increase the level of decision-making.

It is the researcher's second task to develop an effective participation program to increase the degree of participation in decision-making.

To increase the degree of participation in decision-making would require extensive re-organization that involves the cooperation of the entire staff. Such collaboration would best be achieved through decision-sharing. The decision-sharing concept is based on the premise that management should view the staff not as an "expense," but as a "capital" resource. Participation can be increased and stimulated by delegating decision-making and responsibility to the employees, which involves breaking down traditional barriers between management and employees and establishing autonomous groups of cooperation. Thereby, workers become more personally involved in their duties. Once workers feel they are personally involved and free to make suggestions, a flood of ideas is generated that can be of tremendous value since they originate within daily work experience.

To develop this concept into an effective participation program, we need to study how decision-making takes place in the traditional company organization, where decisions are made by management. An organization ordinarily functions on a man-to-man basis, where the organization chart is a classical top to the bottom hierarchical formation. In this type of organization, it is the President's responsibility to make the important decisions, though the regularly holds meetings with the people who report to him for purposes of sharing information, but not decision-making.

However, if the final decision arrived at by the President does not represent the interests of all departments, it will not be a healthy one. In any organization larger than a few hundred employees, the final decision will affect all the other members of the organization regardless of being a management or a non-management employee. Therefore, the interests of these members or groups will have to be taken into consideration when arriving at a final decision.

The classical organization chart has to be re-organized, where each member should be placed equally from each other. The departments should connect on a circular formation rather than traditional hierarchical line formation.

Circular formation creates autonomous groups to handle work of departmental works. In this type of setup, the chores are coordinated in harmony. This is an effective system where the interest of every group within the department is being represented. In this type of teamwork the main idea is to have all the groups participate in the decision-making process. As a result, the arrived decision would be the best solution for all the members of the organization, because it would be a commonly arrived decision.

#### The Functioning of Autonomous Groups

The department's work is to be done by autonomous groups. The members of these autonomous groups are the employees who work in the same department and pursue the same type of jobs. The nature of their jobs causes them to interact with one another. Since they perform the same type of job, they also share the same responsibilities and problems that the job brings. In this type of teamwork, every group will have a chance to be heard, participate in analyzing, discussing, and finding solutions to the problems that the group is facing. Not only the department but the group members will also be benefiting from this type of group work. Since they would be responsible for solving problems and setting guidelines to accomplish their tasks, they would be motivated to work by the department's goals. As a result, if they see their managers encouraging them to work as a team, they would feel a part of the organization and become committed to serving their organization in the best way possible. Like all other groups, each autonomous group will have a leader. In such a case, the leader of the group of maids could be the senior chambermaid.

#### The Leader

It is essential for the success of the group that the supervisor should be the initial leader of the group. The autonomous group concept will gain a quicker acceptance when it steps into the existing organizational structure. The supervisor is already designated to perform a leadership role in the organization.

A successful leader is a person who involves other members of the group in carrying out assignments even though they know that they could do the jobs better. If the leader considers some of the members to be weak and deficient, that is all the more reason for them to get experience while he or she is available to help them, if necessary. The leader alone is responsible for the smooth and effective operation of the group. Therefore, the leader must learn how to handle the group members. To do this, it is necessary to receive training in group dynamics and communications. Of course, understanding the overall autonomous group concept within the company is essential, so that the groups can operate at maximum effectiveness. The leader should schedule group meetings and ensure that the sessions are job oriented. The best groups are those that provide an opportunity for all members to be heard and the leader must make this happen by injecting appropriate inputs and giving encouragement to stimulate group discussion. The leader should always work towards making the group members better than they already are by giving assignments and encouraging them to participate in all areas of the teamwork. The groups should meet twice every month, and also the group leaders should meet approximately once a month, and discuss topics of general interest.

#### The Member

The member is the part of the autonomous group that makes it all worthwhile. This is the individual who occupies the lower levels of the organization, but whose participation as a part of a team can genuinely affect an organization's quality and competitive image. It is at this level that ideas are being sought. Some management people think that "lower level employees don't care about the organization's quality and competitive image." Some management level people think that "lower level employees don't care about the organization's need" or aren't capable of any good ideas." Instead, the management should understand the value of these employees, since they are the ones who perform the jobs, and should benefit from their ideas and experiences, by encouraging them to work as a team. These employees should be given training on group dynamics where they would learn to work constructively with other group members, as well as those outside the group.

#### Motivation

Motivation is a method of meeting employee needs while they accomplish organizational goals. The more one meets employee needs; the more productive output is likely to be. The manager who can match employee needs with organizational goals will get the best results. The manager who has employees who have lost enthusiasm or who may even be fighting the system can never hope to get true motivation.

Participation in group activities provides motivation such as exciting and challenging work, opportunity to perform meaningful work, recognition, and responsibility. Members assume responsibility to identify and

analyze problems in their work area. This opportunity to do exciting and useful work provides a new and exciting challenge. The recommendation to management is a dramatic form of recognition for the group members.

Since the teamwork increases the degree of participation and motivates employees to function cohesively as a team, a successful manager is one who encourages his employees to work as a team and provides an opportunity for all members to be heard.

#### Group Dynamics

Group dynamics is a highly complex subject that deals with the interaction between people. One of the main themes of group dynamics is "People Building." People building is the art of making people better than they already are. It is done by helping them to acquire knowledge and skills; and, just as important, to improve their attitudes—making them feel better about themselves. The members of a group should be given assignments, make presentations, and should be allowed to assist group members who need special help during training. Group members should be respected and given status. There are some status symbols that can make members feel important. It costs little or nothing but carries with it a big pay off. Simply courteously treating members are giving them status. Status creates the motivation that carries benefits for group members, the group and the organization itself. Members should also be kept informed. Everyone wants to "Be in on things," and they should hear about them from the leader. Superiors are very important in group dynamics: He should get fully involved and should be encouraged to strive for the involvement of all members at every group meeting—not once, but several times. Group size may be the most significant factor. If it is too large, then there are just too many members for the leader to handle. Therefore, large groups should be broken into two or more separate groups. The leader should ask questions, encourage group discussions, and give the members assignments to carry out. All members should receive equal attention. The group meetings play an important role in getting members to work with each other. Members get to know each other and get an opportunity to present their ideas. Well—managed meetings stimulate enthusiastic participation in the project. They also encourage quiet and shy to express their ideas to the group through group leaders, or other group members.

#### Communication

Communication is a vital process in the smooth functioning of any organization. Without proper discussion it is difficult to exchange ideas, thoughts, or information. Communication cannot take place unless people are involved in exchanging information. People, therefore, are the most critical element in the communication process. When the communication process involves a group of more than two people, communication networks emerge. Networks are simply diagrams of processes. Communication networks merely represent the direction and unique arrangement of communication attempts in a given group.

In a typical organization, the communication networks are centralized networks, (such as in a chain, wheel, and "Y"). In these three networks, the leader occupies the center of the group and passes on the information to all members and from one member to another. In centralized networks there is a two-way communication, but only between the leader and the members, but not between the members of the group. Whereas in decentralized networks, (such as in the All Channel), the leader is just another member of the group. There is a two—way communication between all members. This motivates the flow of ideas and increases the member participation in problem solving and decision-making.

When centralized and decentralized networks are compared with each other on simple problems, decentralized systems are slower in solving the problem and less accurate; yet, morale is reported as being higher and more messages are transmitted among members than in centralized systems. For complex problem situations, the centralized systems are inferior. They are slow, less accurate, with lower morale and fewer messages than in decentralized systems. To increase the member participation in problem solving and decision-making, decentralized systems should be preferred over the centralized type of operations.

#### Setting Goals

Groups should concentrate on small problems because dealing with big issues is the job of management. Besides, groups usually don't have adequate experience and resources to solve big problems. But several small, solvable issues from the area of group's expertise can easily outweigh a big one. Also, there always seems to be an abundance of minor problems. Perhaps this is because management and other professional problem solvers are too busy to bother with them, or, maybe it is because they are just unaware of them. Of the only persons conscious of the small problems are the people doing the work. If ignored even by group

members, no one will try to solve them. It is possible, too, that—added together—these small problems may comprise a very significant barrier to the success of an organization, or a department in it.

Those charged with fulfilling the goals must be involved in their establishment.

This is an essential ingredient in building commitment. It should be noted that the word “involved” is used—involved entirely or in part. If the goals are established by management without group involvement, then the commitment will belong to management.

There is an array of factors involved in setting group goals. These factors are listed below:

Objectives should be properly stated.

Goals should be stated objectively.

Goals should be clarified with times and dates.

Goals should be challenging.

Goals should be attainable.

Goals should be measurable.

Promoting the Group and its Members

Management support plays an essential role in the success of autonomous groups. But it is unique in the sense that it must come first. That is, if management support is non-existent, the teamwork is doomed to failure.

The support of management:

Must be within or under the control of the organization using the autonomous groups.

Should come from all levels.

Should be visible.

As a result, successful groups and its members should be promoted by:

Appreciation letters, Certificates, Posters, slogans, flyers, monthly letters.

Pictures of the group members.

Employee meetings.

Monthly letters, small gifts.

All these actions help to promote the program and build the morale of the employee.

To achieve the best out of the autonomous groups it is extremely important for the success of this program, and cohesiveness plays a vital characteristic of successful groups. A group, to be cohesive, must have its members identify themselves with the group's norms and missions, where group's values become personal values for members. A coherent group is one in which the behavior of its members is determined by a shared understanding of each's role. Group cohesiveness is an absolute requirement if the group is to remain in existence over the long run. Organization's success is primarily a function of group cohesiveness, which provides an interrelated network of role patterns required to satisfy membership for organization needs. The manager must motivate and develop favorable attitudes towards and among these autonomous groups and coordinate their needs and wants with that of the organization. Finally, representatives from all autonomous come together to form a management committee to hold monthly meetings. Once again, in these meetings, the interests of all the departments are being represented. Therefore, in the final decision phase, the degree of participation is highly increased.

## REFERENCES

Alfred D. Chandler, J. (1968). *The Rise of Big Business*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World.

Dermody, D. A. (1976, May). Participative Management Turns a Loss into a Profit. *Cornell Quarterly*, pp. 71-75.

Gyllenhammar, P. G. (1977, July-August). How Volvo Adopts Work to People. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 107-108.

- Hackman, R. (1977). *Perspectives on Behavior in Organization*. New York: MacGraw Hill.
- Herbert, T. T. (1976). *Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*. New York: McMillan Publishing Co.
- Herbert, T. T. (1976). *Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*. New York: McMillan Publishing Co.
- H-Khozhan, J. K. (1978). *Participative Management; Can it work?*. *Business Horizons*.
- Kovach, K. A. (1981). *Management by Whom-Trends in Participative Management*. *Society for the Advancement of Management*, 5-11.
- McCoby, M. (1982). *One Kind of Leader-A Foreman Who Taught Workers to Take Over his Job*. *Across the Board*, 49-53.
- McConkey, D. D. (1980). *Participative Management: What it really means in practice*. *Business Horizons*.
- Nelson, B. (1982, May). *Participatory Management at a Paris Hotel*. *Business and Society Review*, pp. 29-32.
- Rogers, R. E. (1975). *Organizational Theory*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- The New Industrial Relations*. (1981, May). *Business Week*, pp. 92-93.
- Wadia, M. S. (1980). *Participative Management: Three Common Problems*. *Personal Journal*.
- Wren, D. A. (1979). *The Evolution of Management Thought*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.