Chapter 10. Participative Management and Employee and Stakeholder Involvement[1]

By Kristi M. Branch

Participative management addresses the relationship between the organization and its workers and stakeholders. It addresses fundamental issues of governance within organizations and the role of employees and external stakeholders in all levels of organizational decision making. In addition to philosophical issues of governance and the appropriate relationship between workers and their employers, the literature on participative management can help managers dealing with the fundamental challenges facing public science managers in today's dynamic and competitive environment: maintaining high levels of effectiveness, productivity, innovativeness, and worker motivation in an increasingly dynamic, competitive environment. Participative management is recognized as particularly pertinent to organizations dealing with complex, knowledge-based problems. Extensive research conducted as early as the 1950s and 1960s demonstrated that participative management is particularly well suited to science-based organizations whose key staff are noted for their creativity, intrinsic motivation for work that interests them, stronger affiliation with their discipline than their organization, and sensitivity to directive management (Likert 1969; Marcson 1960; Siepert 1964; Macy 1965; Steele 1969). The interdependence of scientific research, and hence of scientific organizations, requires participation at multiple levels. New requirements to involve external stakeholders in policy-setting and planning decisions, and to address concerns about the public acceptability of research programs place additional demands on the skills and capabilities of both managers and staff. One of the main social and organizational utilities of participation is that it offers the possibility of resolving contradictory interests through individual negotiation and/or collective bargaining rather than imposition of authority (Bolle de Bal 1992a).

Overview

Since its origins with Elton Mayo's *The Human Problems of a Industrial Civilization* (1933) and Kurt Lewin's "Frontiers in Group Dynamics" (1947), a large and diverse literature has been assembled on participative management, which includes employee involvement, industrial democracy, and stakeholder involvement. Interest in participative management has been persistent during this period, with periodic surges corresponding to the social, political, and economic issues of chronically low productivity in the 1960s and 1970s, and international challenges to U.S. industry and product quality in the 1980s and 1990s when worker motivation, productivity and innovativeness became priority issues. Recently, the focus has been on the relationship between participative management and the newer, organic and networked organizational forms, dramatically improved information and communication technology, and greater citizen involvement in organizational decision making. The literature reflects a growing recognition among U.S. academics and managers that a high productivity/high wage economy requires new labor-management relationships, including ways to share gains and organize work that more fully develop and utilize the skills, knowledge, and motivation of the workforce

---

[1] Related chapters include: Science Policy; Strategy; Change Management; Teams and Project- and Program-Based Organizations; Organizational Alliances, Partnerships, and Networks; Organizational Culture; Organizational Communication; Innovation.

(Commission on the Future of Worker-Management Relations 1995:38). Indeed, participative management is increasingly seen as a feasible system of governance for these organizations (Lawler 1996).

The literature reflects a wide and diverse research orientation. Social philosophy and organizational theory, human development, management practices, small-group processes, and leadership perspectives are all represented. It is enriched with a significant comparative component: interest in participative management and industrial democracy has also been high in Europe and the Scandinavian countries. This provides a useful check on the ethnocentrism that can occur when the entire literature shares a similar cultural or geopolitical context. Unlike many aspects of the organizational effectiveness and management literature, both public and private sector organizations have been subject to investigation regarding participative management and employee involvement, and there have been some instructive time-series studies on the extent of adoption and the organizational consequences of participative management practices (Lawler et al. 1986, 1992, 1998, 2001). In addition, there is a strong body of research on the relationships among aspects of organizational design, management practices, and worker characteristics pertinent to participative management and employee involvement.

In keeping with the general problem-driven nature of the organizational effectiveness literature as a whole, the literature on participative management has tended to focus on production-oriented or service-providing organizations where issues of worker motivation and satisfaction, product and service quality and productivity were most acute. However, research on the management of science has included attention to the pertinence of participative management for both public and private research organizations. The literature on external stakeholder or citizen participation, which has also included some specific attention to science-based organizations, is essentially separate from that on participative management and employee involvement.

The Organizational Context: Why The Interest in Participative Management Now?

Competitive Pressure

The literature on participative management and employee involvement addresses the interactive relationship between the broader socio-political system and the workplace, in both empirical and philosophical or normative terms, and then tiers that examination down to look at the relationships between organizational design, managerial approach, workplace conditions, job design, pay systems, worker and manager characteristics, organizational performance, and worker and manager motivation and satisfaction. As a consequence, the literature spans discussions of social theory, organizational theory, human relations and organizational psychology, and management strategies and approach. It draws upon a variety of theoretical frameworks and models about the purposes and mechanisms for achieving participation and the impact of participation on the organization and its members.

A key factor in the interest in participative management was the realization, which really struck home during the 1980s, that better management practices -- superior quality management systems, better employee relations, integrated design and production teams -- could provide critical competitive advantages to public and private sector organizations (Lawler 1996). During this same period, heightened issues about the societal accountability of organizations also occupied management attention (Collins 1997). As a result, since the 1980s there has been substantial expansion in the number and variety of employee participation efforts and initiatives

and the number of organizations employing participative management strategies, although these practices still remain only partially diffused throughout the economy (Commission on the Future of Worker-Management Relations 1995).

Underlying the entire discussion of participative management and employee and stakeholder involvement is the dominance of the bureaucratic, hierarchical organization model and management approach commonly referred to as *Taylorism* (based on Frederick Winslow Taylor's 1911 classic *The Principles of Scientific Management)* or *Fordism* (based on the principles developed by Henry Ford). However, the pre-eminence of the bureaucratic, hierarchical organization model and traditional management practices is facing increased challenge (Lawler et al. 2001). In the early literature, participative management strategies and employee and stakeholder involvement were approached as modifications of or supplements to the traditional bureaucratic, hierarchical model, undertaken to achieve particular goals or address particular problems. Recently, however, participative management has been discussed as a comprehensive governance system that could, and is, replacing the traditional bureaucratic hierarchical system for the new, organic, networked organizational forms emerging in the late 1990s. Conversion into a participative organization is seen as a way for an organization to build key capabilities essential for success in the complicated and dynamic contemporary organizational environment (McLagan and Nel 1995; Bartlett and Ghoshal 1991; Case 1998).

The traditional logic of organizing is to give simple work to employees at the bottom of the pyramid who then report through a supervisor up a hierarchical chain of command to senior executives who provide direction, coordination, and control. This does not work well for organizations managing knowledge intensive tasks. As the number and visibility of high knowledge-based organizations increases, the need for a "new logic" of management has gained currency among both academics and managers (Lawler 1996; Beer et al. 1990; Case 1998). Lawler (1996:22) summarizes some of the principles of this new logic, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The New Logic of Management

Old Logic Principle	New Logic Principle
♦ Organization is a secondary source of competitive advantage	♦ Organization can be the ultimate competitive advantage
♦ Bureaucracy is the most effective source of control	♦ Involvement is the most effective source of control
♦ Top management and technical experts should add most of the value	♦ All employees must add significant value
♦ Hierarchical processes are the key to organizational effectiveness	♦ Lateral processes are the key to organizational effectiveness
♦ Organizations should be designed around functions	♦ Organizations should be designed around products and customers
♦ Effective managers are the key to organizational effectiveness	♦ Effective leadership is the key to organizational effectiveness

Source: Lawler III., Edward E. 1996. *From the Ground Up: Six Principles for Building the New Logic Corporation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. P. 22.

The competitive success of Japanese companies in the 1970s brought American attention to their use of group-work, team-consciousness, quality circles, and decision-emerging process, and the central role of consultation and participation (Beer et al. 1990). U.S. companies implemented participative management strategies such as quality circles and production teams in an effort to meet the Japanese economic challenge, and incidentally, to address local social demands. Collaborative problem solving groups or workers organized in committees or teams were heralded as a superior method for addressing problems of coordination within complex organizations, permitting more rapid diagnosis and resolution of production problems affecting quality and productivity (Kelley 2000). As it became evident that imitating the Japanese organizational design and managerial strategies did not yield similar results, U.S. firms and researchers gradually realized that employee involvement and participative management needed to be designed as a complete organizational model rather than as piecemeal modifications to traditional practices (Lawler et al. 2001; Case 1998). A growing consensus was building in the academic business literature that U.S. firms needed to fully embrace participatory work strategies if they were to regain economic prominence in the global economy because it provided the best way to create the necessary flexibility and worker commitment (Markowitz 1996).

Societal Pressure and Strongly Held Democratic Values

In the United States, there is a widespread philosophical belief that people have a right to be involved in making decisions that affect their lives. This is matched by a belief that people who are involved in making decisions have a greater stake in carrying out those decisions than those who are not involved (Bloom 2000:5). In addition, Ackoff (1999) asserts that employees at all levels, but particularly those in the lower half of U.S. organizations, have become increasingly disturbed by the inconsistency of living in a society "dedicated to the pursuit of democracy but working in organizations that are as autocratic as fascist dictatorships." Participatory management is widely perceived as an attribute of socially responsible companies (Collins 1996), with participation in decision making at the workplace seen as central to the democratic vision and basic to the good society (Greenberg 1986).

These core values are reflected in five different perspectives on the purpose and rationale for worker participation in organizations (Bolle de Bal (1992a:603-610):
- *The Managerial Approach*, which is inspired by productivity and efficiency goals (participation is organized at a lower level in order to relieve worker dissatisfaction and morale problems). This approach reflects the emerging viewpoint that organizational design and management effectiveness can provide a significant competitive advantage. It gives considerable attention to issues of organizational design and organizational change, on the basis that entirely new work structures and ways of organizing work can lead to substantial gains in effectiveness (Lawler et al. 2001). A key issue in this approach is the extent to which management delegates or retains the power to initiate, frame, and terminate participative processes. It also reflects management's view that the direct participation of workers undermines union power.
- *The Humanist Psychology Approach*, which is inspired by human growth and development goals, (participation as a way to enhance the well-being of the individual by promoting individual creativity, self-esteem, and ego strength). This approach reflects the movement led by Elton Mayo , and followed by the work of Argyris (1957); Likert (1961); McGregor (1960); Mohrman and Lawler (1985); Cassar (1999); Massarik 1983; and Sagie (1997). It reflects a much more positive view of human nature and emphasizes the need to retrain managers to develop their participative leadership skills and unlearn authoritarian behaviors. It acknowledges the societal function of the workplace and the

benefit of participatory restructuring of the workplace, given the central role it plays in the lives of most ordinary people (Pateman 1970).

♦ *The Industrial Relations Approach*, which is inspired by democratic goals (participation is not only a means to an end in itself but also a way to create a strongly democratic society, characterized by active participative citizens). This approach reflects the importance of the external environment to the organization (not highly recognized in bureaucratic, hierarchical organization design, but more widely recognized in organic, open-system designs). Participation in the workplace is seen as contributing to an effective and just society. The workplace is seen as a point of leverage from which to achieve a more egalitarian redistribution of power, leading to a greater democratization of the entire political process (Emery and Thorsrud 1969; Bachrach and Botwinick 1992; Pateman 1970; Matejko 1986).

♦ *The Political Approach*, which is inspired by revolutionary goals (participation as a means to change the overall structure of ownership to a collective base and to educate workers to class consciousness). The role of organized labor is addressed in this approach, with Bachrach and Botwinick (1992) noting that worker participation in postwar U.S. is substantially less developed and widespread than in Europe, a factor attributed to the weakness of the trade union movement in the U.S. and the absence of enabling legislation such as is present in Europe. Advancement toward greater worker participation is seen as very dependent upon a strong labor movement.

♦ *The Psycho-Sociological or Anthropological Approach*, which is inspired by synthetic, multidimensional goals (participation as a way of acculturation, of pushing workers to internalize the economic norms of the organization) and emphasizes the fundamental aspects of human nature and how to get the best out of workers. It emphasizes the fundamental social interactions in the workplace and the role of participation in addressing issues of resistance, motivation, and engagement (Lewin 1947; Coch and French 1949; Bolle De Bal 1992a and b). This approach draws a clear contrast with traditional Taylorian and bureaucratic models, which attempt to exclude subjectivity and creativity. In this approach, subjectivity and creativity are integrated into the enterprise culture.

It should be noted that not everyone subscribes to this positive view of participatory democracy or to the benefits of direct participation in the workplace. Unions, for example, argue that participative processes are actually detrimental to the welfare of workers, enabling management to capture the knowledge of workers and circumvent the protections provided by collective representation (Fantasia et al. 1988; Bolle de Bal (1992b), reflecting the generally more critical European perspective, notes that participation in the workplace has features that are not uniformly positive for all interest groups.

Expected Benefits

As literature on participative management and employee involvement accumulated, a wide range of benefits was elaborated, and organizations were encouraged to adopt a variety of participation strategies, and to cultivate a culture of participation (Denison 1990). This enthusiasm undoubtedly influenced organizational behavior, at least to some degree. Kanter (1989; 1983), for example, pointed out that a participatory work environment is theoretically more effective at enhancing innovations than traditional bureaucratic structures because it promotes the sharing of product knowledge between managers and workers, who are closest to the products being made and work being done and therefore more likely to develop strategies and suggestions for better

quality items, and Markowitz (1996) asserted that "giving employees decision-making power boosts their morale and commitment to the organization, which aids productivity…. everyone benefits: businesses accrue higher profits and stability because they are more secure in their industry niche and workers are more fulfilled and attached to the companies because they have a voice in decision-making." Denison (1990) provides empirical evidence that higher levels of employee participation are correlated with better organizational performance.

The literature reveals its management orientation in these discussions – benefits are almost always framed from the perspective of the firm. In this regard, Lawler's (1990:38-40) summary of expected benefits reflects much of the U.S. literature, although unlike many others, he also includes a summary of potential negative consequences. The expected benefits listed are:

- ♦ Improved, more innovative and efficient work methods and procedures (less resistance to new methods may result, and the problem-solving process may produce innovations)
- ♦ Better communication between management and workers and across work units
- ♦ Attraction and retention of employees (improvement results from increased satisfaction and involvement)
- ♦ Reduced tardiness, turnover, and absenteeism
- ♦ Greater staffing flexibility (increased flexibility results from cross-training and teamwork)
- ♦ Increased service and product quality (higher motivation and better methods increase quality)
- ♦ Higher productivity and output (higher motivation and better methods increase the rate of output)
- ♦ Reduced staff support and supervision requirements (more "self-management" and broader skills reduce the needs for staff support and supervision)
- ♦ More effective resolution of conflict and reduced number of grievances (better communication and an improved union-management relationship reduce the number of grievances)
- ♦ Better decisions (better input and decision-making processes improve the quality of decisions)
- ♦ Expansion of staff skills (problem-solving as well as technical skills are developed)
- ♦ Improved morale and job satisfaction.

And the potential negative consequences are identified as:

- ♦ Salary and training costs (developing new skills and responsibilities for lower-level participants results in increased salaries and additional training)
- ♦ Support personnel (if the new program creates a new structure that needs support and management, support personnel must increase)
- ♦ Expectations for organizational change and personal growth and development opportunities (any program that talks about participation increases expectations for organizational change and personal growth, which, if it is limited or fails, results in dissatisfaction and cynicism)
- ♦ Resistance by middle management and/or by staff support groups (if they are not positively affected by the program, they may resist it)
- ♦ Lost time (participation takes time and can slow decision making because a number of people have to understand and accept the decision)

In 1993, Lawler (1993:174-177) emphasized the *strategic* benefits of participative management, arguing that decisions could be made more rapidly and flexibly when power is moved to the lowest possible level and that workers, especially knowledge workers, were empowered and motivated by these changes. Overhead costs can be greatly reduced, increasing the organization's competitive advantage, and better use can be made of capital-intensive technologies by improved problem solving and adaptive behavior.

Appropriate for a discussion of participation and involvement, Bolle de Bal (1992a) points out that those at different positions in the organization have different interests, and hence different perspectives on the benefits and costs of providing direct participation mechanisms for employees. His summary of the pros and cons of direct participation from the perspective of employers, workers, and union representative is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The Pros and Cons of Direct Participation From Different Perspectives[2]

Function	Employer Pro	Employer Con	Worker Pro	Worker Con	Union Pro	Worker Con
Ideological	Work humanization; worker integration; union weakening	Criticism of managerial authority or capitalist property	Recognition, achievement, promotion	Manipulation, managerial reassessment of influence	Exercise counter-power	Paternalism, manipulation, atomization, individual-ization, exclusion
Economic	Improvement of work force and management efficiency	Cost	Profit-sharing, acquisition, use of skills	Cost, time, energy	Exercise counter-power	Paternalism, manipulation, atomization, individual-ization, exclusion
Psycho-logical	Motivation, stress reduction	Tensions and frustrations	Job enrichment, stress reduction	Additional responsibil-ities, loss of freedom	Exercise counter-power	Paternalism, manipulation, atomization, individual-ization, exclusion
Organiza-tional	De-bureauc-ratization, modernization, decision emergence, training	Bureaucracy, slowness, disorgani-zation	Decentral-ization, delegation		Exercise counter-power	Paternalism, manipulation, atomization, individual-ization, exclusion
Socio-logical	Social regulation, cooperation, control	Middle management frustration, union opposition	Integration	Alienation	Exercise counter-power	Paternalism, manipulation, atomization, individual-ization, exclusion

Source: Bolle de Bal (1992:603-610)

---

2 For comparison, he also summarizes the pros and cons of indirect participation (i.e., representation) for the employer, worker, and union.

Key Considerations in Designing and Implementing Participatory Management and Employee and Stakeholder Involvement

In general, reflecting the enduring dominance of the bureaucratic hierarchical model, participation and involvement in organizations is discussed as the way organizations set the context for and interact with employees through the decisions and actions of managers, who are assumed to have the authority to modify all aspects of the organization. In some cases, managers are included among employees, and the focus is on the rights, roles, responsibilities, and interactions of the members of an organization – either among themselves or with groups and individuals outside the organization. The discussions range in scale from societal to organizations or firms to organizational units, teams, and dyads. Although dominated by the firm's point of view, the literature does reflect a general awareness that the firm, managers, employees, and union representatives may have different interests and perspectives on particular strategies and their consequences. In general, aside from the most general of observations, the literature draws few, if any, connections between participative management and employee involvement, and the organizational and management requirements/consequences of external stakeholder involvement. Literature on external stakeholder involvement seldom considers the implications of stakeholder involvement on the organization's structure, management approach, or processes.

Most of the literature on participative management and employee and stakeholder involvement reflects a systems view of organizations and emphasizes that decisions regarding organizational design or change concerning participation are complex in many ways, meaning that different approaches will fit different types of businesses, situations, and individuals. As participation became more common, and participative management started to be seen as a system of governance rather than a collection of activities or programs, attention has been focused on the importance, and challenge, of designing the right combination of participative management strategies for a particular organization and objective (Lawler 1988; Coye and Belohlav 1995). Drehmer et al.'s (2000) research demonstrated that there are relationships and interactions among different the participation strategies and approaches and they, along with others, emphasize that care must be taken in choosing and implementing those activities. This includes decisions not only about both the nature and extent of the activities, but also their location within the organization and the manner in which they are introduced and implemented Bloom (2000:10), Lawler, III (1993:177), Case (1998). Lawler (1993) emphasizes the need for a complete organizational model in order to design an appropriate participation approach or transition, noting that this can be particularly challenging because most existing large organizations do not provide useful models for how an organization should be designed to create an effective participative management approach. Indeed, he notes that almost all existing systems are designed to accomplish – and reinforce – just the opposite.

Although there is no authoritative source or theory that defines the dimensions of participation, Lawler and others (Lawler 1998:197; Lawler et al. 1998; Ledford 1993)) provide a good starting point by identifying four key strategies, whose nature and location in the organization are central issues for governance in all organizations and which largely determine the nature and degree of participation available to employees. These strategies are:

- ♦ *Information sharing* about business performance, plans, goals, and strategies, about new technologies and competitors' performance. Without business information, individuals are restricted in their ability to make meaningful contributions, participate in planning

and setting direction, understand the effectiveness of their performance and that of the organization. Information sharing includes both information disclosure and open communication processes.

- *Knowledge development and training* to provide skills in group decision making and problem solving, leadership, quality and statistical analysis, an understanding of the business, and job skills and cross-training. This knowledge and training enables employees to understand and contribute to organizational performance.

- *Rewards and recognition systems* that are based on the performance of the organization and that are designed to encourage employees to obtain information, add skills, take more decision making responsibility, enhance teamwork, and perform in ways that help the business (for example, through the use of individual incentives, work group or team incentives, gain sharing, profit sharing, employee stock ownership plans, stock options plans, and non-monetary recognition and awards for performance).

- *Power sharing*, particularly in decision making, either through parallel structure practices, such as quality circles, committees, survey feedback, or suggestion systems, or work design power sharing practices such as job enrichment and redesign, self-managing work teams, mini-business units, and participation on decision-making boards and committees that enable employees to use and apply the information and knowledge effectively; key strategies include locating decisions at the lowest possible level in the organization.

Bolle De Bal (1992b) makes the point that the participative model of management can be called post-rational because its rationality is adapted to previously neglected values of creativity, self-expression, and participation. Reflecting Lawler's four dimensions, he describes the participative model of management in the following terms:

- Job hierarchy is narrowed and the workers recover a number of tasks that the Taylorian model had hived off to the technical staff

- Supervision based on authority is replaced by supervision based on competency and performing two functions: technical consultancy and small-group human relations

- Negotiations become possible at the rank-and-file level over production goals, product quality, working conditions, and job assignments

- Hiring and promotion are linked to a person's technical capacities, but also to his degree of involvement or participation in company life

- Mixed decision-making models are developed in which the hierarchy sets general objectives while leaving many questions open to negotiations at lower levels

- Islands of production are created where small groups of wage-earners are responsible for a complicated set of maintenance, production and quality control tasks

- Employees' activities are all linked to the firm's objectives through the overriding concern about product quality; on management's initiative, participative groups are formed, and cultural operations (information, communication, company charters) are launched.

As pointed out by Lawler (1988), Lawler et al. (2001) and others, creating a participative organization, either through design or transition, requires rethinking the entire structure and management of the organization, including how individuals interact, roles are defined, and practices implemented. For transitions, the principles of change management need to be followed.

Lawler (1993:177), McLagan and Nell (1995:44), Cotton (1993), LaGrossa (1998), Landsdale (2000), and Plas and Lewis (2001) characterize participative organizations, and the attributes particularly important in leveraging transition to a participative system, in the terms of the following organizational features:

♦ *Organization and work design* (teams, enriched jobs, flat lean structure, product/service/customer-based activities; task forces, diagonal slice policy groups). Structures express the philosophy of governance of an organization. They influence relationships. Participative structures have two basic building blocks: teams and value-adding work streams.

♦ *Physical layout and design* (egalitarian space, layout that accommodates a changing team structure, meeting areas, co-location of business units). Physical space affects relationships and hence information exchange and teamwork.

♦ *Information systems* (two-way communication, local ownership, performance orientation, human system orientation). Information is power. Those who do not have information or the ability to use it to influence decisions are disempowered. New information technology has increased the amount of participation possible. Controls provide the criteria and warning systems that establish replicable processes, create stability, and prevent anarchy. Participation in the establishment of controls promotes commitment and accountability.

♦ *Managerial role, style, and processes* (leadership, vision, empowerment, enabling, participation). Participative management requires leadership that reflects system thinking,that motivates and does not depend on superiority and subordination for its influence but respects employees and encourages them to take the initiative and seek new responsibilities and solutions. Management processes are powerful determinants of organizational culture. If strategy, plans, budgets, goals, decisions, and feedback remain authoritarian, the organization's culture can not be participative.

♦ *Reward system* (individualized rewards, performance based rewards, egalitarian rewards, growth-oriented rewards, open and participative administration). Rewards are a tangible signal of what is important. They influence relationships and motivation.

♦ *Training and development* (lifetime learning, economic literacy, teamwork, personal growth, understanding of the business). Everyone needs the skills and abilities to do their job and to participate effectively. Training and development are essential to build the competencies needed by the organization.

♦ *Staffing* (careful selection, mutual commitment, support of the culture, personal growth, understanding of the business). Competencies and relationships are the building blocks of the new governance. A learning oriented workforce, who can and are motivated to learn new skills and adopt new perspectives. Recognition that no one can know everything. In science-based organizations, where professional standards provide the dominant guide for behavior, selection of staff who are adequately trained and socialized into the normative system of their discipline is particularly important (Friedson and Rhea 1963).

♦ *Personnel policies* (participative design and administration, individual choices, encouragement of social interaction, development of orientation, support of the family). These show a commitment to meet the needs of those who actually design, produce, and market the organization's product.

♦ *Culture and values* (empowerment, personal accountability, open access to information, focus on the customer, commitment to continuous improvement, teamwork). Values determine the nature of governance. Authoritarian values create hierarchies, disempower

people, create rigid control mechanisms, restrict access to information, and treat people as subordinates. Participative values invalidate such practices.

Davis (1976:7) identifies four models of organizational behavior that inform the discussion of participative management: autocratic, custodial, supportive, and collegial. In a collegial model, the managerial orientation is toward integration and teamwork and the employee orientation is toward responsibility and self-discipline. Jain (1992) provides a complementary representation of the extent of employee influence in the management of the organization, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Extent of Employee Influence in the Management of the Enterprise

	Provision of Information	Advisory Input into Decisions	Negotiating Rights	Co-Determination
Corporate	Observer status at board level	Minority board level representation	Negotiating rights over corporate-wide policies	Parity representation at board level
Establishment/ Plant	Work council's right to receive information	Management's obligation to consult work councils on certain issues	Collective bargaining in several countries	Co-determination right of works councils over plant-level issues
Workplace	Company newsletters, suggestion boxes, bulletin boards	Quality circles, labour management committees (bodies to discuss ways to improve efficiency and productivity	Workplace bargaining by union representatives (eg over pace of work etc)	Workplace health and safety committee right to stop production where danger exists

Source: Jain, Hem C. 1992. Canada. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. Edited by György Széll. Pp. 88-98. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Participative Management and Employee and Stakeholder Involvement Initiatives and Strategies

A Wide Range of Mechanisms and Strategies

A number of specific mechanisms, programs, and strategies have been developed to provide participation opportunities for employees, typically in traditional bureaucratic hierarchical organizations. Initially, they were generally introduced singly or in groups, often in a small section of the organization. Recently, greater attention has been given to the interactive nature of these mechanisms and the need to consider the introduction of participative mechanisms in a more systemic way. The most common participative mechanisms and strategies include:
- Democratic management
- Information sharing forums
- Joint labor-management training programs
- Safety and health committees
- Quality circles
- Quality of work life programs

- ♦ Employee participation teams other than quality circles
- ♦ Total quality management teams
- ♦ Team based work structures with a variety of responsibilities
- ♦ Gain-sharing and profit-sharing plans
- ♦ Employee ownership programs
- ♦ Worker representation on corporate boards of directors.
- ♦ Survey feedback
- ♦ Job enrichment or redesign initiatives
- ♦ Union-management quality of work life committees
- ♦ Mini-enterprise units
- ♦ Self-managing work teams (autonomous work groups, semiautonomous work groups, self-regulating work teams, or even simply work teams)
- ♦ Site-based management.
- ♦ Knowledge management programs
- ♦ Business process reengineering (some don't consider this a participative mechanism)
- ♦ Open-book management
- ♦ Theory Z.

Categorizing and Describing Participative Management and Involvement Strategies and Mechanisms

Many different frameworks for categorizing and describing participative management and employee and stakeholder involvement strategies and mechanisms have been proposed. Lawler (1988:197-201) distinguishes three involvement-oriented approaches to management that have been widely referenced in the literature. The three approaches differ in their histories and approach to the four strategy dimensions identified above (information sharing, knowledge development, reward systems, power sharing).

Parallel suggestion involvement is an approach that solicits employee involvement through mechanisms such as formal suggestion programs, often supplemented with a supportive reward system such as gainsharing, in which the provider of the suggestion receives a share of the resulting monetary benefits. Quality circles are a popular example of a parallel suggestion approach. Indicative of this approach, quality circles use groups especially constituted to generate suggestions, frequently after receiving considerable training. As with other manifestations of this approach, participants are taken out of their regular organizational position and put in a separate new structure that operates parallel to the "regular" organization. The participants in these parallel structures are usually empowered only to make suggestions, not to decide on or implement their recommendations: the authority for establishing and framing the suggestion process and for acting on the recommendations is retained by management. Consequently, parallel suggestion involvement is considered a top-down approach. Eaton et al. (1997) calls this type of approach *off-line participation through parallel structures*. Bachrach and Botwinick (1992) provide an extensive discussion of another variant of this approach, *quality of work life programs,* which were first initiated in the U.S. in the late 1960s to combat low productivity, wildcat strikes, absenteeism, sabotage, tardiness, high turnover, an other labor problems.

The second involvement-oriented approach identified by Lawler is *job involvement*, which focuses on modification of the work process to improve worker motivation and satisfaction either by creating individual jobs that are more satisfying and challenging or by creating work groups or teams that are given responsibility for, and some autonomy in completing the job. Depending upon the degree of autonomy, such groups are variously called autonomous work groups, self-managing groups, work teams, or semi-autonomous work groups. A key goal of this approach is to give workers more control over how the work is done. Eaton et al. (1997) label this approach *production-based on-line participation*. They note that this form of participation has increased rapidly in the United States during the 1990s, frequently replacing off-line approaches. Heckscher (1995), who has studied autonomous and semi-autonomous teams, notes that in order for these types of groups to work effectively across group boundaries, they need to be formed as temporary structures; otherwise, the teams build their own walls and wage turf battles. He notes that the goal is to increase the basic flexibility of the system and increase interdependence and interaction.

The third approach is called the *high involvement approach*. As indicated by the name, its strategy is to structure the organization "so that people at the lowest level will have a sense of involvement not just in how they do their jobs or how effectively their group performs, but in the performance of the total organization" (Lawler 1988:199). The high involvement approach goes further than the other two approaches in moving information, knowledge, and power to the lowest organization level and to support participation with suitable rewards. The high involvement approach incorporates participation into the fundamental governance of the organization.

Fantasia et al. (1988:469) also distinguish three types of worker participation: (1) humanization programs that seek to restructure tasks or jobs to increase productivity; (2) worker ownership programs, which may or may not include participation by workers in decision making; and (3) problem-solving groups, such as quality circles that are convened to resolve problems (usually production problems) in the work place.

Miller and Monge (1986:730-732), who conducted a meta-analysis of the literature on participation in the workplace, used three types of explanatory models to examine participation's influence on satisfaction and productivity: (1) cognitive models, which suggest that participation in decision making is beneficial because it enhances the flow and use of important information in organizations and the use of better information for decisions – increased worker satisfaction is seen as a by-product of their participation, not a central purpose; (2) affective models linking participation to productivity and satisfaction by facilitating attainment of higher order needs such as self-expression, respect, independence, and equality, which in turn lead to increased morale and satisfaction and a greater commitment to implement jointly-reached decisions; and (3) contingency models that reflect the inherent variability and the dependence of individual responses to participation upon a variety of variables including individual characteristics (such as personality) and context.

Case (1998) discusses the concept of *open-book management*, by which he means an organization in which all employees see themselves as partners in the business, rather than as hired hands. This approach is built on three principles:
- Transparency: everyone, not just the executives sees and understands the business information and "real numbers" of the organization
- Joint accountability: everyone is held responsible for his or her part in company performance

- ♦ Shared stakes in the company: if you want people to think and act like owners, you have to pay them accordingly.

Another way of categorizing involvement approaches is by their relationship to rewards, compensation, and ownership. Eaton et al. (1997) and Ben-Ner and Jones (1995) focus on the restructuring of compensation, or *strategic involvement through gainsharing*, in Eaton et al.'s term. Most comprehensive gainsharing plans involve both a compensation system that incorporates group incentive payments and extensive employee involvement focused on reducing waste and increasing productivity. Pendleton et al. (1996) discuss Employee Share Ownership Plans (ESOPs), which developed in the U.K. in the 1980s and for which U.S. legislation was established. Backrach and Botwinick (1992) note that the nature of the relationship between employee ownership and worker participation is a disputed issue. Ben-Ner and Jones (1995:534) discuss the intersection between the control rights held by employees and their *return rights*, which range from none to majority ownership positions.

Considerable effort has been expended to develop appropriate ways to describe the nature, location, and extent of the participative strategy or mechanisms being employed, both to provide a more reliable basis for evaluation and comparison and to allow transfer of lessons learned (Cotton et al. 1998; Pendleton et al 1996; Bolle de Bal 1992a; Bonpain 1993; Coye and Belohlav 1995; Lawler 1988; Eaton et al. 1997). The level of the organization at which participative strategies have been implemented, the extent of the participative program in terms of proportions of organizational units and workers involved, and the locus of control over initiation and termination of the participative strategies are widely recognized as key dimensions that need to be carefully described.

Key Areas of Research On Participation, Participative Management, and its Related Concepts

More than most other areas of organizational effectiveness and management, the literature on participative management and employee involvement is tied to large, supporting bodies of literature. These areas include:
- ♦ *Organizational and managerial behavior, leadership style, and the role of personality* (Davis 1976; Massarik 1983; Vroom 1960 and 1964; Ledford 1993; Kanter 1982; Sagie 1997; Lawler et al. 1998 and 2001).
- ♦ *Dimensions of autonomy and the appropriateness of autonomous work groups for different contexts* (Gulowsen 1992)[3]
- ♦ *Worker competence and the ability of employees to participate effectively* (Heller 1992; Heller and Wilpert 1981)
- ♦ *Collaboration, teamwork, and individualism*[4] (Plas and Lewis 2001; Kotter 1995; Plas 1996; Schrage 1995; Larson and LaFasto 1989; Lawler 1996)

---

3 There is some evidence that the success of autonomous work groups may be dependent upon technological stability, which means that autonomous work groups may be appropriate for an organization trying to prolong the economic viability of a production system about to become outdated, but may not be good choices for science-based organizations that need to remain at the cutting edge of technology. Autonomous work groups have shown little ability to initiate technological change or to make important strategic decisions for their organization (Gulowsen 1992:59).

4 "We [Americans] seem to lack the essential ability to work together effectively to solve critical problems. In fact, the potential for collective problem solving is so often unrealized and the promise of collective

- *Influence, control, and power, a central concept in participation* (Lawler 1988; Ledford 1993; Jain 1992; Bloom 2000; Markowitz 1996; Parker and Slaughter 1988; Saiken et al. 1986)
- *Alienation, motivation, and productivity* (Patchen 1976; Plas 1996; Lewin, Lippit and White 1939; Hackman and Lawler 1971; Case 1998; Markowitz 1996; Pateman 1970; Lehrer 1982; Lawler et al. 2001; Vroom 1984)
- *Resistance to change* (Schwochau et al. 1997; Bloom 2000; Collins 1997)
- *Worker stress* (Lichtenstein and Harris 1993; Parker and Slaughter 1998; Lawler 1996)
- *Unions* (Bachrach and Botwinick 1992; Bolle De Bal 1992a,b; Fantasia et al. 1988; Lichtenstein and Harris 1993; Markowitz 1996; Kelley and Harrison 1990; Jain 1992; Commission on the Future of Worker-Management Relations 1995; Parker 1993; Eaton et al. 1997; Juravich et al. 1993; Rinehart 1984)
- *Access to information* (Lawler 1996; McLagan and Nel 1995; Lewin 1988)
- *Bureaucracy* (Kelley (2000; Bartlett and Ghoshal 1991; Carroll 1993)
- *Who participates* (Seiling 1997; Bloom 2000; Eaton et al. 1997)
- *Issues of impact, including adoption rates and survival rates* (Collins 1996; Lawler et al. 2001; Lawler et al. 1998; Lawler et al. 1992; Schwochau et al. 1997; Leana and Florkowski 1992; Dachler and Wilpert 1978, Locke and Schweiger 1979; Miller and Monge 1986; McLagan and Nel 1995; Drehmer et al. 2000; Commission on the Future of Worker-Management Relations 1995; Coch and French 1948; Ben-Ner and Jones 1995; Coye and Belohlav l995; Cotton et al 1988; Collins 1995).

External Stakeholder Involvement

The literature on organizational effectiveness and participative management has very little to say about involving external stakeholders, aside from noting that many of the collaborative methods can be used to build lateral linkages with suppliers, customers, and partners (see the chapter on organizational collaborations, partnerships, and networks) (Ackoff 1999) and that consideration of external stakeholders is important in strategy formulation (Harrision and St. John 1998; Freeman 1984; Mason and Mitroff 1981). In the participative management literature, the most common link to stakeholder involvement is made through the concept of industrial democracy, and the social responsibility of firms and organizations. The humanistic values that corporate responsibility, responsiveness, and rectitude (CSR3) theorists would like to see embedded in business organizations also constitute the foundation of participatory management theory. Collins (1996) investigated the relationship between an organization's provision of employee participation mechanisms (internal democratic processes) and improved corporate social performance. He looked at documented changes in stakeholder policies and outcomes at four companies operating under a Scanlon-type gainsharing system for 4-6 years. He concluded that the firms' gainsharing and collaborative problem-solving mechanisms did provide benefits to a range of stakeholders, benefiting owners in terms of cost savings, customers in terms of improved product quality and service, suppliers in terms of product feedback, and production employees in terms of improved health and safety conditions plus other favorable changes in policies and outcomes.

---

achievement so often unfulfilled that we exhibit what seems to be a developmental disability in this area of social competence." (Larson and LaFasto 1989)

Freeman's (1984) *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*, Savage et al.'s (1991) "Strategies for Assessing and Managing Organizational Stakeholders," Carroll's (1993) *Business and Society*, and Harrison and St. John's (1998) *Strategic Management of Organizations and Stakeholders: Concepts* represent the few works on stakeholder involvement found within the business management/organizational effectiveness literature. All these works reflect a singularly corporate point of view, clearly focusing on "managing" stakeholders rather than collaborating or engaging with them, or dealing cooperatively to address shared issues and concerns, which is the focus of the literature on public involvement and public participation (which itself tends to say almost nothing about the management or organizational design issues associated with these types of engagements).

Freeman (1984) and Harrison and St. John (1998) reflect an appreciation that the expectations of an organization's stakeholders are important, have the ability to affect the organization's strategy and success, change over time, and require the attention of management. They emphasize the need for organizations to understand who their stakeholders are (for example by developing stakeholder maps), develop processes for identifying issues created by stakeholders (by conducting environmental scanning and other information gathering processes), and develop the skills to interact effectively with their stakeholders.

Carroll (1993) addresses the dual themes of business ethics and stakeholder management within the framework of social responsibility by business, while recognizing the extent of business' power in society. For Carroll, stakeholder management requires managers to identify the various groups or individuals who have a stake in the firm or its actions and decisions and "incorporate these stakeholders' concerns into the firm's strategic plans." He distinguishes between social responsibility and social responsiveness, which he describes as:

♦ Reliability of company executives—the extent to which they stand by their commitments
♦ Attentiveness of company executives—the extent to which they listen and are receptive to information flowing from outside the company
♦ Preparedness of company executives—the extent to which they are aware of potential public policy issues
♦ Credibility of company statements—the extent to which you can believe information communicated by the companies
♦ Accessibility of company executives—the extent to which they are available to you for responses and discussions
♦ Perceived legitimacy of outsiders—the extent to which company executives respect the purpose of outside critics
♦ Communication with its publics—the extent to which the company communicates its programs and interests to its various publics
♦ Clarity of company interests—the extent to which the company clearly defines its own interests in responding to public issues.

Based on the work of Robert Miles (1987), Carroll defines overall corporate responsiveness as "the extent to which the company has an effective overall process for learning about and adapting to changing societal norms, pressures, and public issues."

Savage et al. (1991:65) draws on the concept of primary and secondary stakeholders that is represented in the public participation literature, identifying primary stakeholders as owners, suppliers, customers, and employees and secondary stakeholders as local community groups, special interest groups, consumer groups, environmental groups, civil liberties union, society-at-

large, media. They then represent a "strategic view of stakeholders" that distinguishes stakeholders who pose a potential threat to the organization from those who present potential cooperation, as shown in Figure 1

Stakeholder's Potential for Threat to Organization			
Stakeholder's Potential for Cooperation with Organization		High	Low
	High	Stakeholder Type 4 Mixed Blessing Strategy: Collaborative	Stakeholder Type 1 Supportive Strategy: Involve
	Low	Stakeholder Type 3 Nonsupportive Strategy: Defend	Stakeholder Type 2 Marginal Strategy: Monitor

Source: Grant T. Savage, Timothy W. Nix, Carlton J. Whitehead, and John D. Blair. 1991. Strategies for Assessing and Managing Organizational Stakeholders. *Academy of Management Executive* May:65.

Figure 1. A Strategic View of Stakeholders and Stakeholder Involvement Strategies

Harrison and St. John (1998) categorize stakeholders into those within the organization (owners/board of directors, managers, and employees) and within the operating environment (customers, suppliers, government agencies and administrators, unions, competitors, financial intermediaries, local communities, and activist groups), all operating within the broader environment subject to sociocultural, global economic, and global political/legal forces and technological change. They emphasize the importance of identifying, understanding, building relationships with, and satisfying its key stakeholders, and taking these stakeholders into account in the formulation of organizational strategy.

Bloom (2000) and Thomas (1990) both address the question: Who should be involved in making decisions? Bloom (2000) focuses on the issues of interest and expertise, reflecting the risk-based policy-making approach of the public participation perspective. Bloom (2000) recommends designing a strategy for determining who out of these stakeholders should be involved based upon the following match-up between interest and expertise levels:
- Low interest, low expertise —avoid involvement
- Low interest, high expertise—consult
- High interest, low expertise—rationale is to lower resistance, but need to be careful, and have skilled leadership. Consultative model might be useful so that interested parties have input, but manager makes final decision
- High interest, high expertise—involve as early as possible, and given as much freedom as possible to define the problem and set objectives either as a delegated approach or a collaborative approach.

Thomas (1990) applies the Vroom and Yetton (1973) model of deciding the degree of group involvement desirable in making decisions. This approach is based on matching attributes of the problem with the expertise of the potentially involved stakeholders in an effort to balance the relative needs for *quality* and *acceptability* in a decision. The model (as modified) asks the

following questions to lead to choice among five decision-making approaches, varying in the extent of group involvement and potential influence. The basic issues are (p. 436):

- Are there quality requirements?
- Does the manager have sufficient information?
- Is the problem structured? (and not up for definition?)
- Is public acceptance critical to implementation?
- Is acceptance reasonably certain if the manager decides alone?
- Does the public share agency goals?
- Is conflict within the public likely?

The modified Vroom and Yetton involvement options are (Vroom and Yetton 1973:437):

- Autonomous managerial decision (the manager solves the problem or makes the decision alone without public involvement)
- Modified autonomous managerial decisions (the manager seeks information from segments of the public, but decides alone in a manner which may or may not reflect group influence)
- Segmented public consultation (the manager shares the problem separately with segments of the public, getting ideas and suggestions, then makes a decision which reflects group influence)
- Unitary public consultation (the manager shares the problem with the public as a single assembled group, getting ideas and suggestions, then makes a decision that reflects group influence)
- Public decision (the manager shares the problem with the assembled public, and together the manager and the public attempt to reach agreement on a solution).

Thomas (1990:438) specifically applies the Vroom and Yetton framework to organizational stakeholder involvement. As opposed to the literature on public involvement, which tends to take the public's perspective, Thomas' principal consideration about when to involve the public results from concerns about unwanted consequences from public involvement *from the perspective of the organization*. This approach sets forth the following criteria for evaluating the success of the stakeholder involvement effort:

- Decision process effectiveness (how smoothly the decision making progresses):
  - Level of antagonism or unpleasantness
  - The time necessary
  - Ability to reach a decision
- Outcome effectiveness (how well the eventual decision works)
  - Correspondence with quality requirements (were they respected?)
  - Success of implementation
  - Managerial satisfaction with the eventual decision
  - Eventual achievement of the intended goals.

The Application of Participative Management to Public Science Management

The literature on participative management emphasizes the pertinence of this approach to knowledge-based organizations, and the benefits derived from a management approach and organizational design that emphasizes and supports lateral networks, enhanced flexibility, and respect for worker knowledge and motivation. Increased interdependence requires increased participation (McLagan and Nel 1995:15-16). Participative management's emphases on team building and teamwork, and on autonomy in the conduct of the work itself are consistent with the way science is conducted, particularly in the public sector. What is not well integrated in the literature on participative management is the viewpoint of the scientific staff – those who consider themselves to be professional workers, but as *scientists*, not as managers for the organization. The literature implies that participative management strategies should be effective at the laboratory level as well as at the departmental or organizational management unit level, yet there is little in the literature that discusses the adoption of participative management strategies at the laboratory level or the interest of the scientists who are managers of these laboratories in understanding and addressing leadership and management issues. The Bloom model might be applied, defining scientists are "high expertise" and involving them either as consultants or collaborators, depending upon their interest levels. However, their *scientific* expertise may not be the expertise management is seeking in its decision-making.

One benefit of a participative management perspective is that it encourages consideration of the entire array of workers in an organization. This is important in public science organizations, which tend to identify themselves as largely composed of highly trained and professionally oriented scientists. Yet the workforce of these organizations includes many who do not fit this profile, including those in management, administration, finance, and clerical support roles. The ability to implement an organizational and management design that works effectively within each of the multiple subunits while promoting effective linkages among them is a particular challenge in the relatively loosely coupled public science organizations.

An interesting finding in this literature is that autonomous work groups are not appropriate for technologically cutting-edge situations. It may be that competitive funding process of public science and the multi-organizational networks of scientists prevent autonomous work groups, such as laboratories, from the problems of inflexibility observed in the literature, but the literature raises some intriguing questions that warrant further investigation.

Science funding organizations are increasingly faced with questions about how to involve external groups in its management and other processes. For example, peer review may involve scientists and nonscientists alike in the evaluation of programs. And citizen boards or committees of experts in other fields may advise agencies on such matters as public acceptability, ethics, and community impact of federal activities. With the common federal policy on scientific misconduct (see the chapter on this topic), managers and lawyers must become involved in complicated questions regarding the conduct of science. Involving the public in science-related topics has been the subject matter for many case studies, which often have a strong element of external communications, but little theory has emerged from such studies. The decline of the post-World-War-II underpinnings of science policy and the recent calls for democratic science and socially robust science suggest that involving external stakeholders will be an increasing focus. (See the chapter on science policy for a fuller discussion.)

There are many interesting tensions and complementarities between participative management and scientific research at the philosophical, value level, and at the practical and operational level that have not been fully articulated by the research conducted to date.

References

Ackoff, Russell L. 1999. *Re-Creating the Corporation: A Design of Organizations for the 21ˢᵗ Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ahrweiler, Georg. 1992. Science. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 715-721. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Applebaum, Eileen, and Rosemary Batt. 1994. *The New American Workplace: Transforming Work Systems in the United States*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Argyris, Chris. 1957. *Personality and Organization*. New York: Harper.

Bachrach, Peter, and Aryeh Botwinick. 1992. *Power and Empowerment: A Radical Theory of Participatory Democracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bartlett, Christopher A. and Sumantra Ghoshal. 1991. Matrix Management: Not a Structure, a Frame of Mind. In *Participative Management*. Pp. 23-30. Cambridge: Harvard Review Paperback.

Baumgartel, Howard. 1957. Leadership Style as a Variable in Research Administration. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 2(December):344-360.

Baumgartel, Howard. 1956. Leadership, Motivations, and Attitudes in Research Laboratories. *Journal of Social Issues* 12:24-31.

Beckhard, Richard, and Rueben T. Harris. 1987. *Organizational Transitions: Managing Complex Change*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Beer, Michael, Russell A. Eisenstat, and Bert Spector. 1990. *The Critical Path to Corporate Renewal*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Bellace, Janice R. 1993. Managing Employee Participation in Decision – Making: An Assessment of National Models. *Bulletin of Comparative Labour Relations* 27:5-14.

Ben-Ner, Avner, and Derek C. Jones. 1995. Employee Participation, Ownership, and Productivity: A Theoretical Perspective. *Industrial Relations* 34(4):532-54.

Bernoux, Philippe. 1992. Quality Circles. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 687-694. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Biagi, Marco. 1993. Managing Industrial Relations as a Comparative Advantage: From Formalism to Training in Managerial Initiative. *Bulletin of Comparative Labour Relations* 27:15-23.

Blonpain, Roger. 1993. Managerial Initiatives and Rights to Information, Consultation, and Workers' Participation in the E.C. Countries. *Bulletin of Comparative Labour Relations* 27:25-41.

Bloom, Paula Jorde. 2000. *Circle of Influence: Implementing Shared Decision Making and Participative Management*. Lake Forest, IL: New Horizons.

Bolle De Bal, Marcel. 1992a. Participation. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 603-610. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Bolle De Bal, Marcel. 1992b. Participative Management. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 611-615. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Bottrup, Pernille. 1998. Organizational Learning- A Way of Putting Democratization and Life Politics on the Working Life Agenda? Paper presented at the ISA XIV World Congress. Montreal, Canada. July 26-August 1.

Boyle, Richard J. 1991. Wrestling with Jellyfish. In *Participative Management*. Pp. 47-63. Cambridge: Harvard Review Paperback.

Brown, Warren B., and L.N. Goslin. 1965. R&D Conflict: Manager vs Scientist. *MSU Business Topics* 13(Summer):71-79.

Carroll, Archie B. 1993. *Business and Society: Ethics and Stakeholder Management*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Co.

Cassar, Vincent. 1999. Can Leader Direction and Employee Participation Co-Exist? *Journal of Management Psychology* 14(1):57-68.

Case, John. 1998. *The Open-Book Experience: Lessons from Over 100 Companies Who Successfully Transformed Themselves*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Chouraqui, Alain. 1992. Autonomy. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 61-65. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Coch, L., and J.R.P. French. 1949. Overcoming Resistance. *Human Relations* 1(4):512-533.

Collins, Denis. 1997. The Ethical Superiority and Inevitability of Participatory Management as an Organizational System. *Organization Science* 8(5 September-October):489-507.

Collins, Denis. 1996. How and Why Participatory Management Improves a Company's Social Performance: Four Gainsharing Case Studies. *Business and Society* 35(2):176-210.

Collins, Denis. 1995. Death of a Gainsharing Plan: Power Politics and Participatory Management. *Organizational Dynamics* 24(1):23-37.

Commission on the Future of Worker-Management Relations. 1995. Employee Participation and Labor-Management Cooperation in American Workplaces. *Challenge* September-October:38-46.

Cotton, J.L., D.A. Vollrath, K.L. Froggatt, M.L. Lengnick-Hall, and K.R. Jennings. 1988. Employee Participation: Diverse Forms and Different Outcomes. *Academy of Management Review* 13:8-12.

Coye, Ray W., and James A. Belohlav. 1995. An Exploratory Analysis of Employee Participation. *Group and Organization Management* 20(1):4-17.

Davis, Keith. 1976. Evolving Models of Organizational Behavior. In *Participative Management: Concepts, Theory and Implementation*. Ervin Williams (ed.). Pp. 3-14. Atlanta: Georgia State University.

Denison, Daniel R. 1990. *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Drehmer, David E., James A. Belohlav, and Ray W. Coye. 2000. An Exploration of Employee Participation Using a Scaling Approach. *Group and Organization Management* 25(4):397-418.

Eaton, Adrienne W., Paula B. Voos, and Dong-One Kim. 1997. Voluntary and Involuntary Aspects of Employee Participation in Decision Making. In *The Human Resource Management Handbook* Part I. David Lewin, Daniel J.B. Mitchell, and Mahmood A. Zaidi (eds.). Pp. 63-85. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

Emery, F.E., and E. Thorsrud. 1969. *Industrial Democracy*. London: Tavistock.

Fantasia, Rick, Dan Clawson, and Gregory Graham. 1988. A Critical View of Worker Participation in American Industry. *Work and Organizations* 15(4):468-488.

Freeman, R. Edward. 1984. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston: Pitman.

Friedson, Eliot and Buford Rhea. 1963. Processes of Control in a Company of Equals. *Social Problems* 2(Fall):119-131.

Galbraith, Jay R. 1995. *Designing Organizations: An Executive Briefing on Strategy, Structure and Process*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Galbraith, Jay R. 1994. *Competing with Flexible Lateral Organizations*. 2nd Edition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Galbraith, Jay R., Edward E. Lawler III, and Associates (Eds). 1993. *Organizing for the Future: The New Logic for Managing Complex Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Glueck, W., and C. Thorpe. 1971. *The Management of Scientific Research*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Goll, Irene, and Nancy Brown Johnson. 1996. The Role of Top Management Demographic Characteristics in Employee Participation Programs. *International Journal of Management* 12(1):76-83.

Gilbert, G. Ronald, and Ardel E. Nelson. 1991. *Beyond Participative Management: Toward Total Employee Empowerment for Quality*. New York: Quorum Books.

Gordon, Thomas. 1977. *Leader Effectiveness Training*. New York: G..P. Putnam's Sons.

Greenberg, Edward S. 1986. *Workplace Democracy: The Political Effects of Participation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Gulowsen, Jon. 1992. Autonomous Work Groups. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 57-60. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Hage, J.T. 1999. Organizational Innovation and Organizational Change. *Annual Review of Sociology* 25:597-622.

Harrison, Bennett. 1991. The Failure of Worker Participation. *Technology Review* 94(1):74.

Harrison, Jeffrey S., and Caron H. St. John. 1998. *Strategic Management of Organizations and Stakeholders: Concepts*. 2nd Edition. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Harvard Business Review Paperback. 1991. *Participative Management*. Harvard Business Review.

Heckscher, Charles. 1995. The Failure of Participatory Management. *Across the Board* November/December 16-21.

Hedberg, Bo. 1981. How Organizations Learn and Unlearn. In *Handbook of Organizational Design*. *Volume 1. Adapting Organizations to Their Environments*. Paul C. Nystrom and William H. Starbuck (eds.). Pp. 3-27. New York: Oxford University Press.

Heller, Frank A. 1992. Competence. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 152-157. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Heller, Frank and Bernhard Wilpert. 1981. *Competence and Power in Managerial Decision-Making: A Study of Senior Levels of Organization in Eight Countries*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Hower, Ralph H., and Charles Orth. 1963. *Managers and Scientists*. Boston: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

Jain, Hem C. 1992. Canada. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 88-98. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Jawajar, I.M., and Gary L. McLaughlin. 2001. Toward A Descriptive Stakeholder Theory: An Organizational Life Cycle Approach. *The Academy of Management Review* 26(3):397-414.

Juravich, T., H. Harris, and A. Brooks. 1993. Mutual Gains? Labor and Management Evaluate Their Employee Involvement Program. *Journal of Labor Research* XIV(2):165-185.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1991. The New Managerial Work. In *Participative Management*. Pp. 31-38. Cambridge: Harvard Review Paperback.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1982. Dilemmas of Managing Participation. *Organizational Dynamics* 10(Summer):5-12.

Kappachi, Rama Murthy. 1992. *Managing by Consultation*. London: Sage.

Katz, Harry C. 1993. The Restructuring of Industrial Relations in the United States. *Bulletin of Comparative Labour Relations* 27:45-98.

Kelley, Maryellen R. 2000. The Participatory Bureaucracy: A Structural Explanation for the Effects of Group-Based Employee Participation Programs on Productivity in the Machine Products Sector. In *The American Workplace: Skills, Compensation, and Employee Involvement*. Casey Ichniowski, David I. Levine, Craig Olson, and George Strauss (eds.). Pp. 81-110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LaGrossa, Virginia, and Suzanne Saxe. 1998. *The Consultative Approach: Partnering for Results!* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Landsdale, Bruce M. 2000. *Cultivating Inspired Leaders: Making Participatory Management Work*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Laredo, P., and P. Mustar. 2000. Laboratory Activity Profiles: An Exploratory Approach. *Scientometrics* 47:515-539.

Larson, C.E., and LaFasto, F.M. 1989. *Teamwork What Must Go Right/What Can Go Wrong*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lawler III., Edward E. 1996. *From the Ground Up: Six Principles for Building the New Logic Corporation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lawler III., Edward E. 1993. Creating the High-Involvement Organization. In *Organizing for the Future: The New Logic for Managing Complex Organizations*. Jay R. Galbraith, Edward E. Lawler III, and Associates (eds.). Pp. 172-193. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lawler III, Edward E. 1988. Choosing an Involvement Strategy. *The Academy of Management Executive* 11(3):197-204.

Lawler III, Edward E. 1990. *High-Involvement Management: Participative Strategies for Improving Organizational Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lawler III, Edward E., Allan M. Mohrman, Jr., Susan A. Mohrman, Gerald E. Ledford, Jr., Thomas G. Cummings and Associates (eds). 1986. *Doing Research That Is Useful for Theory and Practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lawler III., E.E., S.A. Mohrman, and G. Benson. 2001. *Organizing for High Performance. Employee Involvement, TQM, Reengineering, and Knowledge Management in the Fortune 1000: The CEO Report*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lawler III., E.E., S.A. Mohrman, and G. E. Ledford, Jr. 1998. Strategies for High Performance Organizations – The CEO Report: *Employee Involvement, TQM, and Reengineering Programs in Fortune 1000 Corporations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lawler III., E.E., S.A. Mohrman, and G. E. Ledford, Jr. 1992. *Employee Involvement and Total Quality Management: Practices and Results in Fortune 1000 Companies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ledford, Jr. Gerald E. 1993. Employee Involvement: Lessons and Predictions. In *Organizing for the Future: The New Logic for Managing Complex Organizations*. Galbraith, Jay R., Edward E. Lawler III, and Associates (eds.). Pp. 142-171. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lehrer, Robert N. 1982. *Participative Productivity and Quality of Work Life*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Lewin, Kurt. 1947. Frontiers in Group Dynamics. *Human Relations* 1:5-41; 143-153.

Lichtenstein, Nelson, and Howell John Harris (eds). 1993. *Industrial Democracy in America The Ambiguous Promise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Likert, Rensis. 1969. Supervision. In *The R&D Game*. David Allison (ed.). Pp.161-181. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Likert, Rensis. 1967. *The Human Organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Likert, Rensis. 1961. *New Patterns of Management.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Locke, E.A. and D.M. Schweiger. 1979. Participation in Decision-Making: One More Look. In *Research in Organization and Behavior*. B.M. Shaw(ed.). Pp. 265-339. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Macy, John W., Jr. 1965. The Scientist in the Federal Service. *Science* 148(April 2):51-54.

Marcson, Simon. 1960a. Professional Needs of the Scientist. Chapter 6. In *The Scientist in American Industry*. Pp.72-85. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Marcson, Simon. 1960b. Opposing Systems of Authority. Chapter 9. In *The Scientist in American Industry*. Pp.121-144. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Mason, R.O., and I.I. Mitroff. 1981. *Challenging Strategic Planning Assumptions: Theory, Cases, and Techniques.* New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Markowitz, Linda. 1996. Employee Participation at the Workplace: Capitalist Control or Worker Freedom? *Critical Sociology* 22 (2): 89-103.

Massarik, Fred. 1983. *Participative Management*: *Highlights of the Literature.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Matejko, Alexander J. 1986. *In Search of New Organizational Paradigms*. New York: Praeger.

Mayo, Elton. 1933. *The Human Problems of a Industrial Civilization.* New York: McMillan.

McAllister, D.J. 1995. Affect and Cognition-Based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal* 38(1):24-59.

McGregor, Douglas. 1960. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McLagan, Patricia, and Christo Nel. 1995. *The Age of Participation: New Governance for the Workplace and the World*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Miles, Robert H. 1987. *Managing the Corporate Social Environment*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Miller, K.I., and P.R. Monge. 1986. Participation, Satisfaction, and Productivity: A Meta-analytic Review. *Academy of Management Journal* 29:727-753.

Mohrman, Susan Albers. 1993. Integrating Roles and Structure in the Lateral Organization. In *Organizing for the Future: The New Logic for Managing Complex Organizations*. Galbraith, Jay R., Edward E. Lawler III, and Associates (eds.). Pp. 109-141. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mohrman, S.A., and G.E. Ledford, Jr. 1985. The Design and Use of Effective Employee Participation Groups: Implications for Human Resource Management. *Human Resource Management* 24(4):413-428.

Monat, Jacques. 1992. Worker's Participation. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 942-951. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Nelkin, Dorothy. 1984. Science and Technology Policy and the Democratic Process. In *Citizen Participation in Science Policy*. James C. Petersen (ed.). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press. [Need page numbers]

Ouchi, W. 1981. Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ostroff, Frank. 1999. *The Horizontal Organization: What the Organization of the Future Looks Like and How it Delivers Value to Customers*. New York City: Oxford University Press.

Parker, Mike. 1993. Industrial Relations Myth and Shop-Floor Reality: The "Team Concept" in the Auto Industry. In *Industrial Democracy in America The Ambiguous Promise*. Nelson Lichtenstein and Howell John Harris (eds.). Pp.249-274. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, M., and J. Slaughter. 1988. *Choosing Sides: Unions and the Team Concept*. Boston: South End Press.

Patchen, Martin. 1976. Participation in Decision-Making and Motivation: What is the Relation? In *Participative Management: Concepts, Theory and Implementation*. Ervin Williams ed.). Pp. 31-41. Atlanta: Georgia State University.

Pateman, Carole. 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peltz, D.C., and F.M. Andrews. 1976. *Scientists in Organizations: Productive Climates for Research and Development.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Pendleton, Andrew, John McDonald, Andrew Robinson, and Nicholas Wilson. 1996. Employee Participation and Corporate Governance in Employee-Owned Firms. *Work, Employment & Society* 10(2):205-226.

Plas, Jeanne M., and Susan E. Lewis. 2001. *Person-Centered Leadership for Nonprofit Organizations.* London: Sage Publications.

Plas, Jeanne M. 1996. *Person-Centered Leadership: An American Approach to Participatory Management*. London: Sage Publications.

Poole, M.S., A.H. Van de Ven, K.J. Dooley and M.E. Holmes. 2000. Organizational Change and Innovation Processes: Theory and Methods for Research. London: Oxford Press.

Purser, Ronald E., and Steven Cabana. 1998. *The Self-Managing Organization: How Leading Companies are Transforming the Work of Teams for Real Impact*. New York: The Free Press.

Rappachi, Rama Murthy. 1992. *Managing by Consultation*. London: Sage.

Rinehart, James. 1984. Appropriating Workers' Knowledge: Quality, Control Circles at A General Motors Plant. *Studies in Political Economy* 14:75-97.

Sagie, Abraham. 1997. Leader Direction and Employee Participation in Decision Making: Contradictory or Compatible Practices? *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 46(4):387-452.

Sagie, Abraham. 1994. Participation in Decision Making and Performance: A Moderator Analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 30:227-246. [Get for EM PI Review]

Savage, Grant T., Timothy W. Nix, Carlton J. Whitehead, and John D. Blair. 1991. Strategies for Assessing and Managing Organizational Stakeholders. *Academy of Management Executive* May:65.

Schwochau, Susan, John Delaney, Paul Jarley, and Jack Fiorito. 1997. Employee Participation and Assessments of Support for Organizational Policy Changes. *Journal of Labor Research* 18(3):379-401.

Seiling, Jane Galloway. 1997. *The Membership Organization: Achieving Top Performance Through the New Workplace Community*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

Siepert, Albert F. 1964. Creating the Management Climate for Effective Research in Government Laboratories. In *The Management of Scientists*. Karl Hill (ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Steele, Lowell W. 1969. Loyalties. Chapter 10. In *The R&D Game*. David Allison (ed.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Stokes, Bruce. 1978. *Worker Participation – Productivity and the Quality of Work Life*. Worldwatch Paper 25.

Strauss, G. 1982. Workers Participation in Management: An International Perspective. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 4:173-265.

Susman, Gerald I. 1976. *Autonomy at Work: A Sociotechnical Analysis of Participative Management*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Swearingen, Michael H. 1997. *Participative Management: An Analysis of Its Effect on Productivity*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Széll, György. 1992. Participative Research. In *Concise Encyclopedia of Participation and Co-Management*. György Széll (ed.). Pp. 616-630. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Tannenbaum, Robert, and Warren H. Schmidt. 1976. How To Choose a Leadership Pattern. In *Participative Management: Concepts, Theory and Implementation*. Ervin Williams (ed.). Pp. 17-29. Atlanta: Georgia State University.

Taylor, Frederick Winslow. 1911. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper and Row.

Thomas, John Clayton. 1990. Public Involvement in Public Management: Adapting and Testing a Borrowed Theory. *Public Administration Review* July/August:435-445.

Trist, E. 1981. The Evolution of Sociotechnical Systems. In *Perspectives on Organizational Design and Behavior*. A. Van de Ven and W. Joyce, eds.). New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Troxel, James P. 1993. Benefits Beyond the Numbers. In *Participation Works*. James P. Troxel (ed.). Pp. 17-32. Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.

Troxel, James P. (ed). 1993. *Participation Works*. Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press.

Vroom, Victor H. 1976. Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation. In *Participative Management: Concepts, Theory and Implementation*. Ervin Williams (ed.). Pp. 93-103. Atlanta: Georgia State University.

Vroom, Victor H. 1960. *Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Vroom, Victor H. 1964. *Work and Motivation* New York: Wiley.

Vroom, Victor H., and Philip Yetton. 1973. *Leadership and Decision Making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Wallace, William McDonald. 1998. *Postmodern Management: The Emerging Partnership Between Employees and Stockholders*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Williams, Ervin (ed). 1976. *Participative Management: Concepts, Theory and Implementation*. Atlanta: Georgia State University.

Employee involvement is creating an environment in which people have an impact on decisions and actions that affect their jobs. The concept is also known as employee participation and participative management. Employee involvement is not the goal nor is it a tool, as practiced in many organizations. Rather, it is a management and leadership philosophy about how people are most enabled to contribute to continuous improvement and the ongoing success of their work organization. A solid recommendation for those organizations that wish to create an empowering, continuously improving workplace is to