

EMPLOYEE RELATIONS INITIATIVES AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE: A STUDY IN POWER SECTOR UNITS

Mr. Bijaya Kumar Sundaray

Associate Professor
Regional College of Management
Chakadola Vihar, Chandrasekharpur,
Bhubaneswar

Dr. Chandan Kumar Sahoo

Associate Professor
School of Management
National Institute of Technology
Rourkela

Dr. Santosh Kumar Tripathy

Professor
Dept. of Personnel Management & Industrial Relations
Utkal University, Vani Vihar,
Bhubaneswar

I. INTRODUCTION

India liberalised its economic policies in 1991. Since then the economy has responded positively and India is now considered as one of the dynamic emerging nations. At present, the second generation reforms are in progress and the economy seems to be moving on the right track. Recently the World Bank forecasts that by 2020, India could become the fourth largest economy in the world. Owing to such development, a large number of foreign firms have become interested to make business in India. The liberalised policies and the increased level of competition by overseas firms have put pressure on HR functions of domestic companies. To survive and prosper, they have to prepare and develop their employees so as to compete with overseas organisations in skills, efficiency and effectiveness (Sparrow and Budhwar, 1997; Venkata Ratnam, 1996). In the present competitive business environment, Indian organisations are feeling compelled from within to reorient their employment relationships (Budhwar, 2000; Sodhi, 1999). After years of organisational restructuring and work re-engineering, management comes to recognise that a productive workforce is increasingly important to attain sustainable competitive advantage for business organisations on a global basis (Bohl et al., 1996).

For healthy employee relations (ER) it is necessary to have well defined policies and procedures as because reactive policies can't continue for long. Growing competition, complex economic environment, rising labour costs, etc. compel organisations to adopt proactive strategies towards ER, while having proactive strategies; the organizations have to ensure achievement of corporate objectives through cooperation and commitment of employees. As the composition of workforce continues to change, companies focusing on quality of work life (QWL) of employees are expected to gain leverage in hiring and retaining valuable people. QWL is a comprehensive programme designated to improve employees' satisfaction. It is a way of thinking about people, work and organization and creates a sense of fulfillment in the minds of the employees and contributes toward greater job satisfaction, improving productivity, adoptability and overall effectiveness of an organization. Heskett et al. (1997) proposed that QWL, which is measured by the feelings that employees have toward their jobs, colleagues, and companies, would ignite a chain effect leading to an organisation's growth and profitability in the end. To improve the quality of work life of the employees, companies are now emphasising on cordial employee relations and adopting a human resource strategy that places high value on employees as organisational stakeholders. In addition, companies with strong employee relations initiatives will benefit because their workforce is highly motivated to expend their best efforts (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2001). It involves providing fair and consistent treatment to all employees so that they will be committed to the organization. Thus, good employee relations help in developing satisfied, committed and productive work force that lead towards overall effectiveness of an organisation.

II. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS INITIATIVES

Employee relations involve the body of work concerned with maintaining employer-employee relationships that contribute to satisfactory productivity, motivation, and morale. Essentially, ER is concerned with preventing and resolving issues involving individuals, which arise out of or affect work situations. It concerns the relationship of employees with the organisation and with each other and includes the processes of developing, implementing, administering and analyzing the employer-employee relationship, managing employee performance and resolving work place conflicts/disputes. Maintaining healthy employee relations in an organization is a pre-requisite for organizational success. Strong employee relations are required for high productivity and human satisfaction. Internal employee relations

comprise the human resource management activities associated with the movement of employees within the organization. These activities include promotion, transfer, demotion, resignation, discharge, layoff and retirement. Discipline and disciplinary action are also crucial aspects of internal employee relations (Mondy and Noe, 2006). It depends upon healthy and safe work environment, cent percent involvement and commitment of all employees, incentives for employee motivation, and effective communication system in the organization. Healthy employee relations lead to more efficient, motivated and productive employees which further lead towards organisational success.

Human resource (HR) specialists play a crucial role in employee relations. For example, if they develop communications and procedures that apply appropriate information tools in a timely manner, employees can access more abundant, higher quality information and can communicate more effectively with management, resulting in being more effective in their work. Managers and human resource specialists must work in partnership to ensure effective communication to foster better employee relations climate, since to develop and sustain such relations, employers must keep employees informed of company policies and strategies (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2001). Additionally, to foster good employee relations, managers must listen to and understand what employees are saying and experiencing and provide employees with the freedom to express grievances about management decisions. Such employer-employee behavior is part of the corporate culture, which can have an impact on employee expectations and in turn productivity (Ivancevich, 2001, p. 47).

Good employee relations providing fair and consistent treatment to all employees so that they will be committed to the organization. Companies with good employee relations are likely to have an HR strategy that places a high value on employees as stakeholders in the business. Employees who are treated as stakeholders have certain rights within the organization and can expect to be treated with dignity and respect. The management should also give employees the freedom to air grievances about management decisions. Effective employee relations require cooperation between managers and employee relations representatives. ER representatives may also develop new policies that help to maintain fairness and efficiency in the work place (Gomez-Mejia et al. 2005). Corporate culture provides a benchmark of the standards of performance among employees. It provides clear guidelines on attendance, punctuality, concern

about quality, and customer service. Moreover, the management style of line managers directly affect employee relations, since line managers are crucial links to the human resource function and orchestrate the distinctive skills, experiences, personalities, and motives of individuals. Managers also, must facilitate the interactions that occur within work groups. In their role, managers provide direction, encouragement, and authority to evoke desired behaviors (Eichinger and Ulrich, 1995).

Effective employee relations in any business unit achieved through rewards and recognition, transparent communication system, proper care towards employee grievances (Srivastava et al., 1998, p.134). A positive feeling about the company is considered to be an ethos that binds people together and discourages the constituent members of the company from leaving (Sayeed, 2001, p.254). The management should develop and implement adequate HR strategies such as empowerment, joint decision making, multi skilling, etc. for optimum utilisation of existing human resources in the competitive environment (Saini, 2000). The fundamental shift in the relationship between employers and trade unions, following the gradual realisation that the interests of all are best served through harmonious rather than adverse employee relations (Pettinger, 1999, p.313). The employers gained assistance from the unions in implementing their corporate programmes, where as the unions enjoyed additional opportunity for enhancing their power through widening the scope of negotiation into new issues other than traditional bread and butter issues (Satrya and Parasuraman, 2007, p.613). Although employers clearly need to consider labour relations from strategic perspective, union representatives must do so even more if they are to keep their unions viable for tomorrow's organizations (Mello, 2003, p.360). Labour and capital need to cooperate and create a win- win relationship in post LPG era. The HR professionals should play the active role to synergise the roles of labour and capital and to build a relationship based on concepts such as respect to each other, team effort, joint goal setting and problem solving through direct participation, performance based reward, transparency in communication, prompt grievance redressal, etc. which are more challenging in practical aspect and both the actors has to think these measures for industrial peace, progress and prosperity.

III. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS AND QUALITY OF WORK LIFE

The term 'quality of work life' was first introduced in 1972 during an international labor relations conference. QWL received more attention after United Auto Workers and General Motors initiated a QWL programme for work reforms. Robbins (1989) defined QWL as "a process by which an organization responds to employee needs by developing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work". QWL has been well recognised as a multi-dimensional construct and it may not be universal. The key concepts captured and discussed in the existing literature include job security, better reward systems, higher pay, opportunity for growth, and participative groups, among others (Havlovic, 1991; Straw and Heckscher, 1984; Scobel, 1975). Thus, QWL is defined as the favorable conditions and environments of a workplace that support and promote employee satisfaction by providing them with rewards, job security, and growth opportunities.

The continuous effort to bring increased labor-management cooperation through joint problem solving to improve organisational performance and employee satisfaction are key aspects of QWL (Cohen and Rosenthal, 1980). Unions can play a constructive role in QWL effort by sustaining and even enhancing its relevancy as a legitimate institution which represent the rights and interests of the workers. This encourages unions to take collaborative course and minimize adversarial and competitive tactics which brings employee satisfaction and better QWL in the work place (Hian and Einastein, 1990). Mutual respect is the building block of the entire QWL movement. In an environment of mutual respect and clearly defined goals, both improvements in life at work and greater productivity realized. By mutually solving work-related problems, building cooperation, improving work environments, restructuring tasks, carefully and fairly managing human resource outcomes and pay offs, will benefit both labour and management. It is a commitment of management and union to support localized activities and experiments for increasing employee participation in determining work environment. It requires decentralization, responsive to customers, participative team and ability of workers to solve the problems without waiting for hierarchical approval. Quality circles, problem solving teams and the like are initiated to encourage team work and for performance improvement (Maccoby, 1984). So management and union should build mutual respect for institutional interests and values to generate a highly motivated, flexible and productive work force. Unions must adopt more proactive and creative roles in the work place and discard their largely reactive strategy to

employer initiatives. For this, organizations should start involvement of unions in participation process by establishing cohesive, supportive organized groups based on an educational strategy that analyses the work processes of the plant or office and comes up with a programme of reforms aimed at increasing individual autonomy, skills, social support, and empowerment (Eiger, 1989). Labour-management relationship plays an important role in enriching QWL (Bernadin, 2007). High union responses are required in the QWL programmes like job redesign, upward communication, team based-work configurations and quality circles which will improve employee satisfaction and commitment (Ellinger and Nissen, 1987). Union goals for employees include job security, dignity on the job, a safe and healthy work environment while union organisational goals include strengthening membership identification with the union, building solidarity, and developing organizational cohesiveness (Heckscher 1984). Emphasis must be given on labour education programme for unions and union members on issues surrounding workers' participation programmes to make a meaningful QWL.

IV. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The objectives of this study are to: (i) Study the employees' opinion on various issues of employee relations in TTPS and OPTCL; (ii) Examine the impact of employee relations on quality of work life of the employees of TTPS and OPTCL; and (iii) Analyse the relevance of various employee relations measures in improving quality of work life environment in the said organizations.

The present study is purely based on case study method and two major industrial units of power sector in Orissa were selected. Such selected organizations are Talcher Thermal Power Station (TTPS), a Unit of NTPC, and Orissa Power Transmission Corporation Ltd., (OPTCL), a Govt. of Orissa undertaking. Initially TTPS was promoted by Govt. of Orissa in the Year 1964 and power generated from this unit since 1967. Due to continuous loss, Govt. of Orissa decided to sell it and it was taken over by National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC), a central Govt. corporate body on 3rd June, 1995. Similarly, in the process of power sector reforms, OPTCL was incorporated by the Government of Orissa in 1st April, 2005 to take over the transmission, STU/SLDC functions of Grid Corporation of Orissa Limited (GRIDCO). During the study 530 interview schedules have been administered among the respondents (executives and non-

executives) of both organizations while active response of 340 respondents were collected; out of which 30 executives and 110 non-executives were from TTPS, and 68 executives and 132 non-executives were from OPTCL. A structured interview schedule administered among respondents for collection of primary data is ascertained by a five-point scale such as strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided (3), disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1). Methods of direct observation and informal focused group discussion with the employees were also followed to know the feelings of the respondents. The responses were well recorded and systematically analyzed to draw a clear picture on the study.

V. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

After restructuring of both organizations, management of both units have given extensive focus on developing sound employee relations. In addition, various measures have adopted in the areas of employee relations like empowerment and involvement, suggestion schemes, collective bargaining, grievance and conflict management, and union-management relations to improve quality of work life of the employees. As a result of those measures, the performances of the organisations have improved significantly and employees became more committed towards their organisations. The degree of efforts given by both actors of said units for healthy employee relations which foster better of quality of work life of employees discussed on the following aspects:

1. Employee Empowerment and Involvement

Empowerment as a recent and advanced manifestation of employee involvement improves employee relations and contributes directly to organisational objectives by increasing skill sets and granting authority to the employees to make decisions that would traditionally be made by managers (Ivancevich, 2001). It can encourage employees to be creative and to take risks, which are key components that can give a firm a competitive edge in a fast-changing environment (Hymowitz, 2000). Johnson and Redmond (1998) opined that employee involvement is operationalised through a process of five essential steps like informing, consulting, sharing, delegating, and empowering. According to Shapiro (2000), organisations are giving efforts to involve employees to different degrees by which staffs are encouraged, enabled and empowered to contribute towards goal attainment. Employee empowerment is more relevant in today's

competitive environment where knowledge workers are more prevalent (Wimalasiri and Kouzmin, 2000; Jarrar and Zairi, 2002). Thus, it is of vital importance that HR managers today understand that empowerment is really a necessary tool to increase employee satisfaction, which will transfer into greater productivity and organizational effectiveness.

Employees feel themselves as the strategic partners of the organization and help in implementation of organisational policies. It not only reduces the dissatisfaction among the employees but also increases their commitment towards the organization. The opinion of the respondents relating to employee empowerment and involvement is exhibited in Table 1. Workers' involvement in decision-making has been given priority in TTPS since it's taken over. Bipartite bodies are well represented by both management employees and unions. Also, the opinion of the workers representatives is well accepted and encouraged by the management. Most of the problems and issues have been resolved amicably through participative approach. Quality circles are also very much active and properly functioning in the organisation. It is observed from the responses of non-executives (average mean 3.705) and executives (average mean 4.184) that there is mutual trust and cooperation in the organisation which help in promoting participative/democratic culture and $r = +0.714$ which confirms the existence and proper functioning of various formal and informal participative bodies in the organisation. OPTCL has not focused more on the representation of employees in decision making process. Quality circles and bipartite committees are not functioning properly. From the Table 1, it is found that the average mean scores of the responses of non-executives and executives are 2.246 and 2.745 respectively. As the calculated value of F is more than its critical value, it indicates that the climate of empowerment and involvement in OPTCL and actions taken towards this is not satisfactory.

2. Initiating Employee Suggestions

Employee suggestion scheme can be described as a formalised mechanism which encourages employees to contribute constructive ideas for improving the organisation in which they work. Implemented ideas are rewarded by a monetary award or some other form of recognition – usually proportionate to the benefits generated. It creates a climate of trust and confidence, job satisfaction and continuous improvement in the company (Yusof and Aspinwall 2000). Marx (1995) defines a staff suggestion scheme as a formalized procedure to encourage the employees

to think creatively about their jobs, job environment, and to come forward with ideas for which they will be rewarded on a specific basis, if acceptable and to the advantage of the organisation. But five critical factors like top management commitment, commitment from middle and junior managers, effective administrative and evaluation procedures, promotion and publicity, and rewards and recognition are needed to implement, support and operate suggestion schemes successfully (Lloyd, 1996 a, b). Day to day employee suggestions is a useful way to obtain and utilise employees' creative ideas especially when operating in a world where innovation and constant improvement plays an increasingly vital part in economic success.

Employee suggestion scheme promote creativity among the employees. It provides opportunity to employees to give their suggestions in improving organisational effectiveness. The opinions of respondents (executives and non-executives) of both organisations are presented in the Table 2. TTPS has introduced employee suggestion scheme for the bringing out of best suggestion out of the experience. It improves the individual employees potential as well as motivates them to be more committed. The management always extends its hands of cooperation by accepting and implementing the cost effective and productive suggestions from the employees. The performance of the employee suggestion scheme is satisfactory as the average mean scores of the response of executives and non-executives are 4.267 and 3.93 respectively and $r = +0.90$. The average mean scores of the response of executives and non-executives personnel of OPTCL relating to attempt towards employee suggestions are 3.309 and 2.585 respectively and $r = +0.40$. Thus, it is confirmed that though suggestion scheme has introduced to facilitate the creativity of the employees, it is not functioning properly due to lack of support from OPTCL management.

3. Facilitating Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining is a process of decision making between parties representing employer and employee interests which implies the "negotiation and continuous application of an agreed set of rules to govern the substantive and procedural terms of the employment relationship" (Windmuller et al, 1987). It can be initiated between trade unions and individual companies (single-employer bargaining), or between union federations and employer associations (multi-employer bargaining). In all of these cases, the goal is to agree upon rules to facilitate compromises between conflicting interests over the terms and conditions of employment. In

replacing unilateral decision-making by the employer, bargaining has introduced an element of industrial democracy into the workplace (Cordova, 1990; Traxler, 1991). As suggested by Brown (2004), the range of issues over which bargaining takes place has narrowed in the last 20 years, but at the same time the scope of collective bargaining had rarely gone beyond pay and hours. Irrespective of the level at which bargaining takes place, a central goal is to reach compromises and agree upon rules for facilitating conflict resolution. For workers, this provides a protective function (ensuring adequate wages and working conditions), a voice function (influencing personnel and labour relations practices), and a distributive function (sharing in the fruits of technological progress and productivity). So, collective bargaining system not only determines the terms and conditions of employment, but also facilitates better employee relations in the organisation.

Collective bargaining is a process where both union and management representatives interacting with each other to reach at an agreement regarding wage and work related issues through mutual understanding and give and take principle. The success of collective bargaining depends on the positive attitude of both union and management. This is the process which promotes industrial peace and progress by reducing the difference of opinion between the two parties. The success of collective bargaining in TTPS is visible from the response of the executives (Average mean= 3.992) and non-executives (Average mean= 3.686) and in OPTCL the average mean responses of executives (3.29) and non-executive personnel (2.676) as reflected in Table 3. But in both cases coefficient of correlation ($r = +0.90$), it signifies very positive correlation between responses of the executives and non-executives towards effectiveness of collective bargaining system.

4. Conflict Management and Grievance Redressal Measures

The sheer volume of grievances and disciplinary actions that arise will affect the costs of managing an organisation. To the extent that management and unions devote time and effort to these formal adversarial procedures, they limit resources available for training, problem solving, communications, and other activities linked to productivity, human resource management, or organisational development (Katz et al., 1983). Consequently, volume of grievances and disciplinary actions should be systematically related to other measures of the performance of an industrial relations system (Thomson and Murray, 1976). High degree of conflict between labour

and management lead to lower efficiency, poorer quality and poorer organisational performance. Therefore, grievance and conflict resolution measures serve important and useful functions for labour and management for resolving the inevitable conflicts of employment relationships and for protecting the individual rights of employees.

Grievance is the seed of dispute and the management should give due consideration to the employees' day to day grievances. In order to maintain industrial peace and harmonious relations, the management should take proactive measures to settle the industrial conflicts and to avoid work stoppages. The performance of grievance and conflict management in both organisations are well understood from Table 4. The grievance committee and multistage grievance handling machinery are very much effective in TTPS. It is also observed that the management is successfully handling grievances to prevent dissatisfaction and frustration as well as taking collaborative approach for quick and prompt resolution of conflicts. The average of mean response of non-executives (4.143) and executives (3.788) strongly confirmed that the attempt towards grievance and conflict management in TTPS is very effective. There is no significant difference between responses of both categories of respondents as calculated F-value is less than its critical value. There is a multistage grievance handling system for redressal of day to day grievances of employees in OPTCL. The management is also taking proactive measures to avoid work stoppages in the organisation. The average mean response of executives and non-executives are 3.231 and 2.557 respectively. This reveals that the grievance and conflict management system is not upto mark. As the calculate value of F is less than its critical value, there is no significant difference between the responses of executives and non-executives.

5. Dynamic Union-Management Relations

Industrial organizations for their survival in competitive market condition have given emphasis on gaining support from employees, mutual trust and confidence building, importance on unions, improved career and salary tracks, retirement benefits, and retraining measures (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2001). Effective employee relations in any business unit achieved through rewards and recognition, transparent communication system, proper care towards employee grievances (Srivastava et al. 1998, p.134). Presently, the influence of technological innovation, work restructuring, and job redesign are helping to reshape shop floor attitudes among managers, unions and workers (Taylor, 1998). Now trade unions are adopting a cooperative attitude

towards the management in contrast to the previous confrontationalist attitude. At the core of this, it is a fundamental shift in the relationship between employers and trade unions, following the gradual realisation that the interests of all are the best served through harmonious rather than adversarial industrial relations (Pettinger, 1999, p.313). In present context, both union and management consider themselves as the strategic business partners and they support and reinforce each other to improve the organisational performance.

The relationship between the management and unions must be harmonious for smooth functioning of the organisation. The management has to deal with the unions in a friendly manner to get their maximum cooperation for the success of the organisation. Similarly unions have to cooperate with management in the formulation and implementation of policies in the organisation. The indicators of union-management relations in both units (TTPS and OPCL) are exhibited in the Table 5. The degree of labor management relationship is very cordial in TTPS because of management's initiative to take unions into confidence during decision making as well as its non-interference in union activities. Since taken over there is no evidence on strikes or lockouts. The average mean scores of response of non-executives and executives are 3.709 and 3.827 respectively. Moreover, $r = +0.90$ confirms existence of cordial relationship between management and unions as perceived by the respondents. In OPTCL, the management is not interfering in union activities, but unions are not always cooperating with management. The average mean scores of response of non-executives and executives are 2.965 and 3.33 respectively while correlation coefficient ($r = +0.30$) indicates that the relationship between management and unions is not as cordial as expected by the respondents.

On the basis of above analysis and discussions, the following valuable findings are established with respect to perceived degree of employee relations prevailing in both the units.

- The bipartite committees of TTPS are working effectively and the employees are getting enough scope and freedom to give their opinion in those committees.
- In OPTCL bipartite committees are not working properly and the employees are also not getting enough opportunity to share their views in the decision making process.
- The employees are encouraged through due recognition and rewards for their creative and innovative suggestions in TTPS.

- In case of OPTCL, though suggestion scheme exist, but its performance is not quite appreciable.
- The management of TTPS encourages collective bargaining in the organisation in order to reduce the gap between union and management with respect to work related issues to promote industrial peace and progress.
- There are 61 trade unions in OPTCL and no union has been recognized by the management. In spite of favourable attitude of management, collective bargaining system is not so successful due to union rivalry and non cooperation of unions.
- The management of TTPS is very careful about employee grievances and is showing willingness to handle those quickly through open door system.
- The managements of TTPS and OPTCL take proactive measures to avoid any form of work stoppages by resolving conflicts in the organisation.
- The grievance redressal machinery is not functioning properly in OPTCL in order to manage day to day grievances of employees.
- The union-management relationship is very cordial in TTPS due to cooperative and compromising attitude of both management and unions. This has been proved from the records that there is no strike/lockout since it's taken over.

VI. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Employee relations issues are influencing the success of any organisation in terms of profitability, survival, competitiveness, adaptability and flexibility. Both organizations (TTPS and OPTCL) have realised this and recognised the importance of human resource for their success and survival. For optimum utilisation of the existing work force, the managements of TTPS and OPTCL have given proper attention towards major ER issues such as employee empowerment and involvement, collective bargaining, employee suggestions, grievance and conflict management, and union-management relations to develop sound and cordial employee relations climate. Though there are some areas which need to be taken care by the managements, but they are committed to continual improvement of employee relations by considering their employees as stakeholders. As a result of which, employees are more satisfied with their jobs and committed towards the organisation. Overall, the employees of both organisations are enjoying a better quality of work life as reflected in the study. So degree of various aspects of

labour-management relations is significantly contributing towards improvement in quality of work life of employees along with achievement of prime objective of the organisations. However, its success depends upon the commitment and attitudes of the three stakeholders-management, union, and the employees of the organisation. The changing aspirations and needs of today's workers require the union to adapt and adjust to the volatile situation. Unions can play a constructive role in the QWL efforts by supporting and cooperating with the management. Strategic ER enables both management and unions to adapt a more integrated approach toward conflict and encourages the development of healthy labour-management relations. It not only enhances the individual efficiency but also improves the organisational effectiveness by reducing accidents, work stoppages, grievances, absenteeism and turnover of employees. In general, one of the key outcomes of strategic ER is enhanced quality of work life which developed the whole gamut of human life by improving not only the quality of work life, but also the quality of life (QL) of the employees.

The following suggestions are made in order to strengthen employee relations which facilitate healthy QWL of employees and organisational performance.

- The management of OPTCL must encourage for constitution of bipartite committees to facilitate employee involvement in the decision making process.
- Employee suggestion scheme needs to be operationalised effectively so as to utilise the creativity of employees in OPTCL.
- The management must encourage employees through significant reward and recognition system to put their constructive and value added suggestions so that the employees will be more committed towards the organisational objectives.
- Although OPTCL has multistage grievance redressal procedure, but it needs to be operated properly by the management to manage the grievances of employees which will reduce the dissatisfaction among them and will promote industrial peace.
- The management must take unions into confidence and needs to discuss the policies and decisions with them before implementation. Similarly unions must consider them as the strategic business partners and cooperate with the management for maintaining peace and progress of the organisation.

References

- Bernadin, H.J. (2007), *Human Resource management- An Experiential Approach*, TMH Publications, New Delhi, pp. 398.
- Bohl, D.L.; Slocum, J.W.; Luthans, F. and Hodgetts, R.M. (1996), "Ideas that will shape the future of Management Practice", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 6-13.
- Brown, W.(2004), "The Future of Collectivism in the Regulation of Industrial Relations", *Lecture to Manchester Industrial Relations Society*, 40th Anniversary.
- Budhwar, P. (2000), "Indian and British Specialists' understanding of Dynamics of their Function: An Empirical Study", *International Business Review*, Vol. 9, No. 6, pp.727-753.
- Cohen, R. and Rosenthal, E. (1980), "Should Union Participate in Quality of Work Life Activities", *The Quality of Work Life- the Canadian Scene*, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 7-12.
- Cordova, E. (1990), "Collective Bargaining", in Blanpain, R. et al (eds.), *Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations in Industrialised Market Economies*, pp. 151-177.
- Eichinger, B. and Ulrich, D. (1995), "Are you Future Agile?", *Human Resource Planning*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 30-43.
- Eiger, N. (1989), "Organizing for Quality of Working Life", *Labour Studies Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 3-12.
- Ellinger, C. and Nissan, B. (1987), "A Case Study of a Failed Programme: Implications for Labor Education", *Labor Studies Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp.195-219.
- Gomez-Mejia, L.R.; Balkin, D.B. and Cardy, R.L. (2001), *Managing Human Resources*, 3rd ed., Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Gomez-Mejia, Luis R.; Balkin, D.B. and Cardy, R.L. (2005), *Managing Human Resources*, New Delhi: Pearson Education, pp.458-459.
- Havlovic, S.J. (1991), "Quality of Work Life and Human Resource Outcomes", *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 469-79.
- Heckscher, C. (1984), "A Union Response to QWL Program", *Workplace Democracy*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 9-14.
- Heskett, J.L.; Sasser, W.E. Jr. and Schlesinger, L.A. (1997), *The Service Profit Chain*, The Free Press, New York.
- Hian, C.C. and Einstein, W.O. (1990), "Quality of work life (QWL): What can Unions Do?", *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, Vol. 55, No. 2, pp. 17-22.
- Hymowitz, C. (2000), How can a manager encourage employees to take bold risks?, State-of – the-art council Report from the Human Resource Planning Society (HRPS), New York.
- Ivancevich, J.M. (2001), *International Human Resource Management*, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York.
- Jarrar, Y. and Zairi, M. (2002), "Employee Empowerment – A UK Survey of Trends and Best

- Practices”, *Managerial Auditing Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 5, pp. 266-71.
- Johnson, R.S. and Redmond, D. (1998), “The Art of Empowerment”, Pitman Publishing, London.
- Katz, H.C.; Kochan, T.A. and Gobeille, K.R. (1983), “Industrial Relations Performance, Economic Performance and Quality of Working Life Programs: An Inter-plant Analysis”, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 3-17.
- Lloyd, G. (1996a), “Fostering an Environment of Employee Contribution to Increase Commitment and Motivation”, *Empowerment in Organizations*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 25-28.
- Lloyd, G. (1996b), “Thinking Beyond the Box”, *Health Manpower Management*, Vol. 22, No. 5, pp. 37-39.
- Maccoby, M. (1984), “Helping Labour and Management Setup a Quality-of-Work Life Program”, *Monthly Labor Review*, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor, Wasington, March, pp. 28-32.
- Marx, A. (1995), “Management Commitment for Successful Suggestion Systems”, *Work Study*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 16-18.
- Mello, Jeffrey A. (2003), *Strategic Human Resource Management*, Thomson South-Western, Singapore, pp.360.
- Mondy, R.W. and Noe, R.M. (2006), *Human Resource Management*, Pearson Education, New Delhi, pp.450-451.
- Pettinger, R. (1999), *Effective Employee Relations*, Kogan Page, London, pp.313.
- Robbins, S.P. (1989), *Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, and Applications*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Saini, Debi S. (2000), “Globalization and Developments in Human Resource Management”, *Human Resource Management: Prospectives for the New Era* (Eds.), Response Books, New Delhi, 2000, pp.55-59.
- Satrya, Aryana; Parasuraman, Balakrishnan (2007), “Partnership as Union Strategy – Does it Work in Asia? Case Studies in Indonesia and Malaysia”, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 42, No. 4, April, pp.589-616.
- Sayeed, Omer Bin (2001), *Organizational Commitment and Conflict*, Sage Publications, New Delhi, pp.254.
- Scobel, D.N. (1975), “Doing Away with the Factory Blue”, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 53, pp. 132-42.
- Shapiro, G. (2000), “Employee Involvement: Opening the Diversity Pandora’s Box”, *Personnel Review*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 304-323.

- Sodhi, J.S. (1999), *Industrial Relations and Human Resource Management*, Shri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources, New Delhi.
- Sparrow, P.R. and Budhwar, P. (1997), "Competition and Change: Mapping the Indian HRM recipe against World Wide Patterns", *Journal of Business World*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 224-242.
- Srivastava, C.M.; Kaul, A.K. and Sivkumar, A. (1998), "Strategies for Change for Building a World Class Company", *Business – Led HR Strategies*, All India Management Association, Excel Books, New Delhi, pp. 134.
- Straw, R.J. and Heckscher, C.C. (1984), "QWL: New Working Relationships in the Communication Industry", *Labor Studies Journal*, Vol. 9, pp. 261-74.
- Taylor, R. (1998), *The Future of Employment Relations*, An ESRC Future of Work Programme Seminar Series, Economic and Social Research Council.
- Thomson, A.J.W. and Murray, V.V. (1976), *Grievance Procedure*, Saxon House, London.
- Traxler, F. (1991), "The Logic of Employers' Collective Action", in Sadowski, D. and Jacobi, D. (eds.), *Employers Associations in Europe: Policy and Organisation*, Nomos, Baden-Baden, pp. 29-50.
- Venkat Ratnam, C.S. (1996), *Industrial Relations in Indian States*, Global Business Press, New Delhi.
- Wimalasiri, J. and Kouzmin, A. (2000), "A Comparative Study of Employee Involvement Initiatives in Hong Kong and the USA", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 21, No. 8, pp. 614-34.
- Windmuller, J.P. et al. (1987), *Collective Bargaining in Industrialised Market Economies: A reappraisal*, ILO, Geneva.
- Yusof, S. and Aspinwall, E. (2000), "TQM Implementation Issues: Review and Case Study", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 20, No. 6, pp. 634-55.

Appendix

Table 1
Employee Empowerment & Involvement

Items	Organization – A						F - value	Organization – B						
	Executives (N=30)			Non -executives (N=110)				Executives (N=68)			Non -executives (N=132)			
	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)		Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	F – value
Bipartite committees	4.4	0.49	11.13	4.01	0.58	14.46		3.221	0.838	26.01	2.288	0.453	19.79	
Freedom for sharing of views	4.1	0.539	13.13	3.918	0.752	19.2		2.926	0.773	26.43	2.22	0.568	25.6	
Performance of such committees	4.3	0.458	10.66	3.945	0.615	15.58	4.257	2.78	0.725	26.06	2.121	0.663	31.24	5.676
Performance of quality circles	4.267	0.443	10.38	3.427	0.744	21.72	d. f. (5,5)	2.074	0.602	29.0	2.068	0.593	28.68	(5,5)
Work related issues	3.867	0.718	18.58	3.136	0.768	24.49		2.324	0.468	20.14	2.174	0.659	30.77	
Conducive climate	4.167	0.582	13.97	4.091	0.497	12.15		3.147	0.691	21.97	2.606	0.746	28.61	

Source: Primary Survey (2009).

C.V. – Coefficient of variation

S.D. – Standard Deviation

Organization - A (TTPS)

Avg. mean response (Executives) = 4.184

Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 3.705

Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.714

Level of significance (α) = 0.05

Critical value of F (5,5) = 5.05

Organization - B (OPTCL)

Avg. mean response (Executives) = 2.745

Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 2.246

Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.886

Level of significance (α) = 0.05

Critical value of F (5,5) = 5.05

Table 2
Employee Suggestion Scheme

Items	Organization – A							Organization – B							
	Executives (N=30)			Non -executives (N=110)				F - value	Executives (N=68)			Non -executives (N=132)			
	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean		S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	F – value	
Employees feel encouraged	4.067	0.680	16.71	3.745	0.639	17.06		2.544	0.673	26.46	2.167	0.618	28.52		
Management effort	4.4	0.49	11.13	3.982	0.632	15.86	2.556	3.618	0.484	13.37	2.091	0.596	28.49	1.493	
Recognition & reward	4.333	0.471	10.87	4.1	0.436	10.63	d. f. (3,3)	3.265	0.76	23.27	2.341	0.474	20.26	d. f. (3,3)	
Creativity of individual	4.267	0.443	10.38	3.891	0.679	17.45		3.809	0.691	18.15	3.742	0.671	17.93		

Source: Primary Survey (2009).

C.V. – Coefficient of variation
S.D. – Standard Deviation

Organization - A (TTPS)
Avg. mean response (Executives) = 4.267
Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 3.93
Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.9
Level of significance (α) = 0.05
Critical value of F (3,3) = 9.276

Organization - B (OPTCL)
Avg. mean response (Executives) = 3.309
Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 2.585
Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.4
Level of significance (α) = 0.05
Critical value of F (3,3) = 9.276

Table 3
Collective Bargaining System

Items	Organization – A							Organization – B							
	Executives (N=30)			Non -executives (N=110)				F - value	Executives (N=68)			Non -executives (N=132)			
	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean		S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	F – value	
Attitude of management	4.267	0.443	10.38	3.809	0.78	20.49		3.221	0.744	23.11	2.576	0.897	34.81		
Attitude of the union	3.9	0.597	15.32	3.527	0.722	20.48		2.426	0.494	20.36	2.136	0.66	30.91		
Implementation of agreements	3.933	0.629	16	3.718	0.663	17.84	2.429	3.838	0.572	14.9	2.955	0.801	27.12	2.353	
Performance of CB	3.867	0.67	17.33	3.691	0.462	12.5	d. f. (3,3)	3.676	0.468	12.73	3.038	0.811	26.68	d. f. (3,3)	

Source: Primary Survey (2009).

C.V. – Coefficient of variation

S.D. – Standard Deviation

Organization - A (TTPS)

Avg. mean response (Executives) = 3.992

Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 3.686

Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.9

Level of significance (α) = 0.05

Critical value of F (3,3) = 9.276

Organization - B (OPTCL)

Avg. mean response (Executives) = 3.29

Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 2.676

Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.9

Level of significance (α) = 0.05

Critical value of F (3,3) = 9.276

Table 4
Grievance and Conflict Management

Items	Organization – A						F - value	Organization – B						F – value
	Executives (N=30)			Non -executives (N=110)				Executives (N=68)			Non -executives (N=132)			
	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)		Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	
Management is very careful	4.267	0.443	10.38	4.082	0.574	14.18		3.324	0.794	23.88	2.28	0.762	33.4	
Open door policy	4.1	0.597	14.57	4.036	0.539	13.34	2.923	2.912	0.887	30.46	2.25	0.678	30.14	1.592
Trained supervisors	3.6	0.49	13.61	3.082	0.752	24.41	d. f.	3.147	0.691	21.97	2.667	0.471	17.67	d. f.
Grievance committee	4.2	0.4	9.52	4.21	0.407	9.68	(6,6)	2.412	0.878	36.4	2.038	0.608	29.85	(6,6)
Resolving of conflicts	4.167	0.582	13.97	3.6	0.777	21.59		3.603	0.49	13.6	2.606	0.746	28.61	
Collaborative conflict mgt.	4.3	0.458	10.66	3.382	0.713	21.07		3.265	0.633	19.39	2.955	0.777	26.3	
Avoidance of work stoppages	4.367	0.482	11.03	4.127	0.605	14.66		3.956	0.628	15.89	3.106	0.828	26.65	

Source: Primary Survey (2009).

C.V. – Coefficient of variation
S.D. – Standard Deviation

Organization - A (TTPS)
Avg. mean response (Executives) = 4.143
Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 3.788
Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.464
Level of significance (α) = 0.05
Critical value of F (6,6) = 4.283

Organization - B (OPTCL)
Avg. mean response (Executives) = 3.231
Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 2.557
Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.714
Level of significance (α) = 0.05
Critical value of F (6,6) = 4.283

Table 5
Union – Management Relations

Items	Organization – A						F - value	Organization – B						
	Executives (N=30)			Non -executives (N=110)				Executives (N=68)			Non -executives (N=132)			
	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)		Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	F – value
Non interference of management	4.3	0.458	10.66	4.01	0.58	14.46		4.029	0.663	16.46	3.538	0.656	18.53	
Union-management interaction	4.1	0.539	13.13	3.945	0.615	15.58		3.206	0.758	23.65	2.129	0.608	27.41	
Cooperation form unions	3.133	0.806	25.71	3.445	0.709	20.57	2.676	2.691	0.753	27.98	3.523	0.645	18.31	1.985
Confidence on unions	3.733	0.442	11.83	3.427	0.744	21.72	d. f. (4,4)	3.103	0.619	19.94	2.22	0.829	37.34	d. f. (4,4)
Cordial relationship	3.867	0.718	18.58	3.718	0.449	12.09		3.632	0.576	15.86	3.417	0.675	19.74	

Source: Primary Survey (2009).

C.V. – Coefficient of variation
S.D. – Standard Deviation

Organization - A (TTPS)
Avg. mean response (Executives) = 3.827
Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 3.709
Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.9
Level of significance (α) = 0.05
Critical value of F (4,4) = 6.388

Organization - B (OPTCL)
Avg. mean response (Executives) = 3.33
Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 2.965
Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.3
Level of significance (α) = 0.05
Critical value of F (4,4) = 6.388