

# A STUDY ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF EMPLOYEE RELATIONS INITIATIVES IN CEMENT INDUSTRIES, TAMIL NADU.

Dr.D.ELAMPARUTHI,  
Assistant Professor,  
Department of Business Administration,  
Annamalai University.

## Abstract-

QWL is a wide-ranging programme selected to improve employees' satisfaction. Employee Relation is concerned with preventing and resolving issues relating individuals, which take place out of or affect work situations. They can concern the relationship of employees in the organisation and with each other. Employee Relation representatives may also develop new policies that help to maintain fairness and efficiency in the workplace. The objective of this study is the employees' opinion on various issues of employee relations in ICF and TANCEM. They selected two cement organizations in Tamil Nadu. The population of study is 530. 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 quality of work life of employees.

**Key words** – QWL, Employee Relations Initiatives, Cement Factory.

## Introduction

A moment ago the World Bank forecasts that by 2020, India could become the foremost economy in the world. Terrific to such development, a large number of foreign firms have become interested to make business in India. The liberalized policies and the improved level of competition by overseas firms have put pressure on HR functions of domestic companies. To continue to exist 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 current competitive business atmosphere, Indian organisations are reaction obligated from within to reorient their employment relationships (Budhwar, 2000; Sodhi, 1999). Later than few years the organisational restructuring and work re-engineering, management comes to recognize that a productive workforce is increasingly important to attaining sustainable competitive advantage for business organisations on a global basis (Bohl et al., 1996).

QWL is a wide-ranging programme selected to improve employees' satisfaction. It is a way of thinking about the people, work and organization and creates a sense of accomplishment in the minds of the employees and contributes toward greater job satisfaction, humanizing productivity, adaptability and overall effectiveness of an organization. The healthy employee relations (ER) it is necessary to have well-defined policies and procedures as because reactive policies can't continue for long. Scheduled the rise competition, complex economic environment, rising labour costs, etc. Despite the fact that having proactive strategies; the organizations have to ensure achievement of corporate objectives through cooperation and commitment of employees. As the composition of the 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.

Employee Relations And Quality Of Work Life

Robbins (1989) distinct QWL as “a method by which an organization responds to employee needs by increasing mechanisms to allow them to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work”. QWL has been well predictable as a multi-dimensional construct and it may not be worldwide. The input concepts captured and discussed in the accessible 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).

The Unions protect to play a constructive role in QWL effort by supporting and even enhancing its relevancy as a valid society which signify the rights and interests of the workers. This encourages unions to take collaborative course and minimize adversarial and aggressive strategy which brings employee satisfaction and better QWL in the work place (Hian and Einastein, 1990). Prominence must be given on labour education programme for unions and union members on issues neighboring workers’ participation programmes to make a meaningful QWL. 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).

### Initiatives Of Employee Relations

Employee Relation is concerned with preventing and resolving issues relating individuals, which take place out of or affect work situations. They can concerns the relationship of employees in the organisation and with each other. It includes the processes of increasing, implementing, administering and analyzing the employer-employee relationship, managing employee performance and resolving workplace conflicts/disputes. The Employee relations occupy the body of work concerned with maintaining employer-employee relationships that contribute to satisfactory productivity, motivation, and morale. The actions include promotion, transfer, demotion, resignation, discharge, layoff and retirement. Obedience and disciplinary action are also crucial aspects of internal employee relations (Mondy and Noe, 2006).

Managers and human resource specialists should work in partnership to ensure effective statement to promote better employee relations atmosphere, since to develop and prolong such relations, employers must keep employees informed of company policies and strategies (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2001). Superior employee relations given that fair and consistent treatment to all employees. So that they will be committed to the organization. The organization should also give employees the freedom to air grievances about management decisions. The successful employee relations require cooperation between managers and employee relations representatives. Employee Relation representatives may also develop new policies that help to maintain fairness and efficiency in the workplace (Gomez-Mejia et al. 2005).

### Employee Empowerment and Involvement

Empowerment as a recent and highly developed appearance of employee involvement improves employee relations and contributes directly to organisational objectives by increasing skill set and charitable system of power to the employees to make decisions that would customarily be made by managers (Ivancevich, 2001). 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.

### Initiating Employee Suggestions

The Employee proposal scheme knows how to be described as a dignified 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 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 appreciation are desired 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.

### Facilitating Collective Bargaining

The Collective bargaining is a process of decision making among the parties representing employer and employee wellbeing, which implies the “negotiation and continuous application of an agreed set of rules to administer the substantive and routine terms of the employment relationship” (Windmuller et al, 1987). It can be initiated between operate unions and individual companies (single-employer bargaining), or between union federations and employer associations (multi-employer bargaining). In all of these cases, the purpose is to agree upon rules to make possible compromises between conflicting interests over the terms and conditions of employment. In replacing independent 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 collection of issues over which bargaining takes place has tapering 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.

### Conflict Management and Grievance Redressal Measures

The grievances and disciplinary actions that occur will affect the costs of managing an society. In the direction of 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.

### 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). The successful employee relations in any industry 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).

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Aswathappa (2010) in his book, “Human Resource Management” discussed the various types of benefits and services provided to employees in terms of payment for time not worked, insurance benefits, compensation benefits, pension plans etc. He also discussed the ways to administer the benefits and services in a better way

Binoyjoseph, josephinjodey (2009), studies in the article points out that, the structure of welfare states rests on a social security fabric. Government, employers, trade unions have done a lot to promote the betterment of workers conditions.

David, A Decenzo (2001) and Stephen P. Robbins in their book, “Personnel / Human Resource Management” explained the various benefits and services provided by the companies to their employees. According to them, the legally required benefits and services include social security premiums, unemployment compensation, workers compensation and state disability programs. They felt that the cost of the voluntary benefits offered appears to be increasing.

Michael (2001) in his book, “Human Resource Management and Human Relations” said that the provision of intra-mural and extra-mural welfare facilities help in improving the quality of work life of employees thereby good human relations will develop among different cadres of employees.

Punekar, Deodhar and Sankaran (2004) in their book, “Labor Welfare, Trade Unionism and Industrial Relations” stated that labor welfare is anything done for the comfort and improvement, intellectual and social well being of the employees over and above the wages paid which is not a necessity of the industry.

## METHODOLOGY

### OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this study are to:

- (i) To Study the employees’ opinion on various issues of employee relations in ICF(India Cement Factory) and TANCEM(Tamil Nadu Cement Corporation., Ltd)
- (ii) To Examine the impact of employee relations on quality of work life of the employees of ICF and TANCEM and
- (iii) To analyze the relevance of various employee relations measures in improving quality of work life environment in the said organizations.

The present study is based on case study method and two major industrial units of Cement Factories were selected. Such selected organizations are India Cement Factory(ICF) and Tamil Nadu Cement Corporation., Ltd(TANCEM), the population of study is 530. among the population (executives and non-executives) of both organizations while active response of 340 respondents was collected; out of which 30 executives and 110 non-executives were from ICF, and 68 executives and 132 non-executives were from TANCEM. A structured interview schedule administered among respondents for the 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 of the study.

### DATA ANALYSIS-

Table – 1 Employee Empowerment & Involvement

Items	Organization – A						F - value
	Executives – (N=30)			Non -executives (N=110)			4.257  d. f. (5,5)
	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	
Performance of such committees	4.3	0.458	10.66	3.945	0.615	15.58	
Performance of quality circles	4.267	0.443	10.38	3.427	0.744	21.72	
Bipartite committees	4.4	0.49	11.13	4.01	0.58	14.46	
Work related issues	3.867	0.718	18.58	3.136	0.768	24.49	
Freedom for sharing of views	4.1	0.539	13.13	3.918	0.752	19.2	
Conducive climate	4.167	0.582	13.97	4.091	0.497	12.15	

Items	Organization – A						F - value
Items	Organization – B						F - value
	Executives (N=68)			Non -executives (N=132)			5.676 d. f.(5,5)
	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	
Performance of such committees	2.78	0.725	26.06	2.121	0.663	31.24	
Performance of quality circles	2.074	0.602	29.0	2.068	0.593	28.68	
Work related issues	2.324	0.468	20.14	2.174	0.659	30.77	
Bipartite committees	3.221	0.838	26.01	2.288	0.453	19.79	
Freedom for sharing of views	2.926	0.773	26.43	2.22	0.568	25.6	
Conducive climate	3.147	0.691	21.97	2.606	0.746	28.61	

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

Organization – A(ICF) , C.V. – Coefficient of variation, S.D. – Standard Deviation

Avg. mean response (Executives) = 4.184, Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 3.705

Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.714

Level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05

Critical value of F (5,5) = 5.05

Organisation – B (TANDEM)

Avg. mean response (Executives) = 2.745, Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 2.246

Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.886 , level of significance ( $\alpha$ )= 0.05, critical value of F(5,5)=5.05

Table – 2 Employee Suggestion Scheme

Organization –A

Avg. mean response (Executives) = 4.267

Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 3.809

Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.9

Level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05

Critical value of F (3,3) = 9.276

Organization – B

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

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

Organization – A      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      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

Organization – A
------------------

Items	Executives (N=30)			Non -executives (N=110)			F - value
	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	2.923 d. f. (6,6)
Open door policy	4.1	0.597	14.57	4.036	0.539	13.34	
Organization – A							

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

Organization – A Avg. mean response (Executives) = 4.143

Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 3.788 Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.464

Level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05 Critical value of F (6,6) = 4.283

Organization – B Avg. mean response (Executives) = 3.231

Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 2.557 Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.714

Level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05 Critical value of F (6,6) = 4.283

Table- 5 Union – Management Relations



	Executives (N=30)			Non -executives (N=110)			
Items	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	2.676 d. f. (4,4)
Cooperation form unions	2.691	0.753	27.98	3.523	0.645	18.31	
Confidence on unions	3.103	0.619	19.94	2.22	0.829	37.34	
Union-management interaction	3.206	0.758	23.65	2.129	0.608	27.41	
Cordial relationship	3.867	0.718	18.58	3.718	0.449	12.09	
Organization – B							
	Executives (N=68)			Non -executives (N=138)			
Items	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	Mean	S.D.	C.V (%)	F - value
Non interference of management	4.029	0.663	16.46	3.538	0.656	18.53	
Cooperation form unions	2.691	0.753	27.98	3.523	0.645	18.31	
Confidence on unions	3.103	0.619	19.94	2.22	0.829	37.34	
Union-management interaction	3.206	0.758	23.65	2.129	0.608	27.41	
Cordial relationship	3.632	0.576	15.86	3.417	0.675	19.74	

Organization – A Avg. mean response (Executives) = 3.827 Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 3.709

Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.9 Level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05 Critical value of F (4,4) = 6.388

Organization – B .Avg. mean response (Executives) = 3.33 Avg. mean response (Non-executives) = 2.965

Correlation coefficient (r) = 0.3 Level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05 Critical value of F (4,4) = 6.388

## DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Restructuring of both organizations, management of both units has 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.

### Employee Empowerment and Involvement

1. Employees feel as the strategic partners of the organization and help in the 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.

2. Workers' involvement in decision-making has been given priority in ICF 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.
3. 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 are 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?
4. TANCEM has not focused more on the representation of employees in the 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.
5. As the calculated value of F is more than its critical value, it indicates that the climate of empowerment and involvement in TANCEM and actions taken towards this is not satisfactory.

### Initiating Employee Suggestions

Employee implication scheme promote creativeness among the employees. It provides chance to employees to give their suggestions in improving organisational effectiveness.

1. The opinions of respondents (executives and non-executives) of both organisations are presented in the Table 2.
2. ICF has introduced employee suggestion scheme for the bringing out of best suggestion out of the experience. It improves the individual employee's potential as well as motivates them to be more committed.
3. The management always extends its hands of cooperation by accepting and implementing the cost effective and productive suggestions from the employees.
4. 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  $r = +0.90$ .
5. The average mean scores of the response of executives and non-executives personnel of TANCEM 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 TANCEM management.

### Facilitating Collective Bargaining

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.

1. 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.
2. The success of collective bargaining in ICF is visible from the response of the executives (Average mean= 3.992) and non-executives (Average mean= 3.686) and in TANCEM the average mean responses of executives (3.29) and non-executive personnel (2.676) as reflected in Table 3.
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 the effectiveness of collective bargaining system.

### Conflict Management and Grievance Redressal Measures

The 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.

1. The performance of grievance and conflict management in both organisations are well understood from Table 4.
2. The grievance committee and multistage grievance handling machinery are very much effective in ICF. It is also observed that the management is successfully handling grievances to prevent dissatisfaction and frustration as well as taking a collaborative approach for quick and prompt resolution of conflicts.
3. 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 ICF is very effective.
4. There is no significant difference between responses of both categories of respondents as calculated F-value is less than its critical value.
5. There is a multistage grievance handling system for redressal of day to day grievances of employees in TANCEM.
6. 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 up to mark.
7. As the calculated value of F is less than its critical value, there is no significant difference between the responses of executives and non-executives.

#### Dynamic Union-Management Relations

The indicators of union-management relations in both units (ICF and TANCEM) are exhibited in the Table 5. The degree of labor management relationship is very cordial in ICF because of management's proposal to take unions into self-reliance during decision making as well as its non-interference in union activities.

1. 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.
2. In TANCEM, 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.
3. 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.
4. The bipartite committees of ICF are working effectively and the employees are getting enough scope and freedom to give their opinion in those committees.
5. In TANCEM bipartite committees are not working properly and the employees are also not getting enough opportunity to share their views in the decision making process.
6. The staffs are optimistic from first to last due recognition and rewards for their creative and pioneering suggestions in ICF.
7. In case of TANCEM, though suggestion scheme exist, but its performance is not quite appreciable.
8. The organization of ICF encourages combined bargaining in the organisation in order to diminish the gap between union and management with respect to work related issues to encourage industrial peace and progress.

9. There are 61 trade unions in TANCEM 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.
10. The management of ICF is very careful about employee grievances and is showing willingness to handle those quickly through open door system.
11. The managements of ICF and TANCEM take proactive measures to avoid any form of work stoppages by resolving conflicts in the organisation.
12. The grievance redressal machinery is not functioning properly in TANCEM in order to manage day to day grievances of employees.
13. The union-management relationship is very cordial in ICF 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.

## CONCLUSION

Employee relations issues are influencing the success of any organisation in terms of profitability, survival, competitiveness, adaptability and flexibility. Both organizations (ICF and TANCEM) have realised this and recognised the importance of human resource for their success and survival. For optimum utilisation of the existing workforce, the management of ICF and TANCEM has given proper attention towards major Employee Relation 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. 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 the degree of various aspects of labour-management relations is significantly contributing towards improvement in the quality of work life of employees along with the achievement of the prime objective of the organisations. Unions can play a constructive role in the QWL efforts by supporting and cooperating with the management. Strategic Employee Relation enables both management and unions to adopt 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 Employee Relation is enhanced the 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.

## 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.
- Cordova, E. (1990), "Collective Bargaining", in Blanpain, R. et al (eds.), *Comparative LabourLaw and Industrial Relations in Industrialised Market Economies*, pp. 151-177.
- 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.
- 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.
- Ivancevich, J.M. (2001), *International Human Resource Management*, McGraw-Hill/Irwin, New York.
- 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.
- Marx, A. (1995), “Management Commitment for Successful Suggestion Systems”, *Work Study*, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 16-18.
- Mondy, R.W. and Noe, R.M. (2006), *Human Resource Management*, Pearson Education, New Delhi, pp.450-451.
- Robbins, S.P. (1989), *Organizational Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, and Applications*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.