

A Study on Employee Awareness and Satisfaction Towards Grievance Settlement System in Rajamahendravaram of Andhra Pradesh

Atchim Naidu Dogga

Research Scholar, Department of commerce and management studies, Andhra University,
Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India

Abstract

The present study entitled “A Study on Employee Awareness and Satisfaction towards Grievance Settlement System in Rajamahendravaram of Andhra Pradesh” examines the effectiveness of the grievance redressal mechanism and the level of employee awareness and satisfaction towards the existing grievance settlement system in Andhra Paper Limited. The study focuses on understanding the grievance handling procedures, identifying the major causes of employee grievances, and assessing the role of management and trade unions in maintaining industrial harmony. A descriptive research design was adopted, and primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire from 545 non-executive employees selected through systematic sampling technique. The findings reveal that most employees are aware of the grievance settlement procedures and perceive the grievance committee and conciliation methods as effective mechanisms for resolving disputes. The study also identified interpersonal relations among departments and subordinates as major sources of grievances. Although the employees expressed a moderate level of satisfaction with the existing grievance redressal system, the study highlights the need for improved communication, transparency, and timely grievance resolution. The research concludes that an efficient grievance settlement system enhances employee morale, productivity, and organizational harmony, and suggests suitable measures for strengthening grievance handling practices in the organization.

Keyword: Employee Grievance, Grievance Redressal, Grievance Settlement System, Employee Satisfaction, Employee Awareness

Introduction:

Grievance redressal is a crucial mechanism designed to address and resolve complaints and concerns raised by individuals or groups within an organization or institution. It serves as a formal process through which grievances can be systematically and fairly addressed, ensuring that all parties involved are heard and their issues are considered. By providing a structured approach to resolving conflicts and disputes, grievance redressal aims to enhance transparency, accountability, and trust, ultimately contributing to a more equitable and harmonious environment. This process not only helps in addressing immediate concerns but also in identifying and rectifying systemic issues, thereby fostering continuous improvement

and stakeholder satisfaction.

In any organization or institution, whether public or private, grievances are inevitable. These grievances might arise due to a variety of reasons, including disputes over policies, perceived injustices, or unsatisfactory service. A robust grievance redressal system is essential for addressing these issues effectively and maintaining a fair and equitable environment. This essay explores the importance of grievance redressal, its key components, and the benefits it offers to organizations and individuals alike. A grievance redressal system is crucial for several reasons. First and foremost, it provides a structured avenue for individuals to voice their concerns and seek resolution. Without such a system, complaints might remain unaddressed, leading to dissatisfaction, resentment, and a decline in morale. By offering a formal mechanism for addressing grievances, organizations demonstrate their commitment to fairness and transparency.

Moreover, an effective grievance redressal system helps in identifying and mitigating systemic issues. Persistent grievances can signal underlying problems within the organization's policies or practices. By addressing these issues, organizations can make necessary improvements, preventing future complaints and enhancing overall efficiency.

This chapter is on the research methodology. It includes the need of the study, objectives of the study, Hypotheses, Scope of the study, Population & sample, sampling techniques used, about the questionnaire, Statistical techniques applies, organization of the theses, limitation of the theses and scope for further research. While framing the hypotheses, the objectives of the study as well as questionnaire was kept in mind. The reliability analysis of each parameter as well as all the statements asked to answer in 5-point Likert's scale were also made and presented. The population was defined without any ambiguity, and proper sampling techniques was suggested to get a more representative sample to study. The statistical techniques that were used to test the Null hypotheses defined were briefly mentioned. The chapter wise presentation of the thesis was presented. The limitation of the present study was given at the end. Grievance redressal is a vital component of any well-functioning organization or institution. It ensures that complaints are addressed in a fair and systematic manner, contributing to a culture of transparency and accountability. By investing in a robust grievance redressal system, organizations can enhance their internal processes, improve stakeholder satisfaction, and ultimately achieve greater success. The commitment to addressing grievances effectively reflects an organization's dedication to justice and continuous improvement, reinforcing its long-term sustainability and growth.

Need for the Study

The performance and productivity of employees is largely impacted by the work environment in which they are situated. Many external factors today can impede the development of a business, leading to grievances among personnel. The contemporary workplace typically consists of a diverse group of individuals, hailing from a variety of backgrounds such as varying cultures, age groups, and countries of origin. If this type of atmosphere is not managed correctly, grievances can occur and confusion may prevail. Such circumstances can negatively impact both employees' productivity and their performance, as well as that of the organization. An in-depth analysis of the available literature uncovered the substantial importance of grievances as a research topic, especially in developing countries such as India. This research is incredibly significant for many reasons, particularly as it will shed light on grievances and their impacts on employees, in terms of their productivity, as well as industrial harmony and discipline. The results of this study are invaluable in developing countries such as India, where few studies have been

done on grievances, as they could inform the formation of policies and as a result, policymaking could be reformed.

Scope of the study

This study sheds light on the need for a well-structured grievance handling process and provides insight to management for future improvements. Though different studies were conducted on this system by various researchers very few studies were done at Andhra Paper limited, Rajamendravaram creating scope for this current research. The present research focuses on providing redressal and establishing an effective grievance resolution system. As such, the researcher chose to conduct the study the redressal and settlement of the employee grievances at Andhra Paper Limited, Rajamendravaram. The findings of this investigation can be beneficial in subsequent studies of a similar nature.

Objective of the study:

The specific objectives of the study are to evaluate the influences of the sources of grievances on productivity, harmonious working environments, and discipline in the Andhra Paper Limited.

1. To study the awareness levels of the respondents in respect of existing grievance redressal and settlement parameters with reference to Andhra Paper Limited, Rajamendravaram.
2. To examine the grievance handling system and its process in the organization.
3. To assess the satisfaction levels of the employees at Andhra Paper Limited, Rajamendravaram on the existing Grievance settlement system by the management.
4. To gauge the impact of existing employee grievances on the industrial harmony at Andhra Paper Limited, Rajamendravaram.

Methodology

Population / Universe and Sample:

The thesis is on the assessment of level of implementation of redressal and settlement of employee grievances variables in the AP Paper Ltd., Rajahmundry. For that initially all the non-executive staff were identified and intended to collect the information from those employees of the Paper mill with the help a structured questionnaire. The non-executive staff is made up of Workmen, Jr. Staff, Sr. staff and Supervisors. The non-executive staffs are participating in the data collection survey at the time, 1000 workmen, 633 Sr Staff, 97 Jr. staff and 103 Supervisors. The total numbers of nonexecutives are 1833 and a particular of these non- executives gives the sampling frame for this study. Out of all these 1833 employees, one third of them were decided to take as sample for this study. One third of the 1833 comes to 611. So, it is decided to select 611 employees from those 1833 employees randomly and used to collect information from them by using structured questionnaire. The Systematic Sampling Technique was used to identify the sample in this case. All of these staff members (sampling frame) were gathered for that list, which was arranged alphabetically by name. uncovered a random start, and the employee with that start was included in the sample. From then employees corresponding to every 3rd number ($1833 / 611 = 3$) was included in the sample till the sample size reaches 611. The developed structured questionnaire was then used to collect data, was pretested, and was finally made ready for use. The researcher was able to obtain only 545 completed questionnaires despite repeated requests from the identified sampling units. The remaining 66 were non-responses, either incomplete, or incorrectly completed.

Systematic Sampling:

The sampling frame is made using this method based on things like alphabetical order, age, occupation, location, and so on. Systematic random sampling is a type of probability sampling in which a skip interval is used to select the sample based on position from a predetermined target population. The sampling interval, which is given by N/n , is determined in order to draw a systematic sample of "n" items from a population of "N" items. For instance, if a systematic sample of 100 items is to be taken from a population of 1000 items, the sampling interval is calculated as $1000/100=10$. After that, a random item is chosen from the first ten items in the sampling frame. The remaining items to be included in the sample are automatically determined if the item chosen is the sixth item. (by adding sampling interval, successively, to selected items) as 16th, 16th,...etc.

Respondents’ distribution based to their Demographic variables:

In this section, the Respondents’ distribution based to their Demographic information was provided and elucidated. The demographic variables considered in this thesis are Gender, Age, Marital status, Family Type, Social status, Religion, Residential status, Educational qualifications, Designation, Work experience, Monthly Income (from all sources), Type o work Handling.

The Respondents’ distribution based to their Gender was presented in Table 1 The classifications of Gender are Male and female.

Table 1
Respondents’ distribution based to their Gender

| Gender | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|---------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Male | 542 | 99.4 |
| Female | 3 | 0.6 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 1, it can be revealed that majority of the respondents i.e., 99.4 percent are Male and female contingent of the respondents are very less which comprise of only 0.6 percent. Hence, from this, further analysis relating to Gender was ignored as the female contingent is almost nil.

The Respondents’ distribution based to their Age was presented in Table 1 the classifications of Age are below 30 years, 30-40 years, 40-50 years and 50 and above years.

Table 2
Respondents’ distribution based to their Age

| Age (In years) | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Less than 30 | 162 | 29.7 |
| 30-40 | 304 | 55.8 |
| 40-50 | 59 | 10.8 |
| 50 and above | 20 | 3.7 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 2, it may be revealed that 29.7 percent of the respondents are of less than 30 years of age,

55.8 percent are between 30-40 years, 10.8 percent are between 40-50 years and 3.7 percent are 50 and above years of age.

The Respondents' distribution based to their Marital status was presented in Table 3. the classifications of marital status are below married, unmarried and divorced / widow

Table 3
Respondents' distribution based to their marital status

| Marital Status | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Married | 511 | 93.8 |
| Unmarried | 32 | 5.9 |
| Divorced / widow | 2 | .4 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 3, it may be revealed that 93.8 percent of the respondents are married, 5.9 percent are unmarried and 0.4 percent of them are divorced / widow.

The Respondents' distribution based to their Family type was presented in Table 4. the classifications of Family type are joint and nuclear

Table 4
Respondents' distribution based to their Family Type

| Family type | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Joint | 287 | 52.7 |
| Nuclear | 258 | 47.3 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 4, it may be revealed that 52.7 percent of the respondents are joint family type and 47.3 percent are nuclear family type.

The Respondents' distribution based to their social status was presented in Table 5. The classifications of social status are other classes, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and other backward classes.

Table 5
Respondents' distribution based to their social status

| Social status | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Other classes | 370 | 67.9 |
| Scheduled castes | 125 | 22.9 |
| Scheduled tribes | 16 | 2.9 |
| Other backward classes | 34 | 6.2 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 5, it may be revealed that 67.9 percent of the respondents are other classes, 22.9 percent are scheduled castes, 2.9 percent are scheduled tribes and 6.2 percent are other backward classes as far as their social status is concerned. The Respondents' distribution based to their Religion was presented in Table 6. The classifications of Religion are Hindu, Christian, Muslim, and others.

Table 6
Respondents' distribution based to their Religion

| Religion | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Hindi | 346 | 63.5 |
| Christian | 189 | 34.7 |
| Muslim | 9 | 1.7 |
| Others | 1 | 0.2 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 6, it may be revealed that 63.5 percent of the respondents are of Hindus, 34.7 percent are Christians, 1.7 percent are Muslims and 0.2 percent are others.

The Respondents' distribution based to their residential status was presented in Table 7. The classifications of residential status are local and non-local.

Table 7
Respondents' distribution based to their Residential status

| Residential status | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Local | 336 | 61.7 |
| Non-local | 209 | 38.3 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 7, it may be revealed that 61.7 percent of the respondents are from local and 38.3 percent respondents are from non-local residential status.

The Respondents' distribution based to their educational qualifications was presented in Table 8. The classifications of educational qualifications are below 30 years, 30-40 years, 40-50 years and 50 and above years.

Table 8
Respondents' distribution based to their educational qualifications

| Educational qualifications | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Primary/SSC/ 10th Standard | 297 | 54.5 |
| Intermediate | 7 | 1.3 |
| ITI/ Polytechnic | 92 | 16.9 |
| Graduation | 41 | 7.5 |
| Post-Graduation | 108 | 19.8 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 8, it may be revealed that 54.5 percent of the respondents are Primary/SSC/ 10th Standard qualified, 1.3 of them are Intermediate qualified, 16.9 percent of them are ITI/Polytechnic qualified, 7.5 percent of them are Graduates and 19.8 percent of the respondents are post-graduates.

The Respondents' distribution based to their Designation was presented in Table 9. The classifications of Designation Workmen, senior staff, supervisor, and junior staff

Table 9
Respondents’ distribution based to their Designation

| Designation | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Workmen | 391 | 71.7 |
| Senior Staff | 151 | 27.7 |
| Supervisor | 1 | .2 |
| Junior Staff | 2 | .4 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 9, it may be revealed that 71.7 percent of the respondents are workmen, 27.7 percent of them are senior staff, 0.2 percent of them are supervisors and 0.4 percent of the respondents are junior staff.

The Respondents’ distribution based to their Work experience was presented in Table 10. The classifications of Work experience are below 30 years, 30-40 years, 40-50 years and 50 and above years.

Table 10
Respondents’ distribution based to their Work experience

| Work experience | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| less than 5 Yrs | 23 | 4.2 |
| 5-10 Yrs | 248 | 45.5 |
| 10-15 Yrs | 170 | 31.2 |
| 15-20 Yrs | 61 | 11.2 |
| 20 Yrs & Above | 43 | 7.9 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 10, it may be revealed that 4.2 percent of the respondents are having less than 5 years of work experience, 45.5 percent of them are having 5-10 years of Work experience, 31.2 percent are having 10-15 years, 11.2 percent are having 15-29 years and 7.9 percent are having 20 and above years of Work experience.

The Respondents’ distribution based to their Monthly Income was presented in Table 11. The classifications of Monthly Income are below Rs. 15,000, Rs. 15,000 – Rs. 25,000, Rs. 25,000 – Rs. 35,000 and Rs. 35,000.

Table 11
Respondents’ distribution based to their Monthly Income

| Monthly Income | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| < Rs. 15,000 | 129 | 23.7 |
| Rs. 15,000 – Rs. 25,000 | 191 | 35.0 |
| Rs. 25,000 – Rs. 35,000 | 162 | 29.7 |
| > Rs. 35,000 | 63 | 11.6 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 11, it may be revealed that 23.7 percent of the respondents are of less than Rs. 15000 of Monthly Income, 35.0 percent are between 30-40 years, 10.8 percent are between 40-50 years and 3.7 percent are 50 and above years of Monthly Income.

The Respondents’ distribution based to their Type of work handling was presented in Table 12. The classifications of Type of work handling are Technical and Non- Technical.

Table 12
Respondents’ distribution based to their Type of work handling

| Type of work handling | Number of Respondents | Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Technical | 142 | 26.1 |
| Non- Technical | 403 | 73.9 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 12, it may be revealed that 26.1 percent of the respondents are handling technical type of work and 73.9 percent of them are handling non-technical type of work.

Respondents’ distribution based to their responses on ever been a member of Grievance Settlement Committee under the Redressal and settlement of employee grievance parameter “Grievance and its Ideology”:

The distribution of respondents based on whether the respondent ever a member of Grievance Settlement Committee was presented in Table 13.

Table 13
Distribution of responses against ever been a member of Grievance Settlement Committee

| Ever been a member of the Grievance settlement committee. | Number of respondents | Percent |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|
| Yes | 298 | 54.7 |
| No | 247 | 45.3 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 13, it can be said that 54.7 percent of the respondents said that they were ever been a member of Grievance Settlement Committee, 45.3 percent of them said they are not.

The distribution of respondents based on their responses on the type of Grievance Settlement Machinery existed in their organization were presented in Table 14

Table 14
Distribution of responses against Type of Grievance Settlement Machinery in your organization

| Type of Grievance Settlement Machinery in your organization | Number of respondents | Percent |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|
| Open-Door policy | 120 | 22.0 |
| Stepladder policy | 235 | 43.1 |
| Combination of the two | 190 | 34.9 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 14, it can be said that 22.0 percent of the respondents said that Type of Grievance Settlement Machinery in their organization is Open-Door policy , 43.1 percent of them said that Stepladder policy, and 34.9 percent of them said that Combination of those two.

The distribution of respondents based on the persons to whom the Grievance Settlement Procedure was communicated were presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Distribution of responses against the persons to whom the Grievance Settlement Procedure was communicated

| Persons to whom the Grievance Settlement Procedure was communicated | Number of respondents | Percent |
|--|------------------------------|----------------|
| Line managers | 100 | 18.3 |
| Union Leaders | 170 | 31.2 |
| Workers | 275 | 50.5 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 15, it can be said that 18.3 percent of the respondents said that the persons to whom the Grievance Settlement Procedure was communicated to Line Managers, 31.2 percent of them said that Union Leaders, and 50.5 percent of them said that workers.

The distribution of respondents based on Method adopted to communicate the Grievance Settlement Procedure were presented in Table 16.

Table 16

Distribution of responses against the Method adopted to communicate the Grievance Settlement Procedure

| Method adopted to communicate the Grievance Settlement Procedure | Number of respondents | Percent |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Official circulars | 13 | 2.4 |
| Company Magazines | 71 | 13.0 |
| Meetings | 62 | 11.4 |
| Grievance Committee | 196 | 36.0 |
| Direct Communication | 126 | 23.1 |
| Online Portal | 77 | 14.1 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 16, it can be said that 2.4 percent of the respondents said that Method adopted to communicate the Grievance Settlement Procedure is Official circulars, 13.0 percent of them said that Company Magazines, 11.4 percent of them said that Meetings, 36.0 percent of them said that Grievance Committee 23.1 percent of the respondents said that Direct Communication and 14.1 percent of them said that Online portal.

Respondents’ distribution based to their responses on the statement the effectiveness of the superiors for the redressal of grievances under the Redressal and settlement of employee grievance

parameter “Grievance Redressal Management System and its effectiveness”:

The distribution of respondents based on the effectiveness of the superiors for the redressal of grievances were presented in Table 17.

Table 17

Distribution of responses against the statements the effectiveness of the superiors for the redressal of grievances

| The effectiveness of the superiors for the redressal of grievances | Number of respondents | Percent |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Immediate Supervisor | 16 | 2.9 |
| Head of the department | 102 | 18.7 |
| Personal / Industrial relations department | 149 | 27.3 |
| Grievance committee | 202 | 37.1 |
| Top Management | 76 | 13.9 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 17, it can be said that 2.9 percent of the respondents attributed that the effectiveness of the superiors for the redressal of grievances is due to Immediate Supervisor, 18.7 percent of them attributed to Head of the Department, 27.3 percent of them attributed to Personal / Industrial relations department, 37.1 percent of them attributed to Grievance committee and 13.9 percent of them attributed to Top management.

Respondents’ distribution based to their responses on the statement the best method followed by our organization to resolve the disputes relating to the Redressal and settlement of employee grievance parameter “Grievance and Policy”:

The distribution of respondents based on the best method followed by their organization to resolve the disputes if arises were presented in Table 18.

Table 18

Distribution of responses against the best method followed by our organization to resolve the disputes

| Best method followed by our organization to resolve the disputes | Number of respondents | Percent |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|
| Collective Bargaining | 190 | 34.9 |
| Conciliation | 232 | 42.6 |
| Adjudication | 108 | 19.8 |
| Voluntary arbitration | 15 | 2.8 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 18, it can be said that 34.9 percent of the respondents said that the best method followed by our organization to resolve the disputes is Collective bargaining, 42.6 percent of them said that the Conciliation, 19.8 percent of them said Adjudication and 2.8 percent of them said Voluntary arbitration. The distribution of respondents based on the main cause for grievances in the Organization were presented

in Table 19.

Table 19
Distribution of responses against the main cause for grievances in the Organization

| Main cause for grievances in the Organization | Number of respondents | Percent |
|---|-----------------------|---------|
| Employment terms and conditions/ Work Related/ Safety Related | 8 | 1.5 |
| Wages & Salary | 87 | 16.0 |
| Relations with Superior | 77 | 14.1 |
| Relations with Subordinates | 171 | 31.4 |
| Relations with other departments | 190 | 34.9 |
| Late Coming/ Attendance | 4 | .7 |
| Organizational Policies | 8 | 1.5 |
| Total | 545 | 100.0 |

From the Table 19, it can be said that 1.5 percent of the respondents said that the Main cause for grievances in the Organization is Employment terms and conditions/ Work Related/ Safety Related, 16.0 percent of them said that it is Wages & Salary, 14.1 percent of them said that it is Relations with Superior, 31.4 percent of them said that it is Relations with Subordinates, 34.9 percent of them said that it is Relations with other departments 0.7 percent of them said that it is Late Coming/ Attendance and 1.5 percent of them said Organizational Policies.

Conclusion:

This research study has made a meaningful contribution to the existing body of knowledge on employee grievances. Specifically, it has shed light on the dimensions of grievances, their impact on productivity, industrial harmony, and discipline among both managers and non-managers working in various paper mills all over India. The findings of this study will help guide future research in this area and provide key insights for organizations looking to maximize employee performance and create an environment of collaboration and respect. This study also identified a number of limitations, creating opportunities for researchers to build upon and refine the existing sources. With further study, these sources can be used to better understand and assess the factors influencing grievances, productivity, industrial harmony, and discipline, as well as to provide reliable, actionable insight into improving labor-management relations. Having well-established grievance settlement machinery in place is essential for any organization as it not only helps minimize grievances, but also ensures uniformity in their handling. The presence of such a mechanism reassures employees that their grievances will be taken seriously and will be given due consideration in a fair and impartial manner. Furthermore, having an effective grievance procedure in place ensures that each employee's point of view is heard and respected. In short, it helps to create a culture of mutual trust and respect between the organization and its employees.

Reference:

1. Singh Manjit, (2014), Mediation and Conciliation Systems in India: A Study with special reference to state of Haryana.

2. Singh, V.B., *Climate for Industrial Relations: A study of Kanpur Cotton Mills*, Bombay, Allied Publishers, 1968, p. 1.
3. Sodhi J.S. (2014), “The Study of Industrial Relations: A Changing Field”, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 37, No. 4, p. 482.
4. Somnath Ghose (2015), *Industrial Relations – Patterns and Trends*”, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp.354-364.
5. Srivastava,15 (2015), *Proactive Industrial Relations – A Framework*”, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 40, No. 2, October 2004, pp. 266-272.
6. Taru, R. D. (2020). *Effectiveness of Grievance Handling Mechanism*. *International Engineering Journal For Research & Development*.
7. V. Mohana Sundaram, N. Saranya, (2013). “Employee Grievance” *Journal of Business Management & Social Science Research (JBM & SSR)*, ISSN NO: 2319-5614, Volume 2, No.3.
8. Venugoplan (2015), *Industrial Relations in sugar industry in Andhra Pradesh*, Thesis submitted to the Andhra University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Commerce
9. Viramani (2015) *Redefining Industrial Relations*”, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 154-177.
10. Walker and Hamilton (2011), “Collective Bargaining for Improvement of Organisational Productivity, Product Quality and Labour Flexibility”, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 47, No. 4, pp. 1143-1158.
11. Yoder, Dale (1974). *A Handbook of Personnel and Industrial Relations*’. *Official Handbook of the American Society for Personnel Administration*, Washington, D.C., The Bureau of National Affairs.