Grievance Handling System and Redressal in Public and Private Sector employees

Prameela Naik¹ Dr G Ramu²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Business Management, Osmania University, Tarnaka, Hyderabad Telangana State. prameelanaik@gmail.com ²Assistant Manager, Quality Control Section, Telangana Foods, IDA, Nacharam, Hyderabad, Telangana State. golla.ramu@gmail.com

Abstract

The tangible topic of employees grievance handling system is significant for sustaining a harmonious and dynamic work environment. The employers insist effective grievance handling is an essential part of cultivating good employee relationships. Objective of study identified the satisfaction level of employees towards their grievance handling system and Redressal in public private sector. Management in their effort to understand the problems of employees and resolve the issues and grievance redressal among employees, probability of maintaining a culture of high performance. The study focused on Descriptive statistics, research design and frequency tested by using data analysis. Moreover, random sampling method was used for data analysis, the descriptive statistics and chi square test was used for the study.

Key Words: Grievance, Employees Satisfaction, redressal, Handling System.

Date of Submission: 23-10-2022

Date of Acceptance: 05-11-2022

I. Introduction

Employee grievance refers to the discontentment of an employee within the organizations and its management. An employer is expected to provide an employee with a safe working environment, clear knowledge about job responsibilities, adequate compensation, respect etc. However, employee grievance is caused when there is a gap between what the employee expects and what he receives from the employer. Employee grievances may or may not be justified. A grievance is a sign of employee's discontent with job and its nature.

The employee has got certain aspirations and expectations which he thinks must be fulfilled by the organization where he is working. When the organization fails to satisfy the employee needs, he develops a feeling of discontent or dissatisfaction. For instance, the employee expects proper implementation of the public and private sector government's laws, collective agreements, company policies and management responsibilities towards the welfare of its employees, clear cut channelized promotions, timely revised pay scales, organizational issues or political problems within the organization or outside the organization. Any violation of these laws, agreements and policies cause dissatisfaction on his part. Thus, grievance is caused due to the difference between the employee expectation and management practice. Employee grievances if left unchecked can lead to large disputes within the company. It can also demotivation of the employees. The companies must have a proper channel for employee grievance redressal. Employee Grievance should be handled in a proper and well defined manner.

Identification of Grievances

The understanding of grievances is important in handling them. The smart manager anticipates and prevents the issues from arising and causing grievances. The significant tools which help in discovering of grievances of employees indicate that Exit Interview, Gripe Boxes, Opinion Surveys, Open Door Policy, Grievance Procedure.

Most common employee Grievances in the public and private sector are four types :

1) Pay and benefits grievances

- 2) Bullying grievances
- 3) Working conditions grievances
- 4) Workload grievances

The Grievance can broadly be categorized as:

- a) Visible Grievances or Hidden Grievances,
- b) Real or Imaginary,
- c) Expressed or Implied,
- d) Oral or Written,
- e) Individual or Group Grievances,
- f) Union Grievances,
- g) Policy Grievances,
- h) Disguised Grievances

In most of the public sector organizations, the general grievance rate the numbers of written grievances are between five to twenty. However, well managed organizations with mature industrial relations have developed lower rates. Increased participation of employees is an effective way to reduce grievances.

Effective ways of handling Employee Grievance observed five key actions to deal with a workplace grievance.1) Initiate the grievance procedure 2) Investigate the grievance 3) Hold a grievance hearing 4) Make your decision and inform the employee 5) Take further action. Suitable actions taken immediately will help resolve the conflict and response to any problem as quickly and simply as possible.

Good Grievance Redressal System

A good grievance redressal system should accommodate the following essentials:

1. Timely Action 2. Acknowledgment of Grievance 3. Identifying the Problem 4. Collecting Facts 5. Analyzing the Cause 6. Taking Decision 7. Implementing the Decision 8. Policy formulation. 9. Disciplinary procedures. Features of the Grievance Redressal System Just as the disciplinary procedure is used where the organization has cause to complain about the behavior of an employee, so also where an employee has cause to complain' about the organization. This helps to prevent minor disagreements sparking off major conflicts, and can also improve employee retention. India' at present has only a voluntary grievance procedure called the Model Grievance Procedure formulated in pursuance to the Code of Discipline adopted by the 16th Session of the Indian Labor Conference in 1958.

Most of the grievance procedures nowadays are built after the Model Grievance Procedure with certain changes to suit individual operations, size and special requirements of an enterprise. The Model Grievance Procedure provides for five successive time-bound steps, each leading to the next in case the aggrieved worker prefers an appeal.

Grievance – Grievance Redressal Procedure in India

At present, there are three legislations dealing with grievances of employees working in government industries. a) The Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946, requires that every establishment employing 100 or more workers should frame standing orders. These should contain, among other things, a provision for redressal of grievances of workers against unfair treatment and wrongful actions by the employer or his agents.

b) The Factories Act, 1948, provides for the appointment of a Welfare Officer in every factory ordinarily employing 500 or more workers. These welfare officers also look after complaints and grievances of workers. They also look after proper implementation of the existing labour legislation.

c) In India, Model Grievance Procedure was adopted by the Indian Labour Conference in its 16th session held in 1958. At present, Indian industries are adopting either the Model Grievance Procedure or procedures formulated by themselves with modifications in the Model Grievance Procedure. In other words, the grievance procedures are mostly voluntary in nature and are highly dependent on the mercy of the superiors or the politically influential.

The Grievance Committee, consisting of the representatives of the employer and employees.

The recommendations of this Committee should be communicated to the Manager within seven days from the date of the grievance reaching it. Unanimous decisions, if any, of the committee shall be implemented by the management. If there is no unanimity, the views of the members of the Committee shall be placed before the manager for his decision. The manager has to take a decision and inform the worker within three days.

Grievance Procedure to be adopted by the Governments:

- 1. Listen
- 2. Acknowledge
- 3. Respond : a) Identify the issues, b) Inquire in detail, c) Analyze the impact, d) solve the issues
- 4. Disciplinary procedures
- 5. Policy framework
- 6. Positive approach
- 7. Review and Response force/ committee

Grievance Redressal Procedure

Different organizations handle grievances differently. Small organizations generally do not follow an elaborate procedure. They follow an open door policy where they just let all the employees speak to the management directly about their grievances and complaints and the management tries to handle the complaint immediately and appropriately. But in big organizations that are managing thousands of employees, it is important for them to have a set procedure to handle grievances so that all the employees are treated on par as far as imparting justice is concerned. An effective grievance redressal procedure ensures that.

Benefits of an adequate grievance procedure:

It brings grievance into the open, It encourage solution of problems before they take serious turn in nature, It helps in preventing future problems, It gives employee's emotional release for their dissatisfaction, It helps in establishing and maintaining a working relationship in group, It provides a check and balance on arbitrary management action, It helps in establishing and maintaining a work culture or way of life.

Problem Statement

A study on Effectiveness of Employees Grievance Handling System and redressal system in public and Private sector employees in india.

Objective of the study

- 1. To identify the effectiveness of the grievance handling system.
- 2. To distinguish the satisfaction level of employees towards their grievance handling system
- 3. To identify the grievance redressal mechanism and handling system in the government.
- 4. To provide suitable suggestions, if necessary

Limitation of the study

The research study was conducted for a limited period of time. The accuracy depends upon the response of employees information. The research was conducted only among public and private sector employees, these research findings and suggestion may or may not be applicable to all the departments of the Government.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

 Table no 01 : The responded employee age

| | | AGI | E | | |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| | Up to 25 years | 48 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 40.0 |
| | 26 -35 years | 33 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 67.5 |
| | 36-45 years | 25 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 88.3 |
| Valid | 46-55 years | 12 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 98.3 |
| | Above 55 years | 2 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Interpretation: From the above chart it is seen that 40% respondents are between the ages of Less than 25 years, 27.5% employees are between the ages of 26-35 years, 20.8% employees are between the age of 36-45 years and 10% employees are between the age of 46-55 years 1.7% employees are above 55 years.

| | | | | - | | |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | EDUC | CATION QU | ALIFICA | TION | | |
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | 40- |
| | School level | 50 | 41.7 | 41.7 | 41.7 | ð 10- |
| | Intermediate | 43 | 35.8 | 35.8 | 77.5 | len be |
| | Diploma | 9 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 85.0 | 20- |
| Valid | Bachelor's degree | 10 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 93.3 | |
| | Master's & above degree | 8 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 100.0 | D School level Intermediate Diploma Bachelor's degree Master's a shore |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Table No 02 : The responded employee Education Qualification

Interpretation: From the above chart we can interpret that out of 120 respondents 41.7% employees education is school level, 35.8% employee's education is Intermediate, 7.5% respondents are educated till diploma 8.3% respondents education is graduate and 6.7% respondents are educated above masters and higher education.

| | | | al Status | | |
|-------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| | Married | 60 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| Valid | UN Married | 60 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | | | | | |

Table No 03 : The responded employee Marital Status

Interpretation:

From the above chart it can be interpreted that 50% of respondents are married and 50% of the respondents are Unmarried in organization

| | Anı | Annual Income | | | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|---------------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|---|
| | | Frequen cy | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | ₩ 1.500 - 14.12,2 ₩ 1.500 - 14.12,2 ₩ 0.000 ₩ 1.500 - 14.12,2 ₩ 1 |
| | less than Rs.3, 00,000 | 59 | 49.2 | 49.2 | 49.2 | |
| | Rs.3, 00,001 – Rs.600000 | 30 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 74.2 | |
| | Rs.600001 – Rs.12, 00,000 | 10 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 82.5 | |
| Valid | Rs.12, 00,001 – Rs.24, 00,000 | 20 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 99.2 | |
| | More than Rs.24, 00,000 | 1 | .8 | .8 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Table No 04: The responded employee Annual Income

Interpretation:

From the above chart it is seen that 49.2% respondents are between the annual income Less than 300000, 25% employees are between the annual income 300001-600000, 8.3% employees are between the between the annual income 600001-1200000 and 16.7% employees are between the annual income 1200001-2400000, 8% employees are more then 2400000.

| | WO | RKING ORGA | ANIZATIO | N | | 60- | WORKING ORG | ANIZATION | |
|-------|----------------|------------|----------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | 50- 40- 30- | | | |
| | Public sector | 60 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 20- | | | |
| Valid | Private sector | 60 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 | 10- | | | |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | Government sector WORKING (| Private sector | |

 Table No 05 : The responded employee Working Organization

Interpretation: From the above chart it can be interpreted that 50% of respondents are from public sector and 50% of the respondents are from Private sector.

| | | Q7 | | | | Q7 |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|------------|--|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid | Cumulative | 52- |
| | | | | Percent | Percent | |
| | Strongly disagree | 41 | 34.2 | 34.2 | 34.2 | Đ- |
| | Disagree | 35 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 63.3 | |
| Valid | neither agree nor disagree | 15 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 75.8 | 0 37- 9 7 |
| vand | Agree | 24 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 95.8 | |
| | Strongly agree. | 5 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 120 | | 100.0 | | 12- |
| | | | | | | от разрани разрани страни с Страни страни с |

Table No 06 : Employees having grievances in the organization

Interpretation: From the above chart we can interpret that out of 120 respondents 34.2% respondents are strongly disagree, 29.2% employees are disagree, 12.5% employees are neutral(neither agree nor disagree), 20.% employees are strongly agree, and 1.2% employees are agree. The majority are 34.2% employees highly disagreed and 4.2% employees are strongly agreeing that they have grievance in organization.

| Table no : 0 | 7 Categories | of Grievances and | their relatedness: |
|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|
|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Biolsbarrer Biolsgare Biolsga Convertient Recent |
|-------|--|------------------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | Work Environment | 38 | 31.7 | 31.7 | 31.7 | |
| | Supervision | 15 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 44.2 | |
| Valid | Work group | 7 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 50.0 | |
| , and | Economic (Salary, Reward, Incentives) | <mark>6</mark> 0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Interpretation:

From the above chart we can interpret that out of 120 respondents 31.7% respondents are working environment, 12.5% employees supervision, 5.8% employees is work group, 50.% employees are strongly facing economic problems.

| | | Q9 | | | | Q9 Storyly diagree |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------|------------|--|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid | Cumulative | Booyle dagee Booyle dagee Booyle gee |
| | | | | Percent | Percent | |
| | Strongly disagree | 18 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 | |
| | Disagree | 40 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 48.3 | |
| Valid | Agree | 56 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 95.0 | |
| | Strongly agree. | 6 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

 Table No 08 : Employees level of satisfaction with the governments grievance handling system

Interpretation:

From the above chart we can interpret that out of 120 respondents 15% respondents are strongly disagree, 33.3% employees are disagree, 46.7% employees agree, 5.0.% employees are strongly agree. The majority 46.7% employees are agreed and 5% employees are strongly agreeing on dissatisfaction over the systems approach towards grievance handling.

| | | Q10 | | | | Q10 Stordy dangere Danger Certer agree to dan |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | Datier spectra da Mage Discogi agre. |
| | Strongly disagree | 10 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.3 | |
| | Disagree | 23 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 27.5 | |
| Valid | neither agree nor disagree | 24 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 47.5 | |
| , and | Agree | 39 | 32.5 | 32.5 | 80.0 | |
| | Strongly agree. | 24 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |
| | | | | | | |

Table No 09 : Managements effectiveness in grievance handling

Interpretation: From the above chart we can interpret that out of 120 respondents 8.3% respondents are strongly disagree, 19.2% employees are disagree, 20.0% employees are neutral(neither agree nor disagree), 32.5.% employees are agree, and 20% employees are strong agree. The majority is 32.52% employees agreed and 8.3% employees are strongly disagreeing in organization. The perception of employees play significant role Managements effectiveness in grievance handling.

 Table No 09: Employees level of satisfaction with the organizations Grievance Redressal System

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | 30- | | | | |
|-------|----------------------------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|-----|-----------------|--|------|----------------|
| | Strongly disagree | 15 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | Ver | | _ | | |
| | Disagree | 22 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 30.8 | 20- | | | | |
| Valid | neither agree nor disagree | 23 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 50.0 | | _ | | | |
| | Agree | 37 | 30.8 | 30.8 | 80.8 | 12- | | | | |
| | Strongly agree. | 23 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 100.0 | | | | | |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 0 | dy disagree Dis | agree neither agree no doagree Q11 | Agee | Stongly agree. |

Interpretation: From the above chart we can interpret that out of 120 respondents 12.5% respondents are strongly disagree, 18.3% employees are disagree, 19.2% employees are neutral(neither agree nor disagree), 30.8.% employees are agree, and 19.2% employees are strong agree. The majority 30.8% employees agreed and 12.5% employees are strongly disagreeing in government organizations.

| | | Q12 | | | | 012 Etanyi dagare Dagre |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent | |
| | Strongly disagree | 69 | 57.5 | 57.5 | 57.5 | |
| Valid | Disagree | 51 | 42.5 | 42.5 | 100.0 | |
| | Total | 120 | 100.0 | 100.0 | | |

Table No 10 : The frequency and time frame followed for redressal of grievance

Interpretation: From the above chart we can interpret that out of 120 respondents 57.5% respondents are strongly disagree, 42.5% employees is disagree that the grievances are addressed within the time frame in government organizations.

| Chi-Square Tests | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2- sided) | 30- | WORKING ORGANIZATION State Governmen Central Governme |
| 68.641ª | 4 | .000 | 20- | |
| 86.931 | 4 | .000 | Count | |
| 63.600 | 1 | .000 | | |
| 120 | | | 10- | |
| count less tha | n 5. The | minimum | G Chroge Disgree networks chrodisgree Q10 | e Agree Strongly agree. |
| | Value 68.641ª 86.931 63.600 120 | Value df 68.641ª 4 86.931 4 63.600 1 120 1 | Value df Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 68.641 ^a 4 .000 86.931 4 .000 63.600 1 .000 | Value df Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) 68.641 ^a 4 .000 86.931 4 .000 63.600 1 .000 120 |

| Table no | 11: | Management | handling | grievance | effectively |
|----------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------------|-------------|
| Lanc no | TT | management | nanunng | <u>gint</u> and | chicchichy |

Interpretation: From the above chart we can interpret that out of 120 respondents as per Chi-Square value is 68.641 and significant value is 0.000, the significant value is less than 0.05. The null hypothesis accepted and alternative hypothesis rejected. As per employee perception Managements handling grievance effectively..

Recommendation

Require to integrate technology based grievance raising mechanism to make the process simpler, confidential and employee friendly. The time duration have to be reduced to solve the employees grievance.

II. Conclusion

It can be concluded through the study, the effectiveness of employee's grievance handling system of Private sector is better than the public sector employees in India. From the study the data researcher can surely say that the effectiveness of grievance handling system is more positive for private sector employees as compared to the public sector, as the public sector employees are overburdened with work and their needs are ignored for the better implementation of government schemes.

The various departments of the private sector are prompt at handling employee's grievances. From the study it is evident that the employees satisfaction level in organization is also high. This study has found a correlating relationship between employees and managers. From the study, it can be assessed that employers are providing good facilities and employees agree with them. In most of the organizations, the management has identified the root cause of the problems and resolved the issues within a month and employees have agreed. The organization study conducted overall view on the effectiveness of the grievance handling system in the public and private sectort.

Grievance Redress Mechanism is part and parcel of the machinery of any administration. No Government can claim to be accountable, responsive and employee friendly unless it has established an efficient and effective grievance redressal mechanism. In fact, the grievance redressal mechanism of an organization is the gauge to measure its efficiency and effectiveness as it provides an important feedback on the working of the administration.

The employee is an integral part of the organization and it stands as a responsibility of the Government to design his personal growth on par with the organizational objectives. The old system of governance is more of autocratic opaque and with no work culture which is not suitable for the present system of governance. This requires a paradigm shift in the outlook towards the relationship between the employer and the employees. The management has to play the role of facilitator and regulator so as to create a better environment and conditions in all the departments of the government organizations in the country for building a nation of excellence.

Reference

- Ambrose, M. L., & Neubaum, D. O. (2005). The effect of leader moral development on ethical climate and employee attitudes. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97(2), 135-151.
- [2]. Bean, C. R. (1994). European unemployment: a survey. Journal of economic literature, 32(2), 573-619.
- [3]. Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. Personnel selection in organizations, 3570, 35-70.
- [4]. Chaudhary, N., & Sharma, B. (2012). Impact of employee motivation on performance (productivity) in private organization. International Journal of Business Trends and Technology, 2(4), 29-35.
- [5]. Dr. V. Mohan Sundaram, N.Saranya,(2013) "Employee Grievance" Journal of Business Management & Social Science Research (JBM & SSR), ISSN NO: 2319-5614, Volume 2, No.3 March 2013.
- [6]. Dr. S. Poongavanam, Meenakshi Sundaram, (2017) Managerial Approach on Handling Grievances in Construction Companies An Empirical Study. International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology, 8(9), pp. 1161–1164.
- [7]. Sonika Sharma, Niti Sharma, (2011) "Listening Skills: A Pre-Requisite for Grievance Handling" VSRD International Journal of Business and Management Research, Vol.1(4),2011, pp-245-252.
- [8]. S. Purushothaman and E. Kaviya, (2020) A Study on Employee Engagement in a IT Company, Journal of Management, 7 (3), pp. 1–7.
- [9]. Shivasubramanian and Rupa. (2017) An Empirical Study on Employee Engagement with Reference to it Sector in Chennai. Journal of Management, 4(1), pp. 18–28.
- [10]. Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Tamkins, M. M. (2003). Organizational culture and climate. Handbook of psychology, 565-593
- [11]. Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8(4), 216-226.
- [12]. Garima,"Grievance Handling: Motivational Tool for Employees", International
- [13]. Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Vol.7, Issue 3,(2017), pp. 130-134
- [14]. Garima, "Grievance Handling: Motivational Tool for Employees", International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Vol.7, Issue 3.(2017), pp. 130-134
- [15]. Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Vol.7, Issue 3,(2017), pp. 130-134
 [16]. Garima, "Grievance Handling: Motivational Tool for Employees", International
- [17]. Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Vol.7, Issue 3,(2017), pp. 130-134
- [18]. Garima, "Grievance Handling: Motivational Tool for Employees", International
- [19]. Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Vol.7, Issue 3,(2017), pp. 130-134

Prameela Naik. "Grievance Handling System and Redressal in Public and Private Sector employees." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 24(11), 2022, pp. 12-19.

DOI: 10.9790/487X-2411011219