

The perception of Employees on the Employer – Employee relations – A study in the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudem, Telangana

**Dr A. Rama Satyavathi, Asst Prof. of Commerce, SR&BGNR Govt Arts & Science
College(A), Khammam,
TELANGANA**

Abstract:

The employer-employee relation in Human resource management is a core topic that covers recruitment policies of the employer, fair wages, welfare facilities, and support to trade unions and so on. How well the employer creates a positive work environment will influence the level of employee satisfaction and organizational productivity. This paper analyses the perception of employees on the workplace environment and facilities provided by the Singareni Collieries Company limited (A Govt. coal Mining Copany), Kothagudem, Telangana

Key words: Transparency in Recruitment, Fair wages, impartial employment policy, welfare facilities

Introduction:

The performance and sustainability of any organization is positively related with good employee relations and also employee- employer relations. If these relations are cordial, the employees' loyalty towards the organization will be higher. Effective workplace relationship is vital at every stage of employee i.e. at the time of recruitment, during his tenure and also separation (Rose, 2008). Good relations among employer and employees inspire employees to work better and produce more results (Burns, 2012). Organizations require employees who can peacefully work together towards the achievement of the set targets and goals, and this can be achieved only when there are cordial employee relations in the organization as the objectives of employee relationship is to achieve harmonious employee relations and minimize conflict practices in employment (Torrington & Hall, 1998). So every organization must take care of employee relations.

This paper studies the perception of employees of the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudem, Telangana (SCCL) on their employer from the stage of recruitment to their tenure in the organization.

Objectives of the study:

1. To evaluate the effectiveness of employer's policies, through the perception of sample respondents.
2. To analyse the workplace facilities provided by the sample unit, through the perception of sample respondents.
3. To suggest measures to increase the effectiveness of employer – employee relations of the sample unit.

Collection of Data:

The data for this study is collected by using both primary as well as secondary sources. Secondary data was taken from HR records of the sample unit. To collect the primary data a structure questionnaire was prepared with 11 statements and distributed among 205 employees of various departments of the sample unit.

Sampling Method:

Stratified random sampling and simple random sampling methods are followed for this study. There are 19 departments in the three mining regions of the SCCL for administrative convenience. They are sub divided into 48 wings. Among them the employees from Civil, Estates, Finance, Forest, Environment, Mining Rescue and Personnel (CSR) departments are selected for this study.

From these departments ten percent of employees are selected based on simple random sampling method. While selecting the sample, care was taken for selecting Executives (EXE), Secretarial (SECR), Supervisory (SUPER) and Technical (TECH) staff only.

Table 1: No. of employees of the SCCL as on 31.3.2018 from selected departments and the sample taken

S. No.	Name of the Department	BPA	KGM	RG	Total no. of employees	Sample taken
1	Civil	109	62	236	407	41
2	Estates	96	49	195	340	34
3	Finance	98	54	192	344	34
4	Forest	21	11	42	74	08
5	Environment	18	9	36	63	06
6	Mining Rescue	124	66	276	466	47
7	Personnel	99	91	163	353	35
	Total	565	342	1140	2047	205
	Sample taken	57	34	114	205	

(Source: Compiled from the records of Personnel Dept., SCCL)

Statistical tools used:

The perception of employees is analysed using the ANOVA, F-test, Mean and standard deviation.

Perception of Employees on Employee Relations (Emp)**Table No 2: Descriptive Statistics and Independent Samples Test: ANOVA test for Equality of Means**

Q No	Statements	Name of the Location									F-ratio test value	P-	Remark			
		Bellampally			Kothagudem			Ramagundam						Total		
		N	Mean	S.D	N	Mean	S.D	N	Mean	S.D				N	Mean	S.D
Q1	Transparency in Recruitment, selection and promotion	57	3.26	1.52	34	1.82	1.19	114	3.00	1.51	205	2.88	1.54	11.16	.000	significant
Q2	Paying fair-wages	57	3.75	1.21	34	2.82	1.31	114	3.36	1.35	205	3.38	1.34	5.42	.005	significant
Q3	Providing Training and development	57	3.79	1.28	34	2.91	1.24	114	3.15	1.23	205	3.29	1.28	6.90	.001	significant
Q4	Health and Safety programmes	57	3.74	1.28	34	2.88	1.34	114	3.30	1.27	205	3.35	1.31	4.94	.008	significant
Q5	Equal and impartial employment policy	57	3.37	1.47	34	2.76	1.16	114	3.42	1.28	205	3.30	1.33	3.38	.036	significant
Q6	Encouragement to Trade Unions	57	3.68	1.23	34	2.94	1.39	114	3.39	1.24	205	3.40	1.28	3.68	.027	significant
Q7	Welfare facilities	57	3.30	1.40	34	2.62	1.16	114	3.18	1.09	205	3.12	1.21	3.76	.025	significant
Q8	Grievances handling system	57	3.42	1.19	34	2.76	1.10	114	3.11	1.28	205	3.14	1.24	3.10	.047	significant
Q9	Financial benefits	57	3.65	1.26	34	2.68	1.22	114	3.14	1.21	205	3.20	1.26	7.04	.001	significant
Q10	Prevention of child labour & gender discrimination	57	3.49	1.47	34	2.91	1.33	114	2.89	1.50	205	3.06	1.48	3.44	.034	significant
Q11	Providing and maintaining job facilities	57	3.51	1.47	34	2.71	1.12	114	3.14	1.19	205	3.17	1.28	4.39	.014	significant
OVERALL MEAN & S.D.SCORES			3.17	1.28		2.71	1.23		3.19	1.29						

Statistical Analysis / Concluding Remarks

The above Table reveals that the overall mean score of the employees of the SCCL who are working at BPA, KGM and RG regions are 3.17, 2.71 and 3.19 respectively. Hence, it can be concluded that the employees are moderately satisfied with their company in maintaining relations with them. It can also be observed that the overall standard deviations of scores of the employees of the SCCL who are working at regions these regions are 1.28, 1.23 and 1.29 respectively. It elucidates that the consistency of responses is high in KGM region than the two regions as the SD is low (1.23) in this region. The test of

hypothesis indicates that the responses of employees of the three regions on employee relations maintained by their organisation are not the same.

Finally, we conclude that mean responses on employee relations with SCCL, who are working at Bellampally, Kothagudem and Ramagudam regions are not the same.

Hypothesis:

For each statement of analysis, the following hypothesis is formed.

Null Hypothesis (H0): The employees' mean response of the each statement of the employee relations in three different regions of SCCL is same.

Alternative Hypothesis (H1): The employees' mean response of the each statement of the employee relations in three different regions of SCCL is different.

Data Analysis and interpretation:

Table. 3: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Transparency in Recruitment, selection and promotion					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count % within Name of the location	10 17.54%	10 17.54%	11 19.30%	7 12.28%	19 33.33%	57 100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count % within Name of the location	18 52.94%	10 29.41%	3 8.82%	0 0.00%	3 8.82%	34 100.00%
	Ramagundam	Count % within Name of the location	26 22.81%	22 19.30%	21 18.42%	16 14.04%	29 25.44%	114 100.00%
Total		Count % within Name of the location	54 26.34%	42 20.49%	35 17.07%	23 11.22%	51 24.88%	205 100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)

Statement 1: 'Transparency in Recruitment selection and promotion'

From table 3, it can be understood that the employees from BPA region (33.33%) and RG region (25.44%) were highly satisfied with the company's policy of recruitment, selection and promotion but the respondents from KGM (52.94%) expressed high dissatisfaction with the same. The aggregate result also shows (26.34%) the same. The lowest response (11.22%) was recorded for 'Satisfied.'

ANOVA test and p-value: It can be observed from table 3 that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F = 11.16$, $p(0.000) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.000. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on transparency in recruitment, selection and promotion are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 4: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Paying fair-wages					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count	4	6	8	21	18	57
		% within Name of the location	7.02%	10.53%	14.04%	36.84%	31.58%	100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count	5	12	6	6	5	34
% within Name of the location		14.71%	35.29%	17.65%	17.65%	14.71%	100.00%	
Ramagundam	Count	16	17	16	40	25	114	
	% within Name of the location	14.04%	14.91%	14.04%	35.09%	21.93%	100.00%	
Total		Count	25	35	30	67	48	205
		% within Name of the location	12.20%	17.07%	14.63%	32.68%	23.41%	100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)

Statement 2: 'Paying Fair Wages'

Table 4 depicts that the employees of the SCCL were satisfied (32.68%) with its payment of fair wages. Regional wise data shows that the employees from BPA (36.84%) and RG regions (35.09%) were satisfied with the same but those that of KGM region (35.29%) were dissatisfied. However the minimum percent of respondents (12.20%) rated 'Highly Dissatisfied'

ANOVA test and p-value: It can be observed from table 4 that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F = 5.42$, $p(0.005) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.005. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on paying fair wages are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 5: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Providing Training and development					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count	4	5	14	10	24	57
		% within Name of the location	7.02%	8.77%	24.56%	17.54%	42.11%	100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count	5	7	13	4	5	34
% within Name of the location		14.71%	20.59%	38.24%	11.76%	14.71%	100.00%	
Ramagundam	Count	8	34	25	27	20	114	
	% within Name of the location	7.02%	29.82%	21.93%	23.68%	17.54%	100.00%	
Total		Count	17	46	52	41	49	205
		% within Name of the location	8.29%	22.44%	25.37%	20.00%	23.90%	100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)

Statement 3: ‘Providing Training and development’

Table 5 represents that the employees of the SCCL were moderately satisfied (25.37%) with the company in providing Training and development to the employees. The same opinion was seen in KGM region (38.24%). And the employees of BPA region were (42.11%) highly satisfied but those from RG region (29.82%) were dissatisfied. The least number of respondents (8.29%) voted ‘Highly Dissatisfied.’

ANOVA test and p-value: It can be observed from table 5 that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F = 6.90$, $p (0.001) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.001. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on providing training and development are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 6: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Health and Safety programmes					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count % within Name of the location	4 7.02%	6 10.53%	13 22.81%	12 21.05%	22 38.60%	57 100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count % within Name of the location	5 14.71%	11 32.35%	7 20.59%	5 14.71%	6 17.65%	34 100.00%
	Ramagundam	Count % within Name of the location	11 9.65%	24 21.05%	21 18.42%	36 31.58%	22 19.30%	114 100.00%
Total		Count % within Name of the location	20 9.76%	41 20.00%	41 20.00%	53 25.85%	50 24.39%	205 100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)

Statement 4: ‘Health and Safety programmes’

The above table illustrates that the employees of the sample unit were satisfied (25.85%) with health and safety programmes conducted by their organisation. The area wise statistics reveal that the employees from BPA (38.60%) were highly satisfied but those from KGM (32.35%) were dissatisfied and RG regions (31.58%) satisfied. The minimum percent of respondents (9.76%) rated ‘Highly Dissatisfied.’

ANOVA test and p-value: It can be observed from table 7 that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F = 4.94$, $p (0.008) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.008. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on health and safety programmes are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 7: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Equal and impartial employment policy					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count % within Name of the location	10 17.54%	5 8.77%	15 26.32%	8 14.04%	19 33.33%	57 100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count % within Name of the location	4 11.76%	11 32.35%	12 35.29%	3 8.82%	4 11.76%	34 100.00%
	Ramagundam	Count % within Name of the location	9 7.89%	22 19.30%	24 21.05%	30 26.32%	29 25.44%	114 100.00%
Total		Count % within Name of the location	23 11.22%	38 18.54%	51 24.88%	41 20.00%	52 25.37%	205 100.00%

Statement 6: 'Equal and impartial employment policy'

The above table gives a picture that the employees of the SCCL were highly satisfied (25.37%) with its policy of equal and impartial employment policy. The employees from BPA region (33.33%) were also of the same opinion but those from KGM (35.29%) expressed that they were moderately satisfied and from RG (26.32%) satisfied. A little response (11.22%) is seen for the option 'Highly Dissatisfied'.

ANOVA test and p-value:

From table 7, it is observed that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F= 3.38$, $p (0.036) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.036. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on equal and impartial employment policy are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 8: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Encouragement to Trade Unions					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count % within Name of the location	4 7.02%	5 8.77%	15 26.32%	14 24.56%	19 33.33%	57 100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count % within Name of the location	6 17.65%	9 26.47%	6 17.65%	7 20.59%	6 17.65%	34 100.00%
	Ramagundam	Count % within Name of the location	10 8.77%	18 15.79%	30 26.32%	30 26.32%	26 22.81%	114 100.00%
Total		Count % within Name of the location	20 9.76%	32 15.61%	51 24.88%	51 24.88%	51 24.88%	205 100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)

Statement 6: 'Encouragement to Trade Unions'

Table 8 highlights that the employees of the SCCL rated equally (24.88%) to 'Moderately Satisfied', 'Satisfied' and 'Highly Satisfied' for the encouragement given by their organization to Trade Unions. The employees of RG region also voted equally (26.32%) for both 'Moderately Satisfied' and 'Satisfied'. And the employees from BPA region were highly satisfied (33.33%) and those are from KGM region were dissatisfied (26.47%). Only 9.76% of the employees expressed highly dissatisfied.

From table 8, it is observed that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F = 3.68$, $p(0.027) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.027. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on encouragement to trade unions are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 9: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Welfare facilities					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count % within Name of the location	7 12.28%	13 22.81%	8 14.04%	14 24.56%	15 26.32%	57 100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count % within Name of the location	3 8.82%	18 52.94%	6 17.65%	3 8.82%	4 11.76%	34 100.00%
	Ramagundam	Count % within Name of the location	5 4.39%	27 23.68%	42 36.84%	23 20.18%	17 14.91%	114 100.00%
Total		Count % within Name of the location	15 7.32%	58 28.29%	56 27.32%	40 19.51%	36 17.56%	205 100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)

Statement 7: 'Welfare facilities'

The above table underlines that the respondents from BPA region (26.32%) were highly satisfied with the company providing welfare facilities but those from KGM region (52.94%) were dissatisfied and those from RG region (36.84%) were moderately satisfied. But the summative result shows that the employees were dissatisfied (28.29%) with the welfare facilities provided by their company. Besides that 7.32% of the total respondents opined that they were highly dissatisfied.

ANOVA test and p-value: It can be observed from table 9 that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F = 3.76$, $p(0.025) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.025. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on welfare facilities are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 10: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Grievances handling system					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count % within Name of the location	6 10.53%	4 7.02%	18 31.58%	18 31.58%	11 19.30%	57 100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count % within Name of the location	4 11.76%	10 29.41%	13 38.24%	4 11.76%	3 8.82%	34 100.00%
	Ramagundam	Count % within Name of the location	15 13.16%	24 21.05%	26 22.81%	31 27.19%	18 15.79%	114 100.00%
Total		Count % within Name of the location	25 12.20%	38 18.54%	57 27.80%	53 25.85%	32 15.61%	205 100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)

Statement 8: ‘Grievances handling system’

The above table reveals that the employees of the SCCL were moderately satisfied (27.80%) with the grievance handling system of their organisation. The regional statistics show that the employees of the KGM region were moderately satisfied (38.24%) and that of RG region (27.19%) were satisfied. But the respondents from BPA region rated equally (31.58%) to both ‘Moderately Satisfied’ and ‘Satisfied.’ The minimum percent of response (12.20%) was observed in ‘Highly Dissatisfied.’

ANOVA test and p-value: It can be observed from table 10 that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% I.o.s, $F = 3.10$, $p(0.047) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.047. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on grievances handling system are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 11: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Financial benefits					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count % within Name of the location	5 8.77%	6 10.53%	10 17.54%	19 33.33%	17 29.82%	57 100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count % within Name of the location	7 20.59%	9 26.47%	8 23.53%	8 23.53%	2 5.88%	34 100.00%
	Ramagundam	Count % within Name of the location	7 6.14%	34 29.82%	30 26.32%	22 19.30%	21 18.42%	114 100.00%
Total		Count % within Name of the location	19 9.27%	49 23.90%	48 23.41%	49 23.90%	40 19.51%	205 100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)

Statement 9: 'Financial benefits'

In terms of financial benefits the employees of the sample unit have given equal rating (23.90%) to both 'Dissatisfied' and 'Satisfied'. The respondents from KGM (26.47%) and RG (29.82%) regions expressed their dissatisfaction. But the employees from BPA (33.33%) were satisfied with the same and the lowest response (9.27%) recorded is 'Highly Dissatisfied.'

ANOVA test and p-value:

It can be observed from table 11 that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F = 7.04$, $p(0.001) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.001. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on financial benefits are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 12: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Prevention of child labour & gender discrimination					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count % within Name of the location	9 15.79%	7 12.28%	7 12.28%	15 26.32%	19 33.33%	57 100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count % within Name of the location	5 14.71%	11 32.35%	5 14.71%	8 23.53%	5 14.71%	34 100.00%
	Ramagundam	Count % within Name of the location	25 21.93%	33 28.95%	13 11.40%	16 14.04%	27 23.68%	114 100.00%
Total		Count % within Name of the location	39 19.02%	51 24.88%	25 12.20%	39 19.02%	51 24.88%	205 100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)**Statement 10: 'Prevention of child labour & gender discrimination'**

The above table shows that the employees of the SCCL expressed to be highly satisfied and dissatisfied (24.88%) with its activities in preventing child labour and gender discrimination. The employees from BPA region (33.33%) were highly satisfied and those from KGM region (32.35%) and RG region (28.95%) were dissatisfied. The lowest response was recorded for 'Moderately Satisfied' (12.20%).

ANOVA test and p-value: From table 12, it is observed that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F = 3.44$, $p(0.034) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.034. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on preventing of child labour and gender discrimination are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Table 13: Cross Tabulation of the Regions according to the Responses to Employee Relations

			Providing and maintaining job facilities					Total
			Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Moderately Satisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied	
Name of the location	Bellampally	Count % within Name of the location	6 10.53%	13 22.81%	6 10.53%	10 17.54%	22 38.60%	57 100.00%
	Kothagudem	Count % within Name of the location	3 8.82%	15 44.12%	8 23.53%	5 14.71%	3 8.82%	34 100.00%
	Ramagundam	Count % within Name of the location	7 6.14%	33 28.95%	30 26.32%	25 21.93%	19 16.67%	114 100.00%
Total		Count % within Name of the location	16 7.80%	61 29.76%	44 21.46%	40 19.51%	44 21.46%	205 100.00%

(Source: Field Survey)

Statement 11: 'Providing and maintaining job facilities'

Table 13 underlines that the employees of BPA region were highly satisfied (38.60%) with the job facilities provided and maintained by the SCCL but those from KGM region (44.12%) and RG region (28.95%) were dissatisfied. The summative results also reveal that the employees were dissatisfied (29.76%). The lowest response (7.80%) was given to 'Highly Dissatisfied'

ANOVA test and p-value: From table 13, it is observed that ANOVA F- test is significant at 5% l.o.s, $F = 4.39$, $p (0.014) < 0.05$. In this case, the significance value is low that it is displayed as 0.014. We, therefore, reject the null hypothesis and conclude that employees mean responses on providing and maintaining job facilities are not same in three regions of SCCL.

Suggestions:

- The employees are not satisfied with the process of recruitment, selection and promotions. Hence it is suggested to focus on fair and more transparent way of recruitment, selection and promotion policy because the better is the human resource planning the better is the quality of the organisation.
- Likewise the employees also expressed dissatisfaction on the welfare facilities and job facilities provided and maintained by the sample unit. As the mining activity is risky and hazardous to health, the safety and security have to be given lot of importance along with the right and proper job facilities. Hence it is suggested to create a good workplace environment to the workers.

Conclusion:

The employer and the employee are the two basic pillars of the organization. Employee relationship management has many documented positive effects in organizations such as strengthening corporate communication and culture, fostering about company products, services and customer providing real-time access to company training, targeting information to an employee based on their needs (Wargborn, 2008). Hence the organization which concentrates on the benefits of the employees may flourish in all the ways.

References:

1. Teicher, J., & Holland, P. (2002). employee relations management. *Work*, 2, 2-2.
2. Singh, P. N. (2010). *Employee relations management*. Pearson Education India.
3. Tansel, A., & Gazîoğlu, Ş. (2014). Management-employee relations, firm size and job satisfaction. *International journal of manpower*.
4. Burns, A. (2012). Employee Relations. *The Encyclopedia of Human Resource Management: Short Entries*, 186-190.
5. Samwel, J. O. (2018). Effect of employee relations on employee performance and organizational performance- study of small organizations in tanzania. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Administration and Management*, 18(8), 30-39.
6. Wilkinson, A. (1999). Employment relations in SMEs. *Employee relations*.
7. Perry, E. L., & Kulik, C. T. (2008). The devolution of HR to the line: Implications for perceptions of people management effectiveness. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(2), 262-273.
8. Chand, M., & Katou, A. A. (2007). The impact of HRM practices on organisational performance in the Indian hotel industry. *Employee relations*.
9. Torrington, D., & Hall, S. (1998). *Human resource management and the personnel function*. london: Routledge.
10. Kelly, J. (2001). The role of the personnel/HR function in multinational companies. *Employee relations*.
11. Wargborn, C. (2008). *Managing motivation in organizations. Why employee relationship management matters* (Doctoral dissertation).