CHAPTER - XIII

EMPIRICAL SURVEY AND ITS FINDINGS

Analysis and interpretation of the data collected during the field survey have been made in this Chapter. The data have been presented and analysed in three different phases.

In the first phase, the data relating to 4 (four) biographical characteristics, considered in the study (Part A of the questionnaire/question nos. 1 to 4), of the respondents have been presented in tabular forms (frequency distributions) and analysed and interpreted.

In the second phase, the respondents' responses relating to 10 (ten) questions (question nos. 1 to 10/Part B of the questionnaire) regarding the functioning of the QCs in their organisations and some allied issues have been presented in a number of tables and analysed and interpreted.

In the third phase, the respondents' responses regarding 15 (fifteen) questions (question nos. 11-25/Part C of the questionnaire) designed basically to capture the perceptions of the respondents vis-a-vis different issues relating to the QCs in their organisations
and the expected positive outcomes in general as a result of functioning of QCs.

The respondents (284 in number) have been suitably classified in terms of sex, age (4 groups), educational attainments (4 groups) and number of years in their present organisation, i.e., length of service (4 groups).

The distribution shows that 88.33% of the respondents are male (Table No. 1) which is quite natural in the Indian industrial organisations, particularly in the lower levels.

The respondents have conveniently been classified into 4 age-groups, keeping the minimum age-group as 21-30 and the maximum age-group as 51-60. The other two age-groups (the range being 10 years) are 31-40 and 41-50. The reason for keeping the minimum age-group as 21-30 is that there was no respondent below 21 years of age. In fact, there was only one respondent of 21 years of age. Again, the reason for keeping the maximum age-group as 51-60 is that normally the upper-most retirement age in the Indian organisations in the organised sector is 60 years.
The age-group distribution of the respondents shows that 53.17% of them are in the 41-50 age-group, followed by 21.23%, 17.25% and 7.75% in 51-60, 31-40 and 21-30 age-groups respectively (Table No. 2). This type of age-distribution indicates that a substantial number of respondents, i.e., 75% belong to the 41-60 age-range (i.e., higher age-groups = 41-50 and 51-60), which is not unusual in the Indian context where a sizable number of lower-level employees are in the higher age-groups.

The respondents, thereafter, have been classified as per level of educational attainments. The distribution of the respondents (Table No. 3) shows that quite a high percentage, i.e., 42.61% of them are illiterate, followed by 27.82% and 18.30% of them who are in the 'below secondary' level and 'secondary' level respectively. Only 11.27% of them have qualified in the higher secondary (or equivalent) examination and/or have some technical diploma.

On the basis of the data presented in Table Nos. 2 and 3, it can be said that a good number of respondents are in the higher age-groups and in the lower educational-level groups. This type of distribution is not unusual in
the Indian industrial organisations so far as lower-level employees are concerned.

Then the respondents have been classified into 4 groups in terms of their length of service (i.e., 'number of years in the present organisation') in their respective organisations (Table No. 4). Such distribution shows that a high percentage of them (i.e., 58.80%) are in the '21-30 years' group, followed by 18.66%, 18.31% and 4.23% of them in the '31-40 years', '11-20 years' and '1-10 years' groups respectively. A very high percentage of the respondents i.e., 77.46% are in the '21-40 years' group. This type of distribution very much matches with the age distribution of the respondents. It is quite possible that due to low job mobility in India and lack of higher qualification(s) (70.43% of them have not reached the school-leaving stage; in fact, 42.61% of them are illiterate), a substantial number of them are compelled to continue with their present organisations.

Part B of the questionnaire has been designed with a view to gathering data mainly relating to the functioning of the QCs in the respondents' organisations and some allied issues taken together.
On the question, 'what is your status in your QC?' (question No.1), 59.50% of them have stated that they are members only followed by 14.44%, 14.44% and 11.62% of them as co-ordinator/facilitator, leader and deputy leader respectively (Table No. 5).

On the basis of the data available, the respondents (284 in number) have been found to be the members of 41 QCs in 24 organisations.

On the question 'how often do you meet?' (question No. 2), the respondents have indicated that out of 41 QCs as high as 20 QCs (48.78%) meet once in a month and 13 QCs (31.71%) meet twice in a month, whereas 6 QCs (14.63%) and only 2 QCs (4.88%) meet once and twice in a week respectively (Table No. 6). This type of distribution of QC meetings is quite natural because, considering the members' busyness in their day-to-day activities and their degree of enthusiasm vis-a-vis QCs, meeting regularly once/twice in a week is not quite easy.

On the question 'for what duration do you meet?' (question No. 3), respondents' responses have indicated that out 41 QCs as high as 28 (68.29%) meet for one hour,
followed by 9 QCs (21.95%) and 4 QCs (9.76%) which meet for 'more than one hour' and 'less than one hour' respectively (Table No. 7). This type of distribution is also quite natural because meeting for more than one hour may not be possible on a regular basis, keeping the degree of busyness and enthusiasm of the members of the QCs in mind.

The data obtained taken together with respect to the question nos. 2 and 3 have very well indicated that a good number of the QCs meet only once in a month (48.78%) and most of them meet for one hour only (68.29%) which in the present level of functioning of QCs in the Indian organisations seems to be quite adequate.

On the question 'where do you meet?' (question No. 4), the respondents' responses have indicated that out 41 QCs as high as 35 (85.37%) meet in the respective departments whereas only 6 (14.63%) meet in 'any other place'. This type of distribution is encouraging in the sense that QCs are/have started getting some importance/recognition in their respective departments and some arrangements have been made for providing space for QCs' meetings there on a regular basis (Table No. 8).
On the question "is there any system of giving feedback of your QC's activities to the management?" (question No. 5), a very high percentage (91.90) of the respondents have responded affirmatively, whereas a very small percentage (8.10) have responded negatively (Table No. 9). This response-pattern is quite encouraging in the sense that the top management is given feedback of the respondents' QC-related activities in their respective organisations.

On the question "does your superior encourage QC activities?" (question No. 6), a high percentage (71.48) of the respondents have responded affirmatively, whereas 28.52% of them have responded negatively (Table No. 10). This type of response-pattern is really encouraging in the sense that after all QC activities cannot be sustained without positive encouragement and support from the superiors.

On the question "how does your QC present its case to the management?" (question No. 7), as high as 70.73% of the respondents have stated that their QCs present cases in seminars where the managerial personnel are invited. 14.63%, 9.76% and 4.88% have stated that their
QCs present their cases to the management 'through the departmental head' (when the departmental head is not the co-ordinator), 'through the co-ordinator' and 'directly to the management by the QC members' respectively (Table No. 11). This type of response-pattern is encouraging in the sense that the respondents (who are mostly in the higher age-groups and lower educational-level groups and serving their organisations for a pretty long time) have developed interest and confidence over a period of time in QC activities because they get an opportunity to present their views before the invited managerial personnel with whom they have a distance in terms of organisational level.

On the question 'does your organisation sponsor your QC for any competition?' (question No. 8), 86.97% of them have responded affirmatively, whereas only 13.03% of them have responded negatively (Table No. 12).

On the question 'have your QC bagged any award so far?' (question No. 9), their responses have indicated that out of 41 QCs only 5 QCs (12.20%) have bagged awards whereas the other 36 QCs (87.80%) have not bagged any award so far (Table No. 13).
The responses relating to question Nos. 8 and 9 (presented in Table Nos. 12 and 13) show that though a high percentage of the respondents have indicated that their organisations sponsor their QCs for competition (a positive sign, no doubt), in terms of performance (as reflected through bagging of awards), most of the QCs still have much scope for improvement.

On the question 'has any member of your QC resigned or discontinued so far?' (Question No. 10), 58.54% of the respondents have responded affirmatively whereas 41.46% have responded negatively (Table No. 14). This type of response-pattern is not unusual because, QC activities being voluntary in nature, some members may resign or decide to discontinue over a period of time depending on, inter alia, their business in day-to-day activities and degree of enthusiasm vis-a-vis QCs.

Part C of the questionnaire has been designed to assess the respondents' perceptions vis-a-vis different issues relating to the QCs in their organisations and the expected positive outcomes in general like employee motivation, productivity-improvement, etc., as a result of functioning of QCs.
On the question 'are the employees in general aware of the role of the QCs in your organisation?' (question No. 11), 57.29% of the respondents have responded affirmatively whereas 42.61% of them have responded negatively (Table No. 15). This type of response-pattern clearly indicates that a good number of respondents think that the employees in their respective organisations in general are not aware of the role of the QCs.

On the question 'are the employees in your organisation in general disinterested in the QC activities?' (question No. 12), a high percentage (70.77) of the respondents have responded affirmatively, whereas 29.23% of them have responded negatively (Table No. 16).

On the question 'is the top management in your organisation really serious enough to make the QCs operationally effective?' (question No. 13), the respondents' responses have indicated that a high percentage of them (67.96) do not think that the top managements in their respective organisations are really serious enough to make QCs operationally effective and 32.04% of them think otherwise (Table No. 17).
On the question 'do the trade unions in your organisation encourage the QC activities?' (question No. 14), as high as 86.97% of the respondents do not think that the trade unions in their respective organisations encourage the QC activities, whereas only 13.03% think otherwise (Table No. 18).

The respondents' responses with respect to question nos. 11 to 14 (presented in Table Nos. 15 to 18) do not reflect a very happy state of affairs with respect to the functioning of QCs in the respondents' respective organisations. If the situation is such, as perceived by the respondents, that in their respective organisations employees are in general not aware of the role of the QCs and are disinterested in QC activities, the top managements in their organisations, by and large, are not really serious enough to make the QCs operationally effective and the trade unions in their organisations, on the whole, do not encourage QC activities, then the picture is not really very encouraging and there remains much scope for improvement in the functioning of the QCs and their contributions towards developing a healthy working environment.
On the question 'Is there any financial reward system linked to the functioning of the QCs in your organisation?' (question No. 15), a high percentage (69.37%) of the respondents have responded negatively whereas 30.63% have responded affirmatively (Table No. 19).

On the question 'If your answer is "no" to the above question (question no. 15), does that adversely affect the QC members in your organisation?' (question No. 16), a high percentage (67.51%) of the respondents have responded negatively, whereas 32.49% have responded affirmatively (Table No. 20).

The respondents' responses to question nos. 15 and 16 (presented in Table Nos. 19 and 20) indicate that, by and large, functioning of QCs is not linked to any financial reward system in their respective organisations and absence of any such system, on the whole, does not adversely affect the QC members in their respective organisations. This reflects quite a desirable situation because, in principle, QC activities are not initiated with a view to generating financial benefits to the persons concerned. The purpose of forming and
developing QCs precisely is to develop a participative culture throughout the organisation.

If as a result of functioning of QCs, inter alia, financial benefits are generated, that is only a peripheral advantage and effectiveness of a QC should not be judged in terms of such benefits, but should be assessed against its abilities to foster an organisation-wide participative culture.

On the question 'is there any delay in general in implementing the QCs' recommendations in your organisation?' (question No. 17), a high percentage of the respondents (67.96) have responded affirmatively, whereas 32.04% have responded negatively (Table No. 21). This type of response-pattern does not reflect supportive organisational environs because sooner or later the QC members will develop a frustration if their suggestions are only appreciated but not implemented. In this connection, the managements of their respective organisations have to be committed and play a positive role vis-a-vis implementation of the QCs' meaningful suggestions.

On the question 'do the QC members in your organi-
sation get adequate training?' (question No. 18) a high percentage (79.93) of the respondents have responded negatively whereas only 20.07% of them have responded positively (Table No. 22). This type of response-pattern does not reflect a very positive state of affairs in the respondents' respective organisations because QC-related training (which is a must for internalising the philosophy of QC and developing the skills required for effectively operationalising the concept of QC) is not getting much importance in respondents' respective organisations.

On the question 'do you think that functioning of QCs increases the level of employee motivation?' (question No. 19), a very high percentage (81.69) of the respondents have responded affirmatively, whereas 11.62% have responded negatively and 6.69% have remained undecided (Table No. 23). This response-pattern is quite encouraging in the sense that the respondents think that functioning of QCs increases employee motivation, one of the most important objectives of developing and operating QCs.

On the question 'does functioning of QCs lead to improvement in organisational productivity?' (question
No. 20), a high percentage (65.14) of the respondents have responded affirmatively whereas 14.79% of them have responded negatively. A good number of them (20.07%) have, however, remained undecided (Table No. 24). This response-pattern is also quite encouraging. A substantial number of respondents remaining undecided is not necessarily a negative sign because it may not always be possible to relate QC activities to improvement in the organisational productivity straight way.

On the question 'does operation of QCs for sometime result in increased loyalty and commitment towards the organisation?' (question No. 21), a high percentage of the respondents (74.30) have responded affirmatively whereas 10.92% of them have responded negatively and 14.78% have remained undecided (Table No. 25). This response-pattern reflects something encouraging because the respondents' perceptions with respect to this question, on the whole, very much match with one of the major objectives of QCs, i.e., increase in loyalty and commitment towards the organisation.

On the question 'do you think that QCs' activities help their members become more effective functionally?'
(question No. 22), a high percentage (64.44) of the respondents have responded affirmatively whereas 13.38% of them have responded negatively. However, a substantial number of them[22.18%](Table No. 26) have remained undecided. This type of response-pattern is quite encouraging because a good number of respondents have perceived that QCs' activities help the QC members become more effective functionally. A substantial number of the respondents remaining undecided does not necessarily reflect a negative attitude on their part because appreciation of the nature of relationship between the QCs' activities and their members becoming more effective functionally is not expected from the lower-level employees in any organisation.

On the question 'do you think that employees' grievances reduce in an organisation as a result of functioning of QCs?' (question No. 23), a high percentage (72.89) of the respondents have responded affirmatively, whereas only 8.45% of them have responded negatively. A considerable number of them (18.66%) have, however, remained undecided (Table No. 27). This response-pattern is positive in the sense that the respondents think that employees' grievances reduce as
a result of functioning of QCs, a benefit expected to generate over a period of time as a product of effective QC functioning. A good number of respondents remaining undecided is not unusual because many employees tend to think that employees' grievances can only be taken care of by the trade unions and, perhaps, QCs (voluntarily organised) are not the right type of bodies to handle such grievance-related issues.

On the question 'do you think that functioning of QCs will lead to better inter-personal relations?' (question No. 24), a high percentage (88.38) of the respondents have responded affirmatively, while only 3.87% and 7.75% of them have responded negatively and remained undecided respectively (Table No. 28). This type of response-pattern is very positive indeed because the respondents' responses match with one of the major outcomes expected over a period of effective functioning of QCs, i.e., better inter-personal relationships.

On the final and the comprehensive question 'does functioning of QCs help develop a participative culture throughout the organisation?' (question No. 25), a quite high percentage (78.87) have responded affirmatively,
while 5.99% and 15.14% (Table No. 29) have responded negatively and remained undecided respectively. Respondents' responses to this comprehensive question is certainly encouraging because their perceptions, on the whole, are in tune with the much-cherished objective of developing and operating QCs, i.e., developing a participative culture throughout the organisation.

The respondents' responses with respect to the question nos. 19 to 25 (presented in Table Nos. 23 to 29) unambiguously make one point very clear, i.e., according to them effective functioning of QCs does increase employee-motivation and organisational productivity and obviously generate the key benefits expected of QC functioning over a period of time and help lead to an organisation-wide participative culture.