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THE CONCEPT

Reaction in inter-personal relationship is the result of one's perception of the other person's behaviour. Perception as such, may be based on individual's own attitude, feelings, interests, experiences and so on. We often come across people saying, "I behave according to the facts as I see them." Since perceptions are strongly influenced by personal values, managements find it essential to avoid excessive formalities and rationalities. People prefer to be dealt with as human beings rather than rational machines.

If the perceptions of a person of the others are favourable, it may indicate satisfying relations between them. If not, it will be the other way round. Perceptions may change after a sufficient course of inter-personal behaviour of the parties. Consequently, the relations between the parties may also change.
While describing perception, Blair J. Kolasa\textsuperscript{1} opines: "... This (perception) involves a whole history of what has happened to the individual over his life time, since it is the organization of inputs through an inner process, that is dynamic, that is a constantly changing one. It is a process that shapes whatever comes in from the outside; in turn, what is there is changed by what comes in." In the words of Beach and Clark,\textsuperscript{2} perception may be interpreted to mean the process which involves the receiving and organizing or interpreting of stimuli by an individual. This means, of course, that it is a personal thing and a varying thing — the same set of stimuli may have quite different meaning to two different persons, and the same stimuli may have quite a different meaning for the same individual on two different occasions. What we perceive depends a great deal not upon what is out there but upon what we bring to the situation or the person through our own impressions and attitudes. In our relationships with others, most of our satisfaction or dissatisfaction results from the product of such perceptions.

**Biased Perception:** When our perceptions take shape along the lines that have been well-established in our past, a biased perception of people and/or the events may emerge. Such a perception may also be known as stereotype perception, in which a certain picture in a person's mind is installed. It is quite possible that perceiving others whom we deal with in a stereotyped or biased way may limit our relations with them, too. Mason Haire

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Kolasa, Blair J.: Introduction to Behavioural Science for Business: (Wiley Eastern Ltd.): 1978; p. 212.
\end{itemize}
(1955) concludes that "there are differences in the impression of a person, when he is viewed as a member of management and when he is viewed as a labour man. Management and labour perceive one another as less dependable; each person in the group sees persons in their group as appreciative of their own — and views the other as deficient in — emotional characteristics, interpersonal relationships and reasoning. Labour sees itself and management differently and management sees itself and labour differently."  

In this Chapter perceptions of different parties like workers, supervisors, union leaders and the managements will be studied scientifically in order to discover clues objectively to their inter-personal relations. The concept of perception of the concerned parties here has a specific connotation. While analyzing various perceptual characteristics of different parties, I have relied upon the experiences and attitudes of the parties at the time of conducting the interview schedules and the personal interviews. Again, as Kolasa has observed, perception is the experience people have as the proximate result of the sensory inputs. The process is one of selection and organization of sensations to provide meaningful entity, we experience.

**Workers' Perceptions of their Supervisors**

Workers are in direct touch with their supervisors, who happen to be their immediate and first line managerial authority.

---


4. Ibid, p.211.
The workers, during their frequent inter-personal dealings with them, form their perceptions in relation to some characteristics of their supervisors. To understand these perceptions of the workers, twelve statements as under regarding the characteristics of their supervisors were put before them for their affirmative or negative responses:

1. He takes interest in understanding the problems of workers.
2. He treats workers as human beings.
3. He listens to workers and does something.
4. He suggests how to improve work.
5. He recommends fair and impartial promotions.
6. Management gives weight to his words and recommendations.
7. He never complains against workers.
8. He inspires workers to give suggestions and accepts them.
9. Workers can meet him without fear and hesitation.
10. He takes due care of supply and maintenance of proper tools and equipments.
11. He informs changes in time.
12. He appreciates good work.

In addition to this, a few supplementary questions like the following were also asked:

* Any specific complaint for your supervisor?
* Can you present your difficulties before your Supervisor?
* Does he solve your difficulties or avoid?
* Does he listen to you in regard to your family problems?

Lastly, the workers were asked specifically to opine about the nature of relations with their supervisors in terms of their being (1) good, (2) tense, (3) satisfactory/peaceful, and (4) excellent.
Analysis of the responses:
A: The responses of the workers (in regard to the 12 statements) in different Units are exhibited, collectively, in Table VI.1.

The perceptions of the workers of their supervisors are analysed, industrywise, hereinbelow:

Refinery Industry:

A statistical mean of affirmative responses for all the twelve characteristics was calculated, which came to 27. It indicates that, on an average, 73 percent respondents perceived their supervisors favourably. Further, the standard deviation was 8. These results reveal a very good affirmative response of the workers' perceptions of their supervisors. Even when the most pessimistic view of the situation was taken, the majority of respondents gave a positive opinion about their supervisors. The variation in their affirmative response seems to be not too wide as seen from the value of standard deviation.

Again it is seen that the highest percentage, i.e., 92% of the respondents felt (i) that they received human treatment from their supervisors, and (ii) that their supervisors were easily approachable. This certainly reveals that there existed healthy relations between the workers and the supervisors. Moreover, 62% of the respondents said (i) that their supervisors never complained against them, (ii) that the supervisors made recommendations impartially, and (iii) that they inspired workers and accepted suggestions from the workers. This signifies their satisfactory mutual relations. It must be noted here that, in case of one characteristic (No. 6), viz., 'Management gives weightage to his words and recommendations,' the affirmative
response of the respondents was 49 percent. However, it does not indicate a significant adverse impact.

Some adverse comments passed by nine of the respondents about their respective supervisors are summarised below:

- My supervisor is uneducated.
- He is partial and does not distribute work equally.
- He puts more efforts to please higher authorities even by displeasing some workers.
- He is not a 'perfect' supervisor.
- He extracts more work from us, even though the conditions are unfavourable. Thus he tries to earn his promotion; he is a selfish man.
- Owing to his heavy work-load, he can't help us, though he has a desire to help us.
- He has communal feelings.
- We solve our difficulties ourselves, he does not extend any helping hand.

**Fertilizer Industry**

The Table reveals that a majority of respondents had a favourable perception of their supervisors, though to a lesser extent than in the case of the Refinery Industry. The statistical mean of affirmative respondents for all the twelve characteristics was 43, i.e., 59%. Moreover, the standard deviation was 7. These results suggest that there was a good affirmative response in regard to the perceptions of workers of their supervisors. The variation in their affirmative response, as seen from the value of standard deviation, was not wide.
It also came out that as many as 89% of the respondents perceived that they received human treatment from their supervisors, while 82% of them felt that their supervisors were easily approachable. Further, 66% of the respondents were of the opinion that their supervisors guided them for improvement, while 62% of them considered (i) that their supervisors were careful in providing them tools, etc. and (ii) that their supervisors appreciated their work. Thus, the perceptions of a majority of respondents, in general, indicated that there existed fairly good mutual relations among the workers and their supervisors.

However, there was no majority of the response in the two spheres of (i) Supervisor's weight on management (37%), and, (ii) Supervisors who never complained, (48%). It suggested that somewhere their relations were less peaceful. It was observed that the perception of workers in Unit F were less favourable and generated tensions.

Some unfavourable remarks made by 20 respondents against their supervisors, in this industry, are quoted below:

* He is a yes-man of the management and lacks morality. He can't safeguard our rights.
* He is too pressed under his own problems to communicate our difficulties to higher authorities.
* He is not impartial.
* Since he is unqualified, he does not give us any theoretical knowledge.
* He makes a mountain of a mole hill.
* Once he assigns the job to us, it becomes our exclusive responsibility to do it. He does not share any responsibility thereafter.

* He cannot present our matters properly before the higher authorities, since he is scared of the management.

* He can't take decisions independently; for every little matter, he has to consult the higher authorities.

* He often threatens me that I would be sacked.

* He does not listen to our complaints sympathetically.

* He has much superiority complex.

* He is loose tempered and makes unnecessary haste.

* He behaves arbitrarily.

* Since he has been given a lift to the supervisor's post, he has to dance to the tune of the management.

* He behaves with some prejudice despite our satisfactory work.

* He follows the policy of 'divide & rule'.

* He neither distributes the work, as should be done, nor does he supply the necessary tools, etc., in time.

* He can't bring lasting solution to any problem.

* He does not take interest in prompt solution of the issues but prolongs the proceedings.

* Practically he is not a capable boss.

**Dairy Industry:**

Alike in the Refinery Industry a majority of the respondents in this industry also perceived their supervisors favourably. The statistical mean of respondents of affirmative opinion of their supervisors was 68, i.e., 72%, and the standard deviation was 8, which indicated a very good affirmative response. Even when the most pessimistic view of the situation was taken, a
fair majority of the respondents gave a positive opinion about their supervisors. The variation in their affirmative response seems to be not very wide as the value of standard deviation was 8.

An examination of the Table indicates that very high percentages of the respondents felt (i) that their supervisors were easily approachable (82%), and (ii) that their supervisors meted out human treatment (81%). The other characteristics are also painted favourably by a considerable majority of the respondents. In no case is the majority less than 54%. This trend revealed that generally good relations prevailed among the workers and their supervisors in this industry.

Nevertheless, the following complaints were put forward by eleven respondents against their supervisors:

- He does not give instructions in time regarding the change of work and does not accept our suggestions.
- He assigns more responsibility than authority.
- He demands 'beedi' and 'tea' from the workers.
- Sometimes he refuses to grant me leave.
- He does not appreciate our work.
- He ill-treats us.
- He does not keep his promises.
- He keeps free the new worker but demands more work from old workers. He does not behave fairly with old people; he insults them.
- He transfers persons from one job to the other.
- He harasses us though we work sincerely in our section. He marks us absent though there are sufficient balances of leave to our credit.
He does not listen to us; he is a proud man.

(B): The workers' responses to the supplementary questions are tabulated below, industry-wise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>No. of workers who tell their difficulties to the supervisors</th>
<th>Supervisors do not solve or avoid difficulties</th>
<th>Family Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinery (n=37)</td>
<td>36 (97)</td>
<td>10 (27)</td>
<td>14 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer (n=73)</td>
<td>69 (95)</td>
<td>30 (41)</td>
<td>41 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy (n=95)</td>
<td>88 (93)</td>
<td>21 (22)</td>
<td>59 (62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) n = Number of workers interviewed.
(2) Figures in brackets constitute the percentages.

It is obvious from the Table (i) that a majority of the respondents felt free to tell their difficulties pertaining to their job to the supervisors, but (ii) that, in a number of cases, the latter were either unable to solve them or they avoided doing so. The percentage of such supervisors came to 27, 41 and 22 respectively in the Refinery, Fertilizer and Dairy industries. While these were not reflective of any alarming situation, in the case of Fertilizer industry, it was found that many supervisors were comparatively less experienced in their jobs, and could not solve the difficulties of their subordinates promptly.

The Table further shows that, in a majority of the cases, the supervisors of the Fertilizer and Dairy industries listened
to the workers in regard to their family problems — the percentages being 56 and 62 respectively. In the case of the Refinery industry, the percentage was only 38. This can, in a way, be construed to mean that more intimate relations existed among the workers and supervisors in the former two industries. Again, the data also reveals that in the Refinery industry as many as 35% of the respondents did not talk to their supervisors about their family problems. Their percentages were quite low in the Fertilizer and Dairy industries, being 15% and 11% respectively. My further inquiries with the workers and some of the supervisors gave the clues — in the case of the Fertilizer and Dairy industries, most of the supervisors and workers came from the same villages and community and, therefore, they were socially closer to one another. Moreover, many of the supervisors in these industries were promoted from amongst the workers' ranks, while in the case of the Refinery industry many of the supervisors were transferred, from other parts of the country (i.e., from the other refineries of I.O.C.) generating a more cosmopolitan atmosphere.

(C): The workers' opinions about the nature of their relationship with the supervisors are summarised in Table VI.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Satisfactory/peaceful</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refinery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of workers interviewed.
Thus, only 6.8% reported to be having tense relations, revealing that, in the units studied in the three industries, the relations between the majority of workers and their supervisors were preponderently satisfactory. This tallies with our earlier conclusions drawn from the analyses of the responses to the statements and supplementary questions.

**Workers’ perception of their managements**

Workers also have their perceptions of their management, employer or company with whom or where they are working. Their perceptions depend upon many factors such as wages, working conditions, welfare amenities, training facilities, financial position of the company, participation in management, etc.

For this purpose, the workers in the Units studied were asked to give positive or negative responses to the nine Statements as under:

1. Company gives good wages.
2. Management provides good working facilities.
3. There are good chances for promotion.
4. Good training is available.
5. Company is financially sound.
6. No victimisation of workers takes place.
7. Workers have participation in production and management.
8. Good bonus is given.
9. There are good labour welfare amenities.

In addition to this, one subsidiary question was asked: 'Any specific complaint against your management?'

Workers’ responses are tabulated in Table VI.4.
Analysis of the responses

Refinery Industry

A statistical mean of all the positive responses (for all the nine perceptual statements) was calculated, which came to 21, i.e., 57 percent. The standard deviation came to 8. They indicate a good affirmative response.

While observing the details in Table VI.4, it is found that quite a large majority of respondents (92%) perceived their company as financially sound and a substantial majority of respondents (78%) felt that their company gave them good wages. Again, 68% of them considered that the company provided them good welfare amenities, whereas 59% of the respondents agreed that their management did not victimise them. This trend of perception of worker-respondents signifies that there existed satisfactory relations between the management and the workers.

Surprisingly, a diminishing trend of affirmative responses for the other characteristics of management was noted as under:

- Company gives good bonus - 57%
- Management provides good working facilities - 54%
- Company offers good chances for promotion - 51%
- Management imparts good training - 38%
- Company allows participation in management - 11%

This analysis, therefore, suggests that there is a need for more training and a greater degree of participation of workers in management to improve the enterprise image.
Moreover, nine respondents had complaints as under:

- Our efficiency is not fully rewarded.
- There is no proper promotion policy.
- Administration is quite loose/liberal.
- There is no rational solution of our grievances.
- Management avoids our genuine demands and delays the decisions to the extent possible.
- Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people are appointed even though they are not fully qualified.
- Those who speak against management find hurdles in their promotions.
- Management is favouring the persons of a particular community.
- Training is given to officers but not to the workers.

Fertilizer Industry

Table VI-4 also reveals that a good majority of the respondents perceived their managements favourably. This was supported by the statistical mean of all the affirmative responses to all the nine Statements that came to 51. It indicated that 70% of the respondents perceived their managements favourably. However, the standard deviation in this case was of 16, which was somewhat wide. It indicated that, when most pessimistic view of the situation was taken, the favourable perception of the respondents would be slightly less than 50%.

The Table also showed that 97% of the respondents considered their management to be financially sound. Moreover, a substantial majority of them also considered: (i) that their company gave them good bonus, (84%), (ii) that their company paid good wages (81%), and (iii) that their company provided them good working facilities (81%).
Similarly, 74% of the respondents reported that their management provided them (i) good training facilities, and (ii) good welfare amenities. 63% of them believed that their management did not victimise the workers. This trend of high majority of affirmative response revealed that the relations between the workers and their managements were generally healthy. 48% of the respondents felt that their company provided them good chances of promotion; but, only 26% of them affirmed participation of workers in management. An improvement, therefore, in these two matters, viz., promotion and participation to workers may create a better climate of labour-management relations in this industry.

As many as seventeen respondents reacted critically about their managements:

- Management does not take interest in the workers' problems.
- In spite of many suggestions for promotion policy, nobody pays attention.
- There is inadequate discipline in our organisation.
- Officers have no value of time. They waste a lot of time.
- Officers have no hold on workers.
- For the last few years management's attitude has been adamant.
- Profits and wages are not correlated.
- Workers have no say in management.
- Many a time management avoids our genuine demands.
- There is unnecessary bossing.
- Management complicates the labour problems and delays the decisions deliberately.
- Promotions are given to 'yes-men' and relatives due to absence of rational promotion policy.
Directors and managers are more worried about their own benefits rather than the company's interests.

Management considers company as their own property.

Management is careless towards workers' problems.

Departmental Heads do not protect us, when desired and necessary.

Uniformity is not maintained while observing the rules and regulations.

We can't express our views freely (for fear of victimisation).

Management's attitude is insulting.

They don't value our work.

Dairy Industry

It is evident from Table VI-4 that a thin majority of the respondents in this industry perceived favourably the different characteristics of their managements. The statistical mean of such respondents came to 50, constituting 52%. Again the standard deviation was 22, which was a little wider. As compared to those in the Refinery and Fertilizer industries, the mean was less and the range of standard deviation was more in this industry.

The wider range of standard deviation indicated that, when a most pessimistic view of the situation was taken, the favourable perception of the respondents would be far away from the overall mean of such perceptions.

Let us now examine the individual responses. A large majority of the respondents (83%) perceived that their company was financially sound. And, a considerable majority of them felt (i) that their managements gave them good wages (76%),
(ii) that their managements provided them good working facilities (74%), and (iii) that there was no victimisation of workers by the managements (71%). Though this trend indicates satisfactory perception of the workers, a poor trend of response was also visible from the following cases:

- Managements create good chances for promotion - 42%
- Company gives good training - 41%
- Company gives good bonus - 38%
- Company provides good welfare amenities - 38%
- Management allows participation to workers - 14%

The situation demanded that greater efforts be made in the spheres of promotions, training, bonus, welfare amenities and workers' participation to raise the level of satisfactory labour-management relations.

The following complaints were noted from the responses of workers in this industry:

- For getting oneself employed, recommendation is a must.
- Daily-rated or substitute workers are not made permanent.
- A worker doing the job of a fitter is issued a certificate of worker, when he leaves the job.
- It takes a long period to settle the labour matters and disputes.
- Due to less number of workers attending some times, others present have to work more. No compensating labour-force is provided.
- Influential people get quick promotions though they might have committed a number of faults. More efficient people having no influence are seldom promoted.
- Management does not take adequate care in order to have more production.
- Higher management — including the General Manager — has inadequate authority, with the result that delay takes
place in solving problems.

- There is unsatisfactory management of labour welfare amenities.
- They take action against us without conducting detailed inquiry; injustice is done to us.
- Workers do not care for the management and management also does not care for them.

The responses to the inquiry about the nature of worker-management relations are exhibited in Table VI-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Satisfactory or peaceful</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refinery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertilizer</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 205)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = Number of workers interviewed.)

The Table is indicative of the prevalence of good and peaceful relations between the vast majority of the workers and their managements. This, again, confirms our previous observations.

Supervisors' perception of their workers

Supervisors or foremen also form certain perceptions of their subordinate workers. They come across many characteristics of their workers during their inter-personal behaviour. To assess
### TABLE VI.7

Supervisors' perception of workers in the Fertilizer Industry
(Number of Supervisors interviewed : 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor's Response</th>
<th>Worker's characteristic</th>
<th>Mostly F1 F2 F3 Total</th>
<th>Generally F1 F2 F3 Total</th>
<th>Some F1 F2 F3 Total</th>
<th>Very few F1 F2 F3 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sincere &amp; committed</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 4 0 12</td>
<td>6 1 2 9</td>
<td>2 0 0 2</td>
<td>2 0 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hardworking</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4 0 8</td>
<td>10 1 1 12</td>
<td>2 0 1 3</td>
<td>2 0 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 3 1 14</td>
<td>8 2 1 11</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knows his job</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 1 1 13</td>
<td>6 3 0 9</td>
<td>1 1 1 3</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Likes his job</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 1 1 9</td>
<td>6 4 1 11</td>
<td>4 0 0 4</td>
<td>1 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Respectful</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 5 2 22</td>
<td>3 0 0 3</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VI-8

**Supervisors Perception of Workers in Dairy Industry**

(Number of Supervisors interviewed = 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor's Response</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Generally</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very few</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worker's characteristic</strong></td>
<td>$D_1$</td>
<td>$D_2$</td>
<td>$D_3$</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$D_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sincere &amp; committed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hardworking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Peaceful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knows his job</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Likes his job</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Respectful</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the responses

Refinery Industry

The study showed that the Supervisors' response to the workers' sincerity and commitment, diligence and liking for their jobs was evenly divided, whereas their response to workers being peaceful and respectful to them was very good. On the whole, as it appears from Table VI-6, the perceptions of supervisors regarding their subordinates were quite favourable. All the respondents reported that their subordinates were respectful to them either 'mostly' or 'generally' and none found them under the category of 'some' or 'very few.' This again indicates that satisfactory relations existed between them.

Fertilizers Industry

In this industry, too, the supervisors' opinions about the workers' characteristics like sincerity and commitment, diligence, being peaceful and having good knowledge of their job seemed to be fairly good and appreciative. An inter-dependance of one characteristic and another reflecting general human behaviour was significantly noticed here. The workers who usually were sincere and committed were found to be hard working and respectful to their superiors. However, this inter-dependence seemed to be lacking in some degree in respect of Unit F₁.

In general, no marked difference in the opinions of the respondents for most of the characteristics of their subordinate workers in the units of the industry was noticed as is apparent from Table VI-7. It is specifically evident that all the
respondents clearly perceived that their subordinates were peaceful and respectful to them either 'mostly' or 'generally' and none reported them under the category of 'some' or 'very few.' This phenomenon reveals quite a favourable aspect of their mutual relations, from the viewpoint of supervisors.

**Dairy Industry**

As compared to the Refinery and Fertilizers industries, the supervisors' responses in the Dairy industry seemed to be rather less favourable as a sufficient number of supervisors perceived their workers under the category of 'some' and 'very few' on the basis of the six characteristics considered as above. However, the supervisors, by and large, were of the view that their subordinates were peaceful and respectful to them. Most of the respondents reported that their workers knew their jobs well, while a substantial number of the respondents perceived that their workers were less hardworking. On the basis of perceptions of supervisors for their workers it appears that the relations between them were 'fair' in the Dairy Industry.

**Supervisors' perceptions of union leaders**

Supervisors have some perceptions of the union-leaders in their industry, too. The latter affect labour-management relations substantially. For example, if the supervisor perceives that union leaders are peaceful and contribute to educating the workers, they may think about their subordinates favourably and hence there are chances of satisfactory relations between them and their workers. To examine this aspect of the perceptions of supervisors,
their responses were obtained for six characteristics of union leaders on the three-degree scale, as under:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of union leaders</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Generally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. They are peaceful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. They are considerate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. They guide and educate the workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. They understand management's problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. They are adamant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. They instigate workers against management.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses of the supervisors are presented, industry-wise, in Table VI-9, VI-10 and Table VI-11.

**TABLE VI-9**
Supervisors' perceptions of union-leaders in the Refinery Industry  
(Total No. of Supervisors = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Union leaders</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Generally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Peaceful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Considerate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Guide &amp; educate workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Understand management's problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adamant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Instigate workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the Responses

Refinery Industry

It is evident from Table VI-9 that the supervisors' perceptions regarding union leaders, on the whole, was rather favourable. Despite this general reading, they were found to be expressing a little adverse opinion about the union leaders for two of the six characteristics, viz., 'understanding the managements' problems' and 'guiding and educating the workers.' However, they did certainly express a very good opinion about their behaviour being peaceful and considerate. Likewise they mentioned that the union leaders did not instigate the workers quite often and were not too much adamant.

Fertilizers Industry

A positive response about the supervisors' perceptions of the union leaders' characteristics was observed in this case also. According to them, the union-leaders understood management's problems and guided and educated workers to a great extent. However, in the case of Unit F₁, some supervisor-respondents thought that some of the union leaders did instigate the workers against the management. The respondents in Unit F₂ had a very satisfying experience of the leaders of the union that was active, the latter being quite peaceful. In fact they spoke highly in regard to most of the characteristics.

Dairy Industry

A sizeable majority of respondents in this industry believed that their union leaders were 'mostly' or 'generally' peaceful, considerate, aware of managements' problems and guided and educated the workers. On the other side, as revealed from
the responses, some union leaders were found to be adamant in very few cases. It is only in Unit D that five of the eleven respondents had categorically said that the union leaders were adamant. Again, all believed that the union leaders seldom instigated the workers against the managements. Thus, on the whole, a fair atmosphere of mutual relations prevailed among the parties in this industry.

Union leaders' perceptions of management

The presence of labour unions in the industrial establishments had, seemingly, modified the relationships between labour and management. Union leaders and shop stewards used to meet the different authorities of management in connection with either individual requests/complaints or collective demands of the workers. They were in direct contact with the managements and had developed their own perceptions of the latter. To discover their perceptions, the chief union leader in each unit under study were interviewed. Their experiences and expressions regarding the management authorities like General Manager, Managing Director, Chairman, etc., are reviewed, unitwise, hereunder:

Refinery Industry

Unit R

According to the General Secretary of the only union (when this inquiry was conducted), "A few years back, the management was rude and indifferent. It never took the union in confidence. Now the management has become cautious and careful. They take us in confidence and discuss the labour problems with us before taking any decision. They do call us for help, when they are
in trouble... How they can't afford to neglect us."

**Fertilizer Industry**

**Unit F1:**

The General Secretary of the only union in the unit expressed: "Management is quite co-operative. It does not resort to any unfair practice. The Managing Director is very kind and considerate, while the Chairman is also sympathetic and humane in regard to workers' problems. Management, as a whole, is rational and progressive. It does not believe in confrontation but prefers compromise in case of any dispute. It has provided us many welfare amenities. Their attitude is to keep the workforce satisfied."

**Unit F2:** (Here there were two unions).

**First Union:** The President of the union had remarked: "Our management is most hostile. It never consults us. General Manager is arrogant and the Chairman is useless, while the Personnel Manager is simply a peon. The management on the whole is bad; it never listens to our complaints and demands. It prefers to talk with its 'chamcha union'". These remarks indicated that his perception of the management was not at all favourable.

**Second Union:** The General Secretary of the union believed: "Our management seeks our co-operation and extends co-operation to us, when necessary. It consults us practically on all matters relating to production and labour. The management is quite sympathetic towards the genuine demands
of the workers. It is never adamant but is reasonably flexible. It is generous in providing us better working conditions and welfare amenities. On the whole, it is a good management."

Unit F₂:

According to the General Secretary of the only union in the unit, "Management prefers not to have any labour union. They generally avoid meeting with and talking to us. However, they call us and seek our co-operation when certain exigencies and legal obligations compell them to do so. They do not consult us, as they should, on labour issues. Management is indifferent. There is no General Manager. The Managing Director exercises overall control on our unit. There is lack of scientific and rational working of the management."

Dairy Industry

Unit D₁:

The Secretary of the only union in the unit perceived of the Management thus: "Management is co-operative. They believe in conciliation of the disputes rather than bringing them to the courts. Management tries to keep peaceful labour relations. It is neither too strong nor too weak. It believes in compromise rather than in confrontation. Management gives us good hearing when we represent workers' demands or complaints. They also consult us when they feel necessary."

Unit D₂:

The President of the only Union in the unit commented on its management in these terms: "Our management is quite co-operative. It consults us mostly on all the labour matters.
Our General Manager is really an able and efficient administrator. Our management, in general, believes in contented labour-force. It has provided certain effective welfare amenities. There has been no evidence of any victimisation, harassment or unfair acts on the part of management. It pays careful attention to our presentation for general demands and individual complaints. In short, our management is just, kind and co-operative in dealing with us."

Unit D3: (Here there were two unions)

**First Union:** The General Secretary opined about his management in these words: "Our management is reasonably co-operative. It usually asks our opinion in regard to major or minor problems of workers, including those of working conditions, welfare amenities, leave, change of shift, transfers, absenteeism and maintenance of discipline. Our General Manager is a good administrator but he is a little lament man."

**Second Union:** The President of the Union described the management thus: "Our management is neither good nor bad. Sometimes it listens to us and accepts our suggestions. But mostly it favours the other union. They do consult us, when they are in trouble. No doubt, General Manager is a kind man but he is sentimental; hence he is not firm in implementing his decisions. Our previous General Manager was quite strong and could bring many changes in favour of workers and general administration. The present General Manager is not strong enough to represent workers' case before the higher management."
Managements' perceptions for union leaders

Similarly, managements also form certain perceptions of the union leaders in their units. During the interviews with managerial authorities of the industrial units under study, their opinions were sought on the following characteristics of the union leaders:

- Their popularity among workers and management.
- Their selflessness in dealings.
- Whether they educated and led the workers or not.
- Their constructive behaviour.
- Their militant behaviour.

The responses of the management people — mainly of the Personnel Managers — about the union leaders on this account are summarised, unit-wise, below:

**Refinery Industry**

**Unit R:**

- They are not very popular among the workers.
- They are selfless.
- They quite often mislead the workers.
- They don't educate the workers.
- Sometimes they are militant.
- Formerly, they were strong but, of late, they have become less responsible.

**Fertilizer Industry**

**Unit F:**

- They are popular among workers.
- They are neither selfish nor selfless.
- Generally they don't mislead the workers; sometimes they educate the workers.
They are constructive.

Our union is good to work with.

It is a strong and responsible union.

Unit F2

First Union:

- They are not popular.
- They are selfish people.
- They very often mislead the workers.
- They are adamant and destructive.
- They always bring rubbish demands.
- They are dangerous to our industrial harmony.

Second Union:

- They are popular.
- They are selfless.
- They educate the workers.
- They don't mislead the workers.
- They are co-operative.
- They come with genuine demands.
- They give valuable suggestions.
- They have helped us in maintaining industrial harmony in our unit.

Unit F3:

- They are popular.
- They are selfless.
- Sometimes they mislead the workers.
- They are neither constructive nor destructive.
- They are, many a time, convinced by us, but they are afraid of allegations from some of the members whom they cannot carry with them.
- They generally have a good control over their workers.
Dairy Industry

Unit D₁:

- They are popular.
- They are selfless.
- Generally they don't mislead the workers.
- They are constructive.
- They are strong.
- We feel alright with them.

Unit D₂:

- They are popular.
- They are selfless.
- They educate the workers.
- They are constructive and co-operative.
- They are good. We feel happy with them.

Unit D₃

First Union:

- Its leaders are less popular.
- They are selfless.
- They don't mislead the workers nor do they educate them.
- They are neither constructive nor destructive. They are co-operative.
- They are less strong than their counter-parts in the second union.

Second Union:

- Its main leader (President) is more popular. Others are less popular.
- They don't mislead the workers.
- Sometimes they do educate the workers.
- They are little militant, but not destructive. Sometime they make constructive suggestions.
* Mostly they are co-operative.

* Its leaders are strong but sometimes they behave in an irresponsible manner.

**Managements' perception of their workers**

Managements were also inquired in regard to their perceptions of their respective labour-forces during the personal interviews with them. Fortunately the authorities in all the units under study perceived their employees favourably. Most of them believed that their workers, in general, were peaceful and mild. They did not like strikes, they were interested in more wages and bonus but they were not adamant. They understood management's problems if convinced. They were less educated but enlightened. They were hard-working. However, in the case of Unit F2 and D3 the managements also thought that a small group of workers in each was violent and militant and, therefore, was a little unmanageable. The necessary disciplinary action had to be resorted to in some cases. In very few cases, were the workers perceived to be insincere and irresponsible.