CHAPTER V

TRADE UNIONS
(General Aspects and Involvement of Workers)

The Government of India is committed in its labour policy
to the encouragement of trade unions in industry. The First Five
Year Plan stated "The workers' right of association, organization
and collective bargaining is to be accepted without reservations
as the fundamental basis of mutual relationship. The attitude to
trade unions should not be just a matter of toleration. They should
be welcomed and helped to function as part and parcel of the industrial
system".1 Second Five Year Plan2 said, "A strong trade
union movement is necessary both for safeguarding the interest of
labour and for raising the targets of production". The Report of
the Third Five Year Plan3 said, "Trade unions have to be accepted
as an essential part of the apparatus of industrial and economic
administration of the country, and should be prepared for the dis-
charge of the responsibilities which attach to this position".

Five Year Plans and several other Government reports for
the public sector in India generally accepted the proposition
that undertakings in the public sector should serve as pace
setters.4 Hence, it was expected that the policy to encourage
trade unions, as laid down in different plans for all the indust-
ries, would be followed by these undertakings. It may also be
mentioned that Draft of the Fifth Five Year Plan5 emphasised the

1. Government of India, Planning Commission, The First Five Year Plan,
   New Delhi, 1952, p. 673.
2. Government of India, Planning Commission, The Second Five Year Plan,
   New Delhi, 1956, p. 572.
3. Government of India, Planning Commission, The Third Five Year Plan,
   New Delhi, 1961, p. 256.
4. For references, see Introduction to this thesis.
5. Government of India, Planning Commission, Draft Fifth Five Year Plan,
   Volume I, 1974-75, p. 20.
need to enlist the support of trade union movement to improve worker-manager relations in the public sector.

OBJECTIVES

We propose to study in this chapter the structure of trade unions; in the two plants, the facilities provided to them by the management; and their relationship with political parties. We shall also investigate the involvement of workers in unions i.e. their membership behaviour, identification with the union and participation in its activities. Let us first compare the structure (multiple or single) of trade unions in the two plants.

MULTIPLE UNION STRUCTURE (HE(I)IL)

Emergence

The multiplicity of unions has been the bane of HE(I)IL. In the very first year (1960) there emerged three unions in the plant. They were: Heavy Electricals Employees Union (HEEU) affiliated to Indian National Trade Union Congress; Heavy Electricals Factory Workers Union (HEFWU) affiliated to Bharatia Mazdoor Sangh; and Heavy Electricals Servants Trade Union (HESTU). Though HESTU had leftist leanings it was not affiliated to any central trade union organisation.

The management of HE(I)IL recognised HEEU, in January 1961 under the code of discipline for industries and again in February 1963 under the Madhya Pradesh Industrial Relations Act, 1960. The promulgation of MPIR Act, 1960, superseded the code of discipline.

6. INTUC was the labour wing of the Congress Party.
7. BMS was the labour wing of the Jan Sangh.
8. Sub Section 2 of section 13 of the Madhya Pradesh Industrial Relations Act provided for compulsory recognition of the union through the registrar of the representative unions. Once a union was recognized by the Registrar, the company was under legal obligation to deal with that union. The method of recognition was based on the verification of membership of a union by the Registrar of Trade Unions.
9. HEEU continued to have the status of a recognized union upto the time of this study, and even later.
HESTU raised objections to the recognition and claimed that it had more membership than HESU. HESTU's claim for recognition resulted in it organizing a large number of strikes during 1961-64. However, HESTU was weakened after the failure of the 1964 agitation. Leaders with the communist ideology remained in jail during 1964-66. After their release they formed a parallel HESTU. Two unions with the name of HESTU continued in the plant for a year. Afterwards, the communist faction changed the name of their union into the Heavy Electricals Mazdoor Trade Union (HEMTU) and got itself formally affiliated to the All India Trade Union Congress.

Thus, up to 1967, there were only three unions in the plant. However, during 1967-70 there was a mushroom growth of unions and associations in the factory. At the time of the present survey (in 1971) there was a formidable array of seven unions and seventeen associations in the plant.

Working

Thus, we find that HE(I)L had a multiple union structure from its very inception. However, the intensity of the inter-union and intra-union rivalry was at its height during 1967-70.

There was a lot of inter-union propaganda and counter-propaganda. HEFWU (affiliated to BMS) and HEMTU (affiliated to AITUC) criticised each other because of the ideological differences. Each would oppose the strikes launched by the other. All the opposite unions and associations joined hands in criticising HESU, the recognized union, as "anti-worker" and "pro-management".

10. AITU is the labour wing of the Communist Party of India.
11. The Jan Sangh and the communists did not see eye to eye with each other.
opposition unions also claimed that they could win higher benefits for the workers than the benefits provided through the efforts of the recognized union.\(^ {12} \) It was also alleged that the management encouraged one union against the other, especially during an agitation. One management official admitted, "We ask other unions to raise their voice against the striking union".

Factions and rivalries within the unions were also rampant. There were sharp divisions within the leadership of HESU. K.N. Pradhan, President of HESU and Minister for Co-operation, and Ganga Ram Tiwari, Minister for Labour,\(^ {13} \) did not see eye to eye with each other due to personal differences. The group led by Ganga Ram Tewari opposed HESU led by Pradhan on various occasions. For example, HESU led by Tewari participated in the December 1967 strike, while HESU presided over by Pradhan opposed it.

HEMTU an affiliate of AITUC had also got factions within it. This factionalism was deepened because of the dispute over the support to the Lok Sabha elections (1971) from the Bhopal constituency. Against the directive of the Communist Party of India to support the Congress candidate, S. Bhowmick, the President of HEMTU, contested as an independent candidate. His behaviour annoyed the communist leadership and that ultimately led to a split in HEMTU.

**Merger of Unions and Associations**

There had been various attempts by unions and associations to combine for a common cause. For example in August 1967, all the

---

12. For example, in the case of the Wage Board Award in the year 1969, different unions wanted different amounts to be paid to workers. The management and the recognized union agreed to give an increase of Rs. 30 to each worker in various categories. HEMTU demanded an increase of Rs. 65 and the National Forum an increase of Rs. 100 to 150 for different categories of workers.

13. Both were ministers in the Congress ministry of Shayam Charan Shukla.
unions of the plant, excluding the representative union, formed a Sangharsh Samiti to get the reinstatement of the employees who had been jailed due to the 1964 agitation. Similarly, a Joint Council of twelve trade unions and associations was formed in January 1970. The council wanted to achieve for workers an amount of wages higher than the amount paid to them through an agreement between the recognized union and the management. However, the strike launched by the Joint Council in August 1970 was a flop.

Assessment of the Working of the Multiple Union Structure

A majority of the workers, trade union leaders and management personnel showed their resentment against the multiplicity of unions. The opinion of 13 out of 18 trade union leaders and 10 out of 17 management representatives was that the multiplicity of unions had spoiled the peaceful atmosphere in the plant. Almost all the trade union leaders said that it was only the management which benefited by the multiplicity of unions. However, the management representatives would not accept that view. A majority of the trade union leaders (17 out of 18) and management personnel (9 out of 17) also agreed that multiplicity of unions had weakened the trade union movement.

Of the workers interviewed in HE(I)L, 65.5% wanted that there should be one union in the plant. Only 25.3% said that there should be two unions — one recognized union and the other 'Opposite Union'. They felt that the existence of a recognized union alone would not benefit workers, as it would be reduced to the status of a 'management union'. However, a small fraction of

14. For the assessment of management representatives and trade union leaders towards multiplicity of unions see Appendix 5.1.
Indian Telephone Industries Ltd. had only one union called the ITI Employees Union. It was registered in October 1950. It received recognition, under the code of discipline, in 1956. The executive committee members and office bearers of the union were elected every two years by secret ballot. Workers took keen interest in the elections of the union leaders. About 75% of the unionizable strength in 1969, and 79% in 1973, voted.

**Causes for Continuation of a Single Union**

The existence and continuation of only one union in ITI for several years became possible due to various reasons. Firstly, the union had been maintaining its independent character since its inception. It was learnt from the respondents that though the union leaders professed different ideologies, none of them tried to introduce politics into it. One trade union leader said, "Petty politics and political ideologies have been kept outside the affairs of the union in spite of the difficulties that had arisen from time to time". Except the President, all the leaders of the union were employees of ITI. Secondly, workers in ITI were also in favour of one union. Only 2.8% of the workers interviewed said that they would like to have more unions than one. A trade union leader expressed the view, "Workers in ITI are accustomed to one union. They did not allow leaders to form a separate union."

15. A sectional union of drivers, formed in the middle of 1964, also existed in the plant. The main objective of this union was to give protection to its members against being involved in police cases in connection with accident etc.
Instead of forming a rival union, workers would like to change the leadership on the occasion of the next elections.

Thirdly, the union's relations with the management were reported to be, by and large, cordial. As far as possible, the union avoided the agitational approach. Hence, the management did not try to create divisions in the ranks of the workers. Cases of victimization of workers due to the participation in the trade union activity were also rare. Fourthly, ITI Employees Union could claim credit for a large number of achievements.

**Difficulties faced by the Union in Maintaining its Unified Structure**

There were various attempts to break the union. For instance, the strikes of 1964 and 1966 were initiated under the influence of some outside leaders of Bangalore belonging to the Communist Party of India, who wanted to capture the union. Similarly, because of delay in the settlement of dearness allowance and bonus issues in 1967, certain inside leaders (opposed to the existing leadership) wanted to make capital out of the situation with the help of outside communist leaders. However, they could not succeed in their aim.

The language problem also created difficulties in the way of unified structure. Workers employed in ITI belonged to different South Indian language groups, such as Kannada, Tamil, Telugu and Malayalam. Kannadigas, being the local people, wanted preference in recruitment, promotion and other facilities. They also wanted that all the work of the union should either be in English or in Kannada. To avoid any clash between different

---

16. For achievements of the union see latter portion of this Chapter. 17. For details see Chapter VI on Industrial Unrest.
language groups the union had to print its pamphlets in English. As English was not understood by many workers, it hindered proper communication between the workers and the union. There had also been cases of the beating up of Tamil workers by the Kannadigas. It was reported that some Tamil workers did not contest the 1960 union election because of the fear of maltreatment at the hands of Kannadigas. All this affected the solidarity of the union.

POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT OF UNIONS

**Political Involvement of Unions in HE(I)L**

The leadership of the major unions in HE(I)L had remained, from the very inception of the plant, with people having strong political leanings. HEEU, the recognized union, was started at the initiative of Dravid who was President of the INTUC in the state and also Minister for labour in the Congress ministry in the state. He was followed by K.N. Pradhan, another outsider and a local leader of the Congress Party. He remained president during 1967-71 and even later. G.Saran, first General Secretary of the Union was also an outside leader and belonged to the Congress Party.

The course of negotiations between the recognized union and the management was also influenced by politicians. For instance, an agreement relating to wages in 1970, following the recommendations of the Wage Board for Engineering Industries, was made with the help of both K.N. Pradhan and Ganga Ram Tiwari. One trade union leader said, "Public Sector management does not want anything. They want only what the Minister wants. They are not interested in industrial relations". A management repre-
sentative said, "The management listens to HEEU, because it has political pulls".

In the case of HESTU (later called HEMTU) the communist leaders, at the centre and state levels, took a keen interest in its working. They addressed public meetings, helped in strikes and negotiations and raised questions in Parliament about the problems of workers in HE(I)L. The prominent central leaders of the communist party who took interest in the working of the union were: S.M. Banerjee, Satish Loomba and Inderjit Gupta. Some of the local communist leaders who actively participated in the union activity were Homi F. Dazi, President Madhya Pradesh AITUC, and Shakir Ali Khan. Homi F. Dazi was also president of HEMU during 1969-70.

HEFWU (affiliated to EMS), the third important union in the plant, did not have much following till 1964. But it started gaining strength after HESTU became weak in 1964. During 1967, when the SVD Government, with the Jan Sangh as the major partner, came to power in Madhya Pradesh, this union gained more prominence. However, after the decline of the SVD Government in 1969, this union also forfeited much of its importance. This union opposed all the strikes launched by HEMTU. One trade union leader said, "EMS people cannot sit with communists, because the state leaders are not interested".

Interviews with the management and trade union representatives revealed that 15 out of 19 management personnel in HE(I)L, considered the role of political leaders in trade unions as harmful. One management representative said, "Politicians have played a most unconstructive role. They instigate workers to demand more
benefits without realizing the consequences on production and discipline*. Out of 17 trade union leaders, eight said that the role of politicians should continue in the same manner as hitherto, while seven were of the opinion that their domination should be reduced. Only one trade union leader wanted their role to increase.

Political Involvement of the Union in ITI

Unlike HE(I)L, the trade union's involvement in politics was very low in ITI. Ever since its inception, the union leaders consistently resisted any external political interference in the affairs of the union. Initially A.N.Singh, the Secretary of the union, tried to instil communist ideology, but he, along with other leaders of communist leanings, was routed in the 1963 union elections.

Internal leaders, no doubt, had political links. For example, at the time of this survey (1971), ten ITIEU leaders belonged to the Congress (Ruling) three belonged to Jan Sangh, one to the Praja Socialist Party and one to the Congress (Organization). But it was reported that none of these leaders allowed their political leanings to influence the union affairs. For instance, it was learnt that the Vice-President of the union, a staunch supporter of the Congress had gone outside Bangalore to canvass for his party during the 1967 general elections. The President of the union said, "Politics may be in the union but party politics is off".

The respondents stated that ITIEU did not participate in any movement at the state or central level, which was inspired by political motives. For instance, ITIEU did not participate
In the Public Sector Undertakings Employees Conference and hunger strike in 1964 (involving workers of various public sector plants of Bangalore) as they were organized by AITUC.

In this connection, it may be stated that the union could not get much support from leaders of outside bodies at times of its crisis. During the stay-in strikes of 1964 and 1966 by the workers of ITI, the union leaders went to Delhi to gain political support. They met politicians of almost all the parties, but they could not secure the requisite support.

Interviews with management and trade union leaders revealed that all the 14 management respondents considered the role of political leaders in the union affairs to be harmful. Fourteen trade union leaders out of 18 interviewed said that the role of political leaders in the union should be reduced as far as possible. Thus a larger number of trade union leaders in ITI than in HE(I)L were against the intervention of political leaders in trade unions.

The analysis shows that although trade union leadership in ITI was shared by leaders with various political leanings the involvement of the union in politics was very low.

**POSITION OF TRADE UNIONS VIS-À-VIS MANAGEMENT IN HE(I)L**

In HE(I)L, the attitude of the management towards HEU, the recognized union, was favourable. The management took all steps to encourage that union. The Madhya Pradesh Industrial Relations Act, 1960, also gave much importance to the recognized union. Under that Act, only a recognized union had the power to bargain with the management. The management could not introduce a change
in the conditions of work without making an agreement with the recognized union. The recognized union alone could collect subscriptions and hold meetings inside the premises of the undertaking. For group grievances, only the recognized union could go to a court of law or ask for conciliation and arbitration. It alone could nominate members to the Joint Committee and other Bipartite committees. Apart from these statutory facilities, the management also provided office accommodation and a telephone to the recognized union.

However, a majority of the workers, trade union leaders and some management personnel said that the attitude of the management towards unrecognized unions, especially the unions which participated in the strikes, was not co-operative. During 1962 and 1964 the services of a large number of union leaders and active workers of the striking unions were suspended or terminated. In 1964, about 30 workers were sent to jail, some of them for two years, under the Defence of India Rules. At the time of the strike in 1969, about 25 workers were suspended. One trade union leader said in a dejected tone: "The trade union movement is crushed, trade union leaders are tired and they fear to take action. New leaders are not forthcoming". One worker remarked, "The policy of termination of the services of active workers had created terror in the minds of employees". Another worker said, "If any one of us becomes a member of any union, a charge sheet is likely to be issued against him. At the time of promotion that fact would also create difficulties. It is of course confidential, but generally

19. Ibid., Sections 26 and 28.
20. Ibid., Section 36.
it is seen that those who are attached to the unrecognized unions do not get promotion even if they are superior or senior". One management member said that unions in HE(I)L had been reduced to a nullity.

POSITION OF TRADE UNION VIS-A-VIS MANAGEMENT IN ITI

The management in ITI had provided a large number of facilities to the union such as (a) office accommodation; (b) factory premises for holding meetings; (c) internal telephone connections to the office bearers; and (d) leave to the employees and executive committee members to attend meetings. The management also provided check-off facilities to the union during 1964 and again in 1972.21

The union had also been playing a constructive role. One management member said, "The union co-operates with the management in building up efficiency". One worker said, "The management is not our enemy. The policy of give and take is followed". However, one trade union leader said, "The management does not treat us as co-partners".

UNION MEMBERSHIP

In this section we shall study the membership of unions in the two plants. We shall take into account the estimated membership of the union in the whole of the plant and the membership of unions of workers in the sample.

Union Membership in HE(I)L

In HE(I)L, the Heavy Electricals Employees Union, the Heavy Electricals Mazdoor Trade Union and the Heavy Electricals Factory Workers Union claimed to have a membership of more than

21. Check-off facility was withdrawn in December 1964 due to the strike launched by the union.
Table 5.1). This indicates that membership figures were politically manipulated.

Moreover, the table shows that about 59% of the workers in the sample were members of one union or another. About 28% of the total respondents belonged to HEMTU and 26% to HESU.

**Union Membership in ITI**

Table 5.2 shows the growth of membership of the ITI Employees Union during the period 1961 to 1973.

**TABLE 5.2**
Membership of the union and degree of unionization between 1961-73 in ITI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Union membership as indicated by subscriptions paid</th>
<th>Strength of workers</th>
<th>Degree of unionization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960-61</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-62 23</td>
<td>3,105</td>
<td>8,050</td>
<td>38.5 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964 December</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>9,679</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-December</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>10,354</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>11,143</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>12,048</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>12,378</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>9,165</td>
<td>12,787</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5,052</td>
<td>13,211</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>6,309</td>
<td>13,641</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>8,269</td>
<td>14,090</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>13,509</td>
<td>15,629</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Data obtained from the union records.
24. Strength of workers who joined the union upto 1962 is approximate.
It was found that the introduction of check-off system in 1964 and again in 1972 increased the membership of the union. The membership was about 75% of the unionizable strength in 1964 and 86% in the year 1972. The membership also rose with the approach of the union elections. For example, there was a sharp increase near the elections of 1966, 1969 and 1972. The membership declined during 1965 and 1967 probably due partly to the failure of the 1964 and 1966 strikes and partly to the withdrawal of the check-off facility. The membership also received a boost from some notable successes of the union. For instance, a part of the increase in membership of 1969 could be ascribed to the fact that the union had won the dearness allowance case in the supreme court in the year 1968.

In our sample, we find that 165 (31.2%) of the workers interviewed were members of the union. It is thus clear that a very large percentage of workers in our sample in ITI were members of the union as compared to the membership of different unions put together in HE(I)L.

Why Workers Join the Union

To find out why workers joined the union: in the two plants under study, nine alternative reasons were presented to them and they were asked to choose three of them in the order of importance.

The reason which ranked first in both the plants was 'to get a raise in wages'. The findings of the present study are in

25. Membership was calculated on the basis of full year's subscription. As each member used to pay subscription of Re.1 in a year, the average membership has been calculated by dividing the total collection in a year by three. These membership figures might be under-estimates, but they serve to give us an idea as to how membership increased or decreased.

26. For the major reasons, as given by workers, for joining the unions in HE(I)L and ITI see Appendix 5.2.
agreement with K.N. Vaid and also Sinha and Paul. To provide safeguards against victimization was given the second rank in HE(I)L and the third in ITI. To solve individual grievances as a reason to join the union was given the third rank in HE(I)L and the fourth in ITI. There is strength in unity was given second rank in ITI and the fourth in HE(I)L. Spearman's rank correlation was applied between the rank orders of the two plants. It was found to be 0.77. This indicates that the rank orders are to a large extent similar in the two plants.

**Why Workers Do Not Join Unions**

Workers, who had not joined the unions in the two plants, were asked why they did not do so. Five alternative reasons were given to them, and they were asked to tick any two of them in the order of importance.

In HE(I)L the non-members gave first rank to the existence of a multiplicity of unions as a reason for not joining any union. One worker said, "We are tired of so many unions. It is an insult to be a member of a union". Workers who did not join any union also felt that unions did not do anything substantial. This reason was given the second rank by the workers. The fear of victimization was given the third rank. A worker in HE(I)L said, "I do not want to spoil my career, as all active members are disliked by the management". Another said, "By following the union I was ruined. I was suspended for nine months". The fourth rank for not joining the union was given to the domination of unions by politicians and the fifth rank to outside leadership.

---

29. For major reasons, as given by workers, for not joining the union see Appendix §3.2.
In ITI the number of workers who did not join the union was very small, being only 3.3% of the workers' sample. The above questions did not appear to apply to their case. However, a number of comments for not joining the union were obtained in the course of interviews. These related to the following: (i) Language problem; (ii) delay in the redressal of the grievances of the workers; and (iii) union leaders did not approach for collection of funds.

WORKERS' PARTICIPATION IN TRADE UNIONS

In this section we propose to study: (a) the extent of the workers' participation in the unions; (b) the difference between the two plants as regards the workers' participation; and (c) the relationship of workers' participation in the union with other variables.

Extent of Workers' Participation in the Unions

A large majority of workers in both the plants (95% in ITI and 74% in HE(I)L) read notice boards and pamphlets of the union. They also talked about the union affairs (90% in ITI and 76% in HE(I)L) and participated in the strikes started by union/unions (78% in ITI and 74% in HE(I)L). In both the plants, only a few workers collected funds for the unions or participated in discussions at the meetings of the unions or canvassed support for the union. However, in ITI a larger number of workers (86%) attended the general body meetings than in HE(I)L (23%). In ITI 97% of the workers said that they voted for the union leaders at

For the table showing the extent of workers' participation in the Trade Union Activity see Appendix 5.
the time of elections for the office-bearers of the union while in HE(1)L a few workers (17%) said that they had voted for the union leaders, as there were very few elections of office-bearers of the unions. Similarly 55% of the respondents in ITI and 31% in HE(1)L said that they visited the union office. The findings of the present study in ITI were contrary to the findings of N.R. Sheth,31 as well as of S.M. Pandey and C.H. Vikram 32 which showed that average member of a union was indifferent or apathetic to its day to day working.

Difference Between HE(1)L and ITI in Workers' Participation in Trade Union Activity

As we have already seen, in ITI there was only one union, while there were 34 unions and associations in HE(1)L. Several studies have shown that a multiplicity of unions weakens trade unionism and is not conducive to workers' mobilisation. 34 Hence it was expected that workers' participation in trade unions would be higher in ITI than in HE(1)L. The findings are depicted in Table 8.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant</th>
<th>Number of workers below median</th>
<th>Number of workers above median</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE(1)L</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITI</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 25.9829** Degree of Freedom = 1

33. For the items selected to measure union participation and their correlation values see Appendix 1.4(b).
It was found that the workers' participation in trade union activity was significantly different in the two plants. The value of chi-square is significant at 1% level. The workers' participation in trade union activity was higher in ITI than in KE(I)I.

Relationship Between Union Participation and Other Variables

Education. The present study did not find any significant relationship between education and union participation in either of these plants. Studies conducted by Dr. Sheth and Baldev R. Sharma also did not find any significant relationship between education and union participation.

Age. It was found that age and union participation were significantly related in ITI, but not in KE(I)I. The results in regard to ITI agree with those of Dr. N.R. Sheth.

Length of Service. It was found that length of service and union participation were positively related in ITI. The findings of the present study in ITI agree with those of Glick and others. However, this relationship was not significant in KE(I)I. It may be because in a plant which has a single strong union, workers with longer service tend to develop closer bonds with it. Thus it may also be hypothesised that longer service is a helpful factor in union participation in a single union structure plant.

Marital Status. It was expected that unmarried workers would be participating more in the union activity than those hampered by

the constraints of wedlock. This expectation, however, was belied by the data. In this respect, the results of the present study differ from those of R.K. Sharma who had reported a significant relationship between union participation and marital status.

**Aspiration for Promotion.** Workers with a higher aspiration for promotion exhibited a higher union participation in HE(I)L, but it was not so in ITI. It is interesting to note that the findings in ITI agree with those of R.K. Sharma in HE(I)L with those of Farm and Dansereau.

### Table A.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>HE(I)L</th>
<th>ITI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Education</td>
<td>10.9068</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>10.118</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Length of service</td>
<td>3.4657</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marital status</td>
<td>2.4281</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aspiration for promotion</td>
<td>9.8964*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wage satisfaction</td>
<td>1.4430</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Satisfaction with supervisory behaviour</td>
<td>3.5112</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workers' participation in the bi-parte committee</td>
<td>9.5*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Union identification</td>
<td>5.0734</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Union affiliation</td>
<td>5.0734</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 5% level. **Significant at 1% level.

39. Baldev R. Sharma, Op. Cit., p. 120.
40. Baldev R. Sharma, Ibid., p. 122.
42. For the corresponding contingency tables to these Chi-square values see Appendix 5.8.
Wage Satisfaction. It was expected that workers with lower wage satisfaction would participate more in the union. We found that the data in ITI supported our hypothesis, but the relationship between wage satisfaction and union participation was not significant in BE(I).L.

Satisfaction with Supervisory Behaviour. Workers with some resentment against their supervisors may be motivated to participate more in the union activity. However, the present study did not show any significant relationship between workers' satisfaction with their supervisors and their participation in the trade union activity. The Chi-square values in the two plants are not significant at 5% level.

Union Identification. It was found that workers with higher union identification participated more in the trade union activities in ITI than workers with lower union identification. However, this association was not significant in BE(I).L.

Workers' Participation in the Bi-partite Committees. It was hypothesized that workers who involve themselves more in other similar social activities in the plant are likely to be more active in the union. It was found that workers with higher participation in the bi-partite committees also participated more in the trade union activity in both the plants.

Union Affiliation. Union affiliation and union participation were not significantly related in BE(I).L, because there was no significant difference in the union participation by members of different unions such as INTUC, AITUC etc. Indeed, union activity in that plant was very low at the time of this survey.

43. This value could not be calculated for ITI as there was only one union in the plant.
Union Participation: Regression Analysis

The regression analysis shows that all the sixteen variables combined in HE(I)L could explain 45\% of the variation in union participation.\(^44\) We retained only four variables through stepwise regression analysis (the value of each of them was significant at 5\% level). With the help of these four variables, we could explain 41\% of the variation of the dependent variables. In ITI, the total explanation by the independent variables was about 58\%. With the help of five variables, retained through the process of stepwise regression, we could explain about 54\% of the variation of the dependent variables in ITI. The most important factor influencing workers' participation in the union activity, in both the plants, was union identification.

In HE(I)L, regression analysis shows that union identification, militancy, aspiration for promotion and workers' participation in the bi-partite committees on the one hand and union participation\(^45\) on the other were positively related. Except for union identification, similar conclusions were arrived at with the help of Chi-square analysis. It means that the relationship between union identification and union participation existed in HE(I)L, provided other factors were held constant.

**TABLE 5.5**

Relationship between union participation and other variables: Regression Analysis: HE(I)L

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B's</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Proportion of variance explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Union identification</td>
<td>.1713**</td>
<td>7.6180</td>
<td>.2444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Militancy</td>
<td>.0555*</td>
<td>2.0737</td>
<td>.0294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aspiration for promotion</td>
<td>.3196*</td>
<td>2.5183</td>
<td>.0431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workers' participation in the bi-partite committees</td>
<td>.0189**</td>
<td>4.2172</td>
<td>.0895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\alpha = -.0301\)

\(R^2 = .4064\)

\(F = 30.8199**\)

\(^44\) For the regression analysis with the help of 16 variables see Appendix 5.3.\(^5\)

\(^45\) For relationship of militancy and union participation with the help of Chi-square see Chapter VII on Militancy of Workers.
TABLE 5.6

Relationship between Union Participation and other variables: Regression Analysis: ITI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B's</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Proportion of variance explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Union identification</td>
<td>.1775**</td>
<td>3.8122</td>
<td>.2736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>-.3410**</td>
<td>-2.8637</td>
<td>.0436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Length of service</td>
<td>.4073**</td>
<td>6.0632</td>
<td>.2238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workers' participation in the bi-partite committees</td>
<td>.0273**</td>
<td>4.7625</td>
<td>.1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisory behaviour</td>
<td>-.2216**</td>
<td>-4.4334</td>
<td>.0216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a = 2.7061 \quad R^2 = .5370 \quad F = 40.6942** \]

*Significant at 5% level. **Significant at 1% level.

Similarly in ITI, both the Chi-square and the regression analysis showed that union identification, length of service, and workers' participation in the bi-partite committees on the one hand, and union participation on the other, were positively related. However, the relationship between wage satisfaction and union participation, which emerged significant with Chi-square in ITI, disappeared through regression analysis. It shows that the effect of wage satisfaction on union participation was not independent. This variable was influencing union participation through some other variable. Similarly the relationship of age and union participation was positive through the Chi-square method, but it became negative through regression analysis.

The regression analysis in ITI also shows that satisfaction with supervisory behaviour and union participation were negatively related. Workers with unfavourable feelings towards supervisors also participated more in the trade union activity. However, Chi-square did not show significant relationship between
workers' satisfaction with supervisory behaviour and their activity in the union. This relationship emerged only when the effect of the other variables in the regression equation was held constant.

Regression analysis in HELI also shows that workers with a higher militancy were participating more in the union activity than those who had a lower militancy. In III, the relationship between union participation and militancy was not found to be significant.

UNION IDENTIFICATION

Union identification refers to the workers' attitude towards the union. If a worker feels closer to the union, his identification is said to be higher.

Union identification and union participation are often supposed to be identical, though there is considerable evidence against such an assumption. Workers may be loyal to the union without participating actively in its work. Purcell, on the basis of a detailed study of the members of Local 23 UDWA (Swift and Co.), estimated that out of 3340 workers only about 40 were very active and 500 were occasionally active, yet he estimated that almost 50% of the workers were very favourable to the union and 30% were favourable. 46

A Likert type scale was formed to measure identification with the union. It had five items. The items were selected on the basis of correlational values between scores on individual items and the total score. 47

47. For items selected and their correlation values, see Appendix 1.4c.
The findings regarding union identification have been divided into two parts. In the first part, differences in the extent of union identification among workers of HE(I)L and ITI are considered. In the second part, an attempt is made to see the relationship between union identification and other variables.

**Differences in Union Identification of Workers in HE(I)L and ITI**

A larger number of workers in ITI than in HE(I)L perceived that the union was successful in securing benefits for them. So it was expected that union identification would be higher in ITI than in HE(I)L.

**Table A.7**

Comparison of Union Identification in HE(I)L and ITI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>Number of workers above median</th>
<th>Number of workers below median</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE(I)L</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITI</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C²-1-square = 14.300444; Degree of Freedom = 1

The median test shows a significant difference in union identification in the desired direction between the workers' samples of HE(I)L and ITI, and thus supports our hypothesis.

In HE(I)L identification of workers with unions had been varying over a period of time. Before 1964 when HESTU was strong, the workers accepted its leadership. As one worker put it, "If the leader raises his hand, one thousand workers will stand where they are". Another worker said, "Workers were ready to sit in the sun for the whole day at the call of the leader". After 1964 when HESTU became weak and a number of unions and associations cropped up, the faith of the workers in the leadership dwindled. One trade
union leader admitted: "Trade unionism has got no charm in HE(I)L. Even a peon would not like to listen to us".

Relationship Between Union Identification and Other Variables

It was expected that age and union identification would be positively related. As workers mature in age they may develop closer and stronger bonds with the union. It was also expected that married workers would be less close to the union as they have greater responsibilities than the unmarried workers. However, contrary to our expectations, union identification was not found to be significantly related to either age, or marital status. Similarly no significant relationship was found between wage satisfaction and union identification. This was the position in both the plants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>HE(I)L</th>
<th></th>
<th>ITI</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>4.2399</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9080</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Marital status</td>
<td>0.1715</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3289</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wage satisfaction</td>
<td>2.5909</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9393</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interest in the job</td>
<td>1.5938</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8238*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was also found that in ITI, workers with a higher interest in the job identified themselves more with the union than those who had a low interest in the job. Chi-square value is significant at 5% level. In HE(I)L, no significant relationship was found.

48. For the corresponding contingency tables to these chi-square values see Appendix 5.7.
ship existed between interest in the job and union identification. The management and the union in ITI, by and large, co-operated with each other. It was reported that the management did not harass workers due to their trade union activity. Hence workers with interest in work in ITI might have identified themselves with the union.

**ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE UNION**

Achievements of the Unions in HE(I)L

Agreements were reached between the management and the recognized unions on a number of issues like wages, working conditions and welfare facilities. The general feeling of workers in HE(I)L had been that it was due to the pressure of the unrecognized unions, especially the strike calls of HESTU, (later called HEMTU), that the management was forced to negotiate with the recognized union.

When asked about the success of recognized union in negotiating with the management, 14.9% of the respondents said that the recognized union was successful in negotiating with the management while 60.8% said that it was partly successful. About 17% considered it a failure. As regards the factors responsible for negotiations between the recognized union and the management, the respondents gave first rank to justified demands. 'Other unions were strong' was considered by the workers as the second most important reason. One worker remarked, "If the INTUC gives a notice of change, the management does not listen. If unrecognized unions go on strike, the management listens to INTUC". 'Unity of workers' and co-operative attitude of the management received third and fourth rank.
TABLE A.2

Workers' perception of the reasons for the success of negotiations between the management and the recognized union in HE(I)I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>First Priority</th>
<th>Second Priority</th>
<th>Total Weight</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unity of workers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Justified demands</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capable Union leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Co-operative attitude of the management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other unions were strong</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE A.10

Workers' perception of the reasons for the failure of negotiations between the management and the recognized union in HE(I)I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>First Priority</th>
<th>Second Priority</th>
<th>Total Weight</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disunity of workers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unjustified demands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incompetent leadership</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unco-operative attitude of the management</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, for the failure of negotiations between the management and the recognized union, the first rank went to 'incompetent leadership'. The second rank went to 'unco-operative attitude of the management'. The third rank was given to 'disunity of workers'.

Achievement of the Union in IIT

IIT Employees Union was in a position to achieve various monetary and non-monetary benefits for workers. It was described for various achievements about wage, welfare and working conditions see Chapters II, IV, V and VIII.
as a "model in the field of modern trade unionism". 50

Unlike HE(I)L, about 44% of the workers interviewed in ITI said that the recognized union was successful in negotiating with the management, while 37.6% said that the recognized union was partly successful in this respect. Only 2% said that the recognized union was not successful.

In successful cases of negotiations 'unity of workers' was given the first rank and capable union leadership was given the second rank. The third and fourth ranks went to 'justified demands' and 'cooperative attitude of the management' respectively.

**TABLE 5.11**

Workers' perception of the reasons for the success of negotiations between the recognized union and the management in ITI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>First priority</th>
<th>Second priority</th>
<th>Total weight</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unity of workers</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Justified demands</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Capable Union leadership</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cooperative attitude of management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5.12**

Workers' perception of the reasons for failure of negotiations between the recognized union and the management in ITI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>First priority</th>
<th>Second priority</th>
<th>Total weight</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disunity of workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unjustified demands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incompetent leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unco-operative attitude of management</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. One of the remarks by 60 education officer trainees from all over India, who visited ITI in 1962.
According to the workers the main reason for the failure of negotiations in ITI was the uncooperative attitude of the management.

TRADE UNIONS IN OTHER PUBLIC SECTOR PLANTS

The two studies conducted by the Implementation and Evaluation Division of the Ministry of Labour and Employment — one of 205 public sector units for the year 1968 and the other of 241 public sector units for the year 1971 bring out the following facts about the trade unions in these plants.

Out of the 205 plants studied in the first survey 120 had unions, 134 of them had more than one. Out of 241 plants studied for 1971, 199 had unions, 147 of them had more than one. It shows that the number of plants having more than one union increased, but the number of plants with only one union declined from 56 in 1968 to 52 in 1971. This implies that under the existing industrial relations system, the tendency is towards the multiple union structure.

A majority of the plants, covered under these two studies, provided recognition to the union/unions. Out of 120 units with trade unions in 1968, 134 units recognised unions. In 1971, on the other hand, 150 out of 199 units, had recognised unions.

The study conducted by the Implementation and Evaluation Division for 1968 revealed that the largest number of recognised unions (78) were affiliated to INTUC. This was followed by HMS(21) and AITUC (12). The remaining recognised unions were

either not affiliated to any central organisation of workers or were affiliated to United Trade Union Congress (UTUC), Hind Mazdoor Panchayat (HMP) or Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh (BMS).

CONCLUSIONS

(a) There were variations in the trade union structure in the two plants. HE(I)L had a multiple union structure, while in ITI there was only one union. Three major unions of HE(I)L were affiliated to different central trade union organisations, while the union in ITI had an independent entity. In HE(I)L, elections of the office bearers and the executive committee members of the various unions were irregular. In ITI these elections were regular.

(b) The recognized unions in both the plants were provided with a large number of facilities. In HE(I)L, the non-recognized unions, though, at times, they had a fairly large following, were debarred from all types of facilities. The Madhya Pradesh Industrial Relations Act, 1960, also did not provide for any facility to be given to a non-recognized union.

(c) In HE(I)L, the attitude of the management towards unrecognized trade unions was allegedly inequitable. A weaker union had been recognized, though a stronger union was clamouring for recognition. Trade union activity was discouraged. Hostile relations between the union and the management continued between 1960-70. In ITI the attitude of the management and the union towards each other, by and large, was cooperative. Generally, the management did not intervene in independent trade union activity.
(d) Involvement of outside political leaders was high in HE(I)L. The unions were politically conscious and their activities appeared to be politically motivated. Different political parties shared the leadership of different unions. Political leaders helped their affiliated unions during strikes and at the time of negotiations.

On the other hand, in ITI, it was reported that though the leaders of the union had political links, they did not allow their political leanings to influence the union affairs. From the very inception of the union, the union leaders agreed to exclude party politics from the affairs of the union. In contrast, in HE(I)L, the militant activity started from the very beginning. "Inside" leaders had to take the help of political leaders from outside to pressurize the management.

In ITI, all the management personnel interviewed, and in HE(I)L, a large majority of them, were against the interference of political parties in trade unions. Similarly a large majority of trade union leaders interviewed in ITI, and half of them in HE(I)L, were against external political interference.

(e) Although, in HE(I)L, a majority of the management personnel, trade union leaders and workers were opposed to the existence of a multiple-union structure, a large number of unions continued to exist in the plant. In ITI, a large majority of workers, trade union leaders and management personnel were in favour of continuation of the single union. However, some difficulties in maintaining the solidarity of the union in ITI, such as the language problem did exist.
(f) A multiple union structure affected collective bargaining in HE(I)L in three ways: (a) All the unions never went on strike simultaneously. One group of unions would try to break the strike started by another group of unions. Although the number of strikes increased, it only weakened the capacity of the unions to stage a successful strike; (b) rival unions assured workers higher benefits than they could actually get through negotiations between the management and the recognized union; and (c) intra-group rivalries also affected their bargaining power.

(g) A very large percentage of workers in our sample were members of the union in ITI as compared to the membership of different unions put together in HE(I)L. In HE(I)L, no proper membership records were kept by the unions. Membership figures were also manipulated due to political reasons.

In ITI, the degree of unionization increased with the approach of the elections of office bearers and the executive committee members of the union; or when the union had achieved some major demand of the workers; or when the management introduced check-off. Conversely, the degree of unionization declined immediately after the failure of strikes in 1964 and 1966.

(h) The ranking pattern shows that the reasons which motivated workers to join any union were more or less similar in both the plants. The economic reasons received the highest priority on the part of workers in both the plants. The most important reasons given by the workers in HE(I)L for not becoming members of a union were: (a) multiplicity of unions; (b) unions were not doing anything substantial; and (c) fear of victimization.

(i) It was found that the workers' participation in the trade union activities was significantly higher in the single-union
structure plant than in the multiple-union structure plant (Table 5.3).

(j) No significant relationship was found between union participation on the one hand and education and marital status on the other in both the plants.

Chi-square analysis in ITI further shows a positive relationship between age, union identification and workers' participation in the bi-partite committees on the one hand and union participation on the other. Moreover, in ITI, workers with low wage-satisfaction participated more in the trade union activity. In EB(II), on the other hand aspiration for promotion and workers' participation in the bi-partite committees on the one hand and union participation on the other were positively related.

Regression analysis for union participation gave very promising results in both the plants. Total explanation of union participation by the independent variables was about 68% in ITI and 45% in EB(II).

In EB(II), regression analysis brought out a significant relationship between union identification and union participation. Similarly, in ITI relationship between wage satisfaction and union participation completely disappeared through regression analysis, while relationship between supervisory behaviour and union participation emerged significant. The relationship of age and union participation in ITI was positive through the chi-square method, but it became negative through regression analysis. Results of other relationships through regression analysis were similar to that of chi-square analysis.

(k) Workers' identification with the union was significantly higher in ITI than in EB(II) (Table 5.7). The study does not find
any significant relationship between union identification on the one hand, and age, marital status and wage satisfaction on the other.

In ITI workers with high interest in work identified more with the union. In HE(I)T no significant relationship existed between these two variables. It may be because the management of ITI did not harass the workers due to their trade union activity.

In ITI workers had the feeling that the union had been able to secure monetary and non-monetary benefits for them. It is clear from the fact that a majority of workers, when interviewed, said that the union had been successful in negotiating with the management. Among the reasons for success of the union the first rank was given to 'unity of workers' and the second to 'capable union leadership'.

In HE(I)T on the other hand, various issues like wages, working conditions and welfare facilities were settled through negotiations between the management and the recognized union. However, the general feeling entertained by workers was that the success of the recognized union was the result of the pressure exerted by unrecognized unions, especially the strike calls given by HESTU (later called HEMTU). It was believed that because of these strike calls the management was forced to negotiate with the recognized union and came to an agreement. For the success of the recognized union in negotiating with the management workers gave first rank to 'justified demands' and the second rank to 'other unions were strong' (See Tables 5.9 to 5.12).