PROCESS OF GRIEVANCE MANAGEMENT IN HEALTH CARE ORGANIZATION: AN EMPLOYEE PERSPECTIVE
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Abstract

An investigation into the grievance management process of organizations is imperative with an increasing concern over healthy work cultures in organizations. Using a behavior-response model, a structured survey was administered to employees of a leading healthcare institute to explore their perspectives on the grievance management process. According to the findings of the study, there is a strong association between grievance management constructs and the grievance management process, and factors like acceptance of grievance by supervisors, supervisors’ attitudes toward grievant, and employee and supervisor trust play an important role in grievance resolution (Monish & Dhanabhakyam, 2022; Ochieng & Kamau, 2021; Elbaz et al., 2022; Casper, 2021; Kimotho & Ogol, 2021; Dichner, 2021; Akhtar, 2021; Singh & Agarwal, 2022; Hammoud et al., 2022). Based on the findings, the study delivers implications for organizations to prevent chaos, stress, and conflict in the workplace through a better grievance management process.
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1. INTRODUCTION

As people in an organization work in a culture different from the society they live, they embrace some perception psychologically towards their organization and work culture. The performance of hospital staff has always been the focus of the public and society, in particular. It has become evident that the entire hospital staff has always been committed to their schedules as the COVID-19 pandemic reformed the entire health care system. Because of this busy schedule hospital staff has to maintain a tough work-life balance. Hospitals are important social institutions of human society without which the condition of human life will worsen and will always remain in threat or danger. The sole responsibility lies on the staff (be it a doctor, a nurse, a pharmacist, an attendant, helper staff, security, etc.) who work day and night treating and assisting patients to improve their lives. Every human being and every community has appreciated their efforts in difficult times like the pandemic. Many health workers have sacrificed their lives for the community but people will never forget them as their service to the community is outstanding and cannot be compensated by any means. Being overloaded with patients a hospital staff working day and night might feel tired and stressed. In developing countries, hospitals (especially, public hospitals) always remain overloaded with patients and the health employee works tirelessly in delivering services to the public and, in turn, expects the attention of management to be acknowledged. If the health workers are not very well motivated and concerned in delivering their service then the entire system may break down and society may suffer. This may be primarily due to the grievances of employees with their management or employers. With a serious role to play, the management of hospitals must always rectify the problems of staff at the earliest.

A grievance is any actual or perceived sense of personal discrimination in an employee’s working relationship. Therefore, the grievance is a deterioration of human relations and would include any discontent or disappointment experienced by an employee affecting the performance of the organization directly or indirectly (Lazarro, 2022). It is the moral responsibility of administrators and researchers to have a timely check whether the people who work in organizations feel satisfied with their employers or not. Do they have any kind of grievance? Are their grievances heard and mitigated properly? Is there justice, equity, and transparency? What is the employee turnover rate? Why is it happening? And many other issues alike. A grievance is an inherent part of the employee-employer relationship (Gunnigle & Brady, 1984; Holdford & Lovelace-Elmore, 2001; Syed & Yan, 2012; Singh & Mehra, 2012; Budd, 2020; Wu et al., 2021; Ochieng & Kamau, 2021; Casper, 2021; Dichner, 2021; Hammoud et al., 2022). In organizations, there are chances of disagreement and there might be different explanations for the event of complaints (Klaas, 1989a), such as an excess of responsibility, job shifts, inability to have common trust, absence of acknowledgment, unmanageable work pressure, absence of offices, absence of collaboration, and absence of regard for the people. Complaints need to be addressed immediately; otherwise confrontational issues may escalate. Although unresolved conflicts do not often result in confrontational conflicts, they can contribute to destructive employee behavior that is detrimental to productivity (Klaas, 1989b). As a result, dispute handling is a major issue in industrial relations/human resource management (HRM) (Harlos, 2010). Reasonable management tackles and corrects grievances when they appear, while outstanding management anticipates and avoids them from occurring. Wages, bonuses, rewards, rewards for services, administrative action, fines, raises, leave, medical care, the essence of the work, termination of wages, recovery of dues, superannuation, safety appliance, supersession, transfer, conditions of work, and supervision are some of the reasons for grievance. In this methodology, the idea of conflict in the workplace is understated or even not acknowledged. It arose at first in the US during the 1990s as different political and monetary elements thrilled sensational changes to the work environment resolution of disputes (Lipsky et al, 2003). Rather than relying on regulatory or aggregate approaches to resolving workplace disputes, employers increasingly prefer personal (high accountability) tactics and voice instruments (Klaas, 1989a; Seeber & Lipsky, 2006).

This paper explores the opinions of employees and highlights the principal factors influencing the resolution of grievances in one of the leading hospitals of the Kashmir division regarding the handling of grievances in their respective organizations by their supervisors.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 1 deals with the introduction of the grievance aspect in organizations. Section 2 deals with the systematic literature review. Section 3 deals with the conceptual framework and hypothesis development. Section 4 introduces the methodology used in the study. Section 5 presents the analysis of the data and findings of the study. Section 6 offers findings and discussions. Finally, Section 7 puts forth the conclusion, some implications, future research perspectives, and limitations of the study.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on grievance management is promising, and yet the consideration of its background and consequences remain amorphous. In spite of the fact that organizations attempt to determine the issues of their inner clients by their own technique and practices, yet what amount fulfilled a worker is with the system or the movement of complaint the executives in their organizations involve concern. In view of this, different scholars and researchers have given their own findings to understand how employees actually feel about grievance management in their organizations. The effective use of grievance mediation frameworks by organizations is crucial in resolving member concerns as a genuine subject for advancing justice and avoiding controversy or confrontation. This is further elaborated as follows.

2.1. Origin of grievance

According to Averini (2012), grievance involves employee discontent which typically arises in the presence of unequal treatment. Incompetence exposed by company managers to maintain
the actual code of ethics and repetitive processes at different corporate levels inevitably raises employee dissatisfaction. According to Baumruk (2010), the management of a company is highly engaged in enhancing the aims of the company and is inattentive towards increasing the stress level among employees, not enough holidays are offered, and are left leave less, directed towards work. An employee comes under huge mental, physical, and psychological pressure and might get sick. This later terminates into a grievance. According to Hunter and Kleiner (2004), some of the most frequent employee grievances include unequal treatment by the boss, violated contract arrangements, and employer correspondence and defamation.

Absenteism, insubordination, misconduct, drug misuse, unsatisfactory results, and safety and health breaches are the most frequent workplace concerns of employers. Employees’ views of the attractiveness of both, the grievance operation and any possible solutions to inequity would be influenced by whether they use such a logical, calculative method when deciding whether to file a grievance (Klaas, 1989b). Individual and authoritative components cause grievances in organizations. Individual factors, such as employee personality/character, values, perspectives, convictions, information, capacities, and abilities can add to the conflict (Zakari et al., 2010; Mosadeqhrad, 2014a; Akhtar, 2021; Raphael, 2021). The fundamental explanations behind conflict in organizations, as proposed by Mosadeqhrad (2014a), Pavlakis et al. (2011), and Graham (2009), include authoritative variables, including substantial responsibility, time pressure, asset shortage, indistinct sets of responsibilities and obligations, job equivocalness, work vulnerability, helpless correspondence, word related pressure, vague guidelines and approaches, administrative assumptions, and hierarchical changes. There may be many causes of grievance to rise but only certain important causes are addressed through the literature cited above.

2.2. Determination approaches

Two general approaches to workplace dispute management were recognized by Roche and Teague (2012). One is the conventional complaint management technique, which is built up by a bunch of formal and progressive methods, and may also include an outsider (outside the association). The activity of this basic procedural methodology has been analyzed for its adequacy and significance in assorted public settings (Roche & Teague, 2012; Cooke & Saini, 2015; Seeber & Lipsky, 2006). By advising representatives to share responsibility for the organization’s objectives through the arrangement of normal interests and social qualities, high-responsibility HRM strategies and practices intend to forestall complaints by creating an atmosphere of recognition and inclusion (Roche & Teague, 2012). To effectively manage grievances, a company must scrutinize the actual reason behind the grievances of employees (Chebat, 2003). Providing a system to address employee disputes and the position of managers is essential for maintaining a harmonious working atmosphere (Rose, 2004).

The other methodology is related to high responsibility sorts of HRM strategies and practices that mean to forestall complaints by causing representatives to feel esteemed and included, by urging representatives to share responsibility for the organization’s objectives through the arrangement of normal interests and social qualities (Roche & Teague, 2012).

When managers are educated and trained, they are more able to choose suitable dispute management styles (Bohlander & Snell, 2004). Likewise, Mondy and Noe (2005) mentioned that labour relations issues will escalate if a supervisor lacks the necessary skills and expertise to resolve them at the outset, and that an aggrieved person can turn the grievance into a conflict. Other factors, such as age, gender, work experience, and education may also affect grievance filing rates, as evidenced by recent studies (Bemmels, 1994, 1991; Bemmels & Foley, 1996; Bemmels & Lau, 2001; Gordon & Miller, 1984; Bemmels et al., 1991; Lewin & Peterson, 1988; Peterson & Lewin, 2000; Kimotho & Ogol, 2021; Hammoud et al., 2022; Götzmann & Bainton, 2021; An et al., 2021). In contrast, among demographic factors, excluding educational background, Fryxell (1992) found that perceived workplace justice was not significantly influenced by demographic factors. Although the current study tracked an inverse correlation, employees with higher levels of education have more workplace equity. In complaint management, a number of people are likely to be involved as a debate progresses, from first-line, neighborhood staff to higher-level staff from the organization and professional advisors as the issue reaches higher levels. In this way, the full spectrum of development can be gathered in a complaint management process (Walker & Hamilton, 2011).

Almost every organization faces grievances and commonly used ways to identify grievances are:

- **Opinion survey:** Group meetings and periodical interviews with employees help to get information about employees' dissatisfaction before it turns in to a grievance.
- **Exit interviews:** Employees typically leave a company due to disappointment (or) a greater opportunity elsewhere.
- **Gripe boxes:** Containers in which workers anonymously lodge their grievances.

Thus, different organizations have different focuses on handling grievances in order to manage and maintain their employees in their own culture and environment. A dispute process enables employers to implement a consistent labor strategy. This will result in an early resolution of disputes or the correction of contested job problems. In comparison, the grievance process allows for the discovery of processes, activities, and management policies that trigger employee grievances, calling for improvements to be considered. Grievance management procedures assist a company in improving its corporate structure and general climate by bringing complaints into the open so that management can be aware of them and take appropriate steps to resolve them. It assists in avoiding grievances from reaching
dangerous levels by encouraging management to settle a grievance before escalating into a dispute. It is a comprehensive and timely way of addressing complaints, and it also helps managers to hear about workers’ perceptions, actions, and emotions toward the organization’s policies, rules, and procedures. With such knowledge, organizations necessarily improve in making the environment of their organization favorable for their employees.

2.3. Pervasiveness of grievance management studies

Several studies have advanced over a period of time in the field of grievance management and have contributed to making the grievance system more robust and active. According to Nurse and Devonish (2007) and Beugre (1998), the grievance system and frameworks should possess certain characteristics, to ensure their adequacy; executives must possess certain characteristics and demonstrate the application of specific criteria. Hierarchical equity, which involves a worker’s relationship with managers, subordinates, superiors, and the organization as a whole, refers to “the apparent reasonableness of the transactions taking place in an organization” (Nurse & Devonish, 2007; Beugre, 1998). As identified by Myer (1994), a labour management climate that emphasizes friendliness and concord lowers the probability of filing complaints, and it also helps managers to hear about grievances. The likelihood of filing complaints was negatively associated with attempting to determine debates casually among shop-stewards (Bemmels, 1991). The use of a suitable style or mixture of styles to address complaints would aid in the settlement of grievances in a mutually beneficial and satisfactory manner (Rollinson, 2000). As per the workers, the disposition of directors, the time taken to give the choice, and the subsequent system are generally essential for the viability of the method. The development of relationships among laborers and executives is a way to accomplish effective industrial relations (Geetika et al., 2014). Powerful complaint handling is a critical component of building great representative relationships and operating a fair, efficient, and profitable work environment (Geetika et al., 2014). The most ideal approach to settle a protest or complaint is at the least level (Rose, 2004). The likelihood of filing complaints was negatively associated with attempting to determine debates casually among shop-stewards (Bemmels, 1991). In the assessment of Tjosvold and Morishima (1999), organizational agents and grievant representatives should have the capacity and eagerness to discuss the issue at the initial stage and is in agreement with various scholars (e.g., Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2008; Bemmels & Foley, 1996; Lipsky et al., 2003; Lewin, 1999).

Among various mechanisms for workplace dispute management, unionized complaint strategies have been examined to the principal degree. There has been a considerable amount of research into the factors that influence the initiation of complaints (Bemmels, 1994; Racharach & Bamberger, 2004), grievance processes, as well as attitudes about and satisfaction with them (Bemmels, 1995; Bemmels & Lau, 2001), the pace at which grievances are processed (Lewin & Peterson, 1988; Ponak et al., 1996), factors that influence grievance results (Klaas, 1989a; Meyer & Cooke, 1988), the affiliation of individual and organizational success with grievance filing (Kleiner et al., 1995; Lewin & Peterson, 1988; Boswell & Olson-Buchanan, 2004) and a bunch of other similar issues. But there is an absence of acknowledged measurements for assessing complaint systems.

To formulate workers’ general assessment of the viability of complaint frameworks and their outcome, Peterson and Lewin (2000) developed a fundamental complaint-handling methodology (Dhanabhakayam & Monish, 2021; Akhtar, 2021; Monish & Dhanabhakayam, 2022; Singh & Agarwal, 2022). Various studies have shown that modest use of superior human resource strategies improves employees’ belongingness, empowerment, mission participation, job satisfaction, esteem, engagement, and citizenship actions (Huselid, 1995; Huselid et al., 1997; Farias & Varma, 1998; Handel & Gittleman, 2004). The ability to manage disputes expresses itself across five dimensions: diplomacy, detachedness, fair-mindedness, and sagacity, as suggested by Rai (2007). Walker (2009) built up a grounded hypothetical model of business and representative choice dependent on a force reliance system, as a feature of a more extensive complaint measure model. Complaints address a significant region of contemporary employment relations. In the midst of the ebb and flow of political discussions, there is a requirement for research-based proof instead of the manner of speaking: anyway at this point, the restricted existing nearby examination regularly gives clashing outcomes without clear examples (Walker & Hamilton, 2009).

Syed and Yan (2012) indicated that particular predominant practices of HRM like occupation pivot, worker participation, strengthening, merit-based advancements, and execution-based compensation and complaint dealing with measures could impact work fulfillment, job satisfaction, employee commitment, and employee productivity. Employee job-related issues and complaints that are not addressed easily and successfully result in lower morale and lower work efficiency and client services, dissatisfaction with the company’s priorities, lack of faith and miss-communication between employees and supervisors, low self-esteem, and job dissatisfaction (Syed & Yan, 2012). As a result, there will be industrial challenges, higher skiving and staff attrition, a lack of status for the employee, and decreased working hours for everyone involved. Employees who discover successful grievance mediation measures in the workplace can be more relaxed performing, more dedicated to the organization, and more pleased with their employment (Kleiner et al., 1995; Lewin & Peterson, 1988).

3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

To date, speed and satisfaction have been two of the most important estimates of grievance methods (Budd & Colvin, 2008). The speed reviews normally investigate what amount of time it requires
to determine complaints and at what step of the interaction complaints are settled. The satisfaction knowledge regularly reviews the effectiveness of the complaint methodology to gauge their impression of the complaint strategy viability (Budd & Colvin, 2008).

Previous research has found that socioeconomic influences do not have a substantial impact on views of organizational justice (Cohen-Carash & Spector, 2001), across a range of ages, genders, races, educational levels, and tenures, people perceive justice similarly. Here two main intents of grievance procedures become obvious in the literature: 1) Resolving employee complaints efficiently, fairly, and economically should be the objective of the procedure; 2) The lowest level of grievance settlement should be encouraged with all efforts (Graham & Heshizer, 1979; Knight, 1986; Briggs, 1981). Supervisors’ reactions to employees engaged in grievance operations can affect performance levels (Klaas, 1989a, 1989b; Lazaro, 2022). The speed of grievance resolution before mediation has been a significant determinant of the efficacy of grievance management (Knight, 1985). In this way, the capacity of an organization and the board to determine debates at the least conceivable level without outsider intercession is a significant proportion of compelling complaint methods (Knight, 1986). One such factor which affects grievance easing is labour-management relations. There has been a marked increase in complaints among employees and directors where there is a significant strain or difficulty between the two. This has not been limited to only large or small companies or associations, nor to a specific industry or organization (Davy et al., 1992). Some important conciliation skills are empathy and equality (Lippitt, 1982), the capacity to see problems for what they really are (Bottles, 2001), acceptance of discrepancies (Lee, 1998), and also the ability to safeguard all parties’ self-esteem (Shell, 1999). To improve the ability of executives in the work environment, grievance management should frame advancement training and leadership development programmes. This would upgrade workers’ feeling of hierarchical equity and may build their obligation to the firm (Cooke et al., 2016). To prevent and oversee work environment strains, grievance management should be considered an essential component of HRM (Cooke et al., 2016; McLean et al., 2013).

Generally, there must be three conditions before any formal or informal complaint arrangement can be set up, as recommended by the National Commission on Labour (1969) in India, specifically: satisfaction for the individual specialist, the prudent exercise of power by the director, and associational interest. Budd and Colvin (2008) suggest that grievance-handling procedures should be correlated and appraised based on three central concepts: value, performance, and voice. The proper execution of a grievance-handling framework is at the core of its efficacy. The engagement of all stakeholders is the most critical component of this operation. To make the grievance system successful, all workers, especially managers, should be the champions of the process (Geetika et al., 2014). The demeanor of the supervisor mirrors the philosophy and reasoning of the employer. Supervisors who listen to complaints, formulate a correspondence strategy, and take disciplinary action would not have a problem with handling complaints. According to Swann (1981), by posting complaint methodology and related data on the intranet, organization manuals, bulletins, and notice sheets, senior managers can improve refinement and correspondence as well as educate and train subordinates and managers about how to properly enforce it. The study is based on the behavior-response model proposed in Figure 1. The statements/variables which form the structured questionnaire of the model with reference to the grievance management process/grievance handling are presented below. Moreover, a few statements were adapted/incorporated based on expert advice as per the need of the study. So, the authors propose the following hypotheses (Table 1) with reference to the above context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1a. Proposition development: Grievance perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underlying dimensions/Variables</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1b. Proposition development: Resolution of grievance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Underlying dimensions/Variables</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Relationship with</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Contributing authors/Adopted from</th>
<th>Study hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matters of grievance are kept confidential, ability to safeguard all parties’ self-esteem, to resolve the grievance through mutual discussion, friendliness, and concord with the grievant</td>
<td>Mutual trust among employees and supervisor</td>
<td>Resolution of grievance</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Rahim (1983), Xie et al. (1998), Jules et al. (2021), Shell (1999), Gomathi (2014), Gamage and Hewagama (2007), Jules et al. (2021), Rollinson (2000), Myer (1994)</td>
<td>H4: Mutual trust among employees and supervisor has a significant association with a resolution of grievance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ compilation.

Conceptual model development: Based on the above literature, the researchers propose a conceptual/interactive framework in the form of a behavior-response model (Figure 1), which has been developed in order to test the relation between the proposed variables. Sixteen underlying variables have been correlated with the outcome variable, i.e., resolution of the grievance.

Figure 1. Conceptual model
Research objectives: The researchers tried to investigate whether the grievance management process in selected healthcare institutions leads to a favorable attitude towards the management and organization in the form of resolution of the grievance.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. Target population characteristics

The present research is an exploratory study on the perception of employees with the grievance management process in one of the leading healthcare institutions/hospitals (Sher-i-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, SKIMS) in the Kashmir division in March–June 2022. The selected health institution has more than 5000 staff members with 50 different departments including surgery, medicine, cardiology, nephrology, neurology, urology, pathology, anesthesiology, endocrinology, nuclear medicine, etc., and other allied departments like administration, pharmacy, lab, and maintenance, etc., the hospital caters an average 5000–6000 patients daily with more than 1200-bed capacity. The authors have not found any exclusive study regarding grievance management with respect to this particular health institution. The motive to uncover the underlying opinion of employees of the respective institution with respect to the grievance management process becomes the main reason to select the institution.

4.2. Methods

The study uses a structured questionnaire as a research instrument in order to get the diverse response of employees' opinions on the grievance management process followed by their respective organizations. The structured questionnaire was distributed personally to the respondents of selected healthcare institutions (job designation: doctors, nurses, lab staff, pharmacy staff, maintenance staff, clerical staff, and other staff). An equal number of responses was collected from each of the job designations mentioned. As hospital employees have a 24/7 busy schedule, taking the time constraints and busy schedule of hospital staff into consideration a short structured questionnaire (the first part refers to 4 demographic variables, evaluated on the dichotomous scale and the second part consists of 16 statements, evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree") was adopted based on the previous literature and was anticipated for the study.

4.3. Sample size

The sample was chosen through judgmental/purposive sampling to make the sample inclusive and representative of the population, the structured questionnaire was distributed personally to 250 respondents of the target population (doctors, nurses, lab staff, pharmacy staff, and other staff) and only 221 responses were observed as correct responses and 29 responses were later dropped due to biased or incomplete responses. The structured questionnaire was initially pilot tested for reliability. Initially, 55 responses were collected and tested for internal consistency; the value of α > 0.70 confirmed the reliability for the further gathering of data. Statistical analysis, such as descriptive statistics, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were used to generate results through IBM SPSS Statistics and AMOS.

5. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

5.1. Respondent’s profile

Overall, 221 responses were used for statistical analysis. More males (150 or 69.7 per cent) than females (71 or 32.1 per cent) have responded. In the age bracket of up to 35 years old — 51.1 per cent and above 35 years old, which amounts to 108 (48.9 per cent), lies the majority of the respondents. According to the education profile, 92 (41.6 per cent) of the respondents are with diploma/undergraduate and 129 (58.4 per cent) are post-graduates and above. The number of respondents who are married was 155 (70.1 per cent) and 66 (29.9 per cent) are unmarried. All the respondents witness grievance in one or the other way and perceive grievance in a similar way. Moreover, the perception of the grievance management process is not influenced by the demographic profile of the respondents (p > 0.05; Chi-square = 0.147; df = 4).

5.2. Measurement, reliability, and validity tests

We conducted a principal component analysis using IBM SPSS Statistics 22.0 with varimax rotation to extract statistically significant factors based on correlation. The Cronbach's alpha value is 0.734 and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) level of sampling adequacy is 0.735, which is above the threshold of 0.70 suggested by Demo et al. (2012), Hair et al. (1998), and Hair et al. (2006, 2007). Moreover, Demo et al. (2012) and Nunnally (1978) demonstrate that loadings in the range of 0.60 to 0.70 are good; however, loadings above 0.70 are considered excellent. The first-order CFA using AMOS 20.0 was performed and the indices show good model fitness. EFA and CFA loadings and values of Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability, and average variance extracted (AVE) are represented in Table 2. Chi-square is in the acceptable range of 3:1 with a value chi-square minimum (CMIN)/degree of freedom (df): 153.585/98 = 1.567 (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). This model demonstrates a satisfactory fit with root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of 0.051 (Byrne, 2013; Bentler & Bonett, 1980). It also possesses additional parameters of confirmation of maximum fit (implicit fit measures, measured by Hair et al., 2010, and Bagozzi and Yi, 1988), such as goodness of fit index (GFI) = 0.924, normed fit index (NFI) = 0.809, incremental fit index (IFI) = 0.921, relative fit index (RFI) = 0.766, and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) = 0.900, also parsimony fit measures lie in the acceptable range (parsimony comparative fit index — PCFI = 0.750 and parsimony normed fit index — PNFI = 0.660); model fit index (FMIN) = 0.698.
Table 2. EFA and CFA and convergent validity results of scale items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Variable code</th>
<th>EFA item loading</th>
<th>CFA item loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of grievance by supervisor (AGS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.734$; KMO = 0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance is properly attended</td>
<td>AGS1</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance filed is immediately processed</td>
<td>AGS2</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance procedure/filing grievance is simple and easy</td>
<td>AGS3</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees feel open to share grievance</td>
<td>AGS4</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real basis of the problem is identified</td>
<td>AGS5</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-discriminatory treatment with the grievant</td>
<td>AGS6</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude of supervisor (PAS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.721$, VE = 0.814, and $\text{AVE} = 0.522$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary relief is provided until final decision is reached</td>
<td>PAS1</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors understand grievance</td>
<td>PAS2</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors have friendly/sociable approach with grievant</td>
<td>PAS3</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors are authorized to take decision</td>
<td>PAS4</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust among employees and supervisor (MTES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.731$, VE = 0.819, and $\text{AVE} = 0.560$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance resolved through mutual discussion also</td>
<td>MTE51</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper records are maintained</td>
<td>MTE52</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievant confidentiality is maintained</td>
<td>MTE53</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution of grievance (ROG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.715$, VE = 0.816, and $\text{AVE} = 0.513$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance mechanism is robust</td>
<td>ROG1</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final decision favors justice</td>
<td>ROG2</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance is resolved on time</td>
<td>ROG3</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' elaboration.

5.3. Structural model

Three indices (factor loadings, AVE, and CR, as presented in Table 3) were used to examine the convergent validity. A threshold of 0.50 for factor loadings, an AVE of 0.50 for the constructs, and a composite reliability (CR) of 0.70 for each construct were recommended by (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2006). There was sufficient reliability and validity in the proposed model, according to the results. As each construct's AVE exceeded its squared correlation estimate, discriminant validity could be demonstrated (Hair et al., 2006; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 3. Convergent and discriminant validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>MSV</th>
<th>AVE item loading</th>
<th>CFA item loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGS</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>(0.730)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>(0.722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTE5</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The highlighted values in the diagonal of the above matrix are the square root of variance; AVE = Average variance extracted; MSV = Maximum shared variance; CR = Composite reliability.
Source: Authors' elaboration.

5.4. Hypothesis testing

As proposed through the conceptual model, the path analysis was further utilized to test the relationship between independent and dependent variables. The results obtained using AMOS 20.0 show an acceptable model fit for the structural model with a value of Chi-square (CMIN/df; 170.250/101 = 1.686), fit index baseline comparisons (NFI = 0.788, RFI = 0.748, IFI = 0.901, TLI = 0.879, CFI = 0.899); parsimony-adjusted measures (PNFI = 0.663; PCFI = 0.756; RMIN = 0.774, and RMSEA = 0.056.

According to the results of the relationship between constructs, as presented in Table 4, acceptance of grievance by supervisor (AGS) has a significant impact on final resolution (ROG) ($\beta = 0.028$; $p < 0.05$; variance extracted: VE = 34.651). Similarly, the positive attitude of the supervisor has a significant impact on the resolution of the grievance (ROG) ($\beta = 0.353$; $p < 0.01$; VE = 23.305). Moreover, mutual trust among employees and supervisors (MTES) plays a dominant role and has a significant impact on the final resolution of grievance (ROG) ($\beta = 0.222$; $p < 0.01$; VE = 20.32). Based on the test results, hypotheses H1, H2, and H3 state proved.

Table 4. Hypothesis testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG $\rightarrow$ AGS</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>0.026**</td>
<td>H2 supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG $\rightarrow$ MTE5</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>5.664</td>
<td>0.006***</td>
<td>H3 supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG $\rightarrow$ PAS</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>2.434</td>
<td>0.005***</td>
<td>H4 supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** significant at $p < 0.01$, ** significant at $p < 0.05$.
Source: Authors' elaboration.
6. DISCUSSION

The inferences derived from most of the studies referred to grievance management are in agreement with the present study. Myer (1994) identified that a labour management climate that emphasizes friendliness and concord will lower grievance rates and increase grievance resolution, and minimize steward political participation. Similarly, Geetika et al. (2014) express that as per the workers, the disposition of directors, the time taken in giving the choice, and the subsequent system are generally essential for the viability of the grievance method. Tjosvold and Morishima (1999) determined that administrators should have the capacity and eagerness to examine the issue with the grievant and association agents at the underlying stage itself and is in agreement with various other scholars (Lewin, 1999; Bemmels & Foley, 1996; Lipsky et al., 2003; Olson-Buchanan & Boswell, 2008). The use of a suitable style or mixture of styles in addressing complaints would aid in the settlement of grievances in a mutually beneficial and satisfactory manner (Rollinson, 2000). As part of several studies, determinants of complaints (Bacharach & Bamberger, 2004; Bemmels, 1994), attitudes, and satisfaction with grievance processes (Bemmels, 1995; Bemmels & Lau, 2001). A particular pace is set for processing grievance filings (Lewin & Peterson, 1988; Ponak et al., 1996), factors influencing grievance outcome (Klaas, 1989a; Meyer & Cooke, 1988), and organizational and individual success are connected with grievance filings (Boswell & Olson-Buchanan, 2004; Kleiner et al., 1995; Lewin & Peterson, 1988) are interconnected studies.

Similarly, artfulness, diplomacy, detachedness, fair-mindedness, and sagacity, and described the effective negotiation ability of supervisors as suggested by Rai (2007), i.e., the positive attitude of supervisor in our study, are important dimensions expressed in managing disputes and act as a set of abilities/skills needed to negotiate and handle disputes. Similarly, Rose (2004) supports the investigation that providing a system to address employees’ disputes and the position of managers were seen as essential in maintaining a harmonious working atmosphere. When managers are educated and trained, they are more able to choose suitable dispute management styles (Bohlander & Snell, 2004). This is parallel with Mundy and Noe (2005) and Rose (2004), as the authors mentioned that labour relations issues will escalate if a supervisor lacks the necessary skills and expertise to resolve them at the outset, and that an aggrieved person can turn the grievance into a conflict. Klaas (1989b), established that supervisors’ reactions to employees engaged in grievance operation can affect performance levels. The researchers also conclude that grievance procedures have three primary objectives: fostering an efficient, equitable, and economical resolution of employee complaints and at settling grievance at lowermost level in the organization (Lazaro, 2022; Knight, 1986; Briggs, 1981; Graham & Hesshizer, 1979). Similarly, Godbless et al. (2020) conclude that, regardless of the outcome of the grievance handling process, grievances are handled according to well-defined, efficient, equitable and fair procedures, which management continues to promote to employees.

The present study did not find any significant impact of demographics on the perception of the grievance management process. Similarly, previous research has also found that socioeconomic influences do not have a substantial impact on views of organizational justice (Cohen-Carash & Spector, 2001). These researchers argued that people tend to perceive justice similarly, a perceived state of justice in the workplace was not significantly influenced by age, gender, race, educational level, or tenure, according to Fryxell (1992). Like the present study, there seems little or no consensus between socioeconomic profile and perception of grievance handling by some researchers. But, unlike our results, some researchers (Bemmels, 1994; Lewin & Peterson, 1998; Bemmels, 1991; Bemmels & Foley, 1996; Gordon & Miller, 1984; Bemmels et al., 1991; Bemmels & Lau, 2001; Peterson & Lewin, 2000) make differing arguments. A significant influence on grievance filing rates is also exerted by variables such as age, gender, work experience, and education. So, no complete theory of dispute handling process exists (Bemmels & Foley, 1996) as it still remains an open topic of debate until any general consensus is reached.

7. CONCLUSION

The potential contribution that the mechanisms for addressing complaints by corporate with justice will only be maximized if administrators and trade-union officials pay attention to the efficacy of the governance systems they use to cope with occupational grievances, as well as the consistency of the outcomes that result from their use (Nurse & Devonish, 2007). Ominous conditions and changes in strategies for activity lead to expansions in complaint rates (Slichter et al., 1960). A few administration arrangements have an impact on complaint management. Consultation and interview with the organization preceding the presentation of changes that influence labourers is a regularly referenced arrangement thought to lessen complaints (Kaplan, 1950; Fleming & Witte, 1959; Slichter et al., 1960; Pettefer, 1970; Peach & Livernash, 1974; Gandz, 1979). Low complaint rates won where the board maintained the conditions of its work arrangement and did not modify starting situations on complaints; high rates won where the executives unyieldingly disregarded the work understanding or mollified the organization by consenting to its situations on grievances (Slichter et al., 1960).

Over the past few decades, legitimate, industrial relations, and organizational behavior scholars have been concentrating on hypothesis and practice through a change of authoritative dispute resolution toward an organized and proactive approach (Avgar et al., 2013; Bendersky, 2007; Colvin, 2003b; Eigen & Litwin, 2014; Colvin, 2004; Avgar, 2015).

The primary responsibility of HR and senior management should be to control conflict settlement, ensuring that the mechanism is working correctly and that any new problems are dealt with effectively. The organizational hierarchy should ensure that proper preparation is in place and that line managers receive adequate assistance and after line managers have been unable to settle conflicts they
should become personally involved (Hamberger, 2018). A neutral dispute resolution system/ framework, as suggested by Budd and Colvin (2008), would include shields, such as the ability to offer nonpartisan parties' options, as well as straightforwardness to prevent self-assured or eccentric dynamics and enhance accountability and responsibility. Further, Hamberger (2018) suggests that the process for settling conflicts should be reasonable, not exclusively should results mirror the benefits of the issue. Decision-makers ought to be honest, conscious, and accommodating in imparting choices, and ought to clarify the reasoning for their choices. To interact better with different stakeholders, managers should primarily use collaborating, compromising, and accommodating conflict management styles. By using the appropriate conflict management types and techniques, managers can keep conflicts positive by participating in relevant preparation and training programmes (Mosadeghrad & Moghafan, 2019; Oya & Schaefer, 2021; Russel, 2021).

Broken or dangerous clashes can debilitate staff, decrease inspiration and fulfillment, increment truancy and turnover, diminish the coordinated effort and commitment to deliver (Brinkert, 2010; Graham, 2009; Monish & Dhanabhakyam, 2022; Mosadeghrad, 2014b; Akta;2021; Dhanabhakyam & Monish, 2021; Wood & Lehdonvirta, 2021). Henceforth, the grievance should be overseen viably; else, it brings about additional issues and lessens authoritative efficiency. Administrators in medical care institutions should have the option to recognize the grievance and its sources, along these lines, they can utilize fitting compromise procedures to contest or animate clash (Brinkert, 2010; Graham, 2009; Mosadeghrad, 2014b).

Managers must take care to ensure that the governance structures they use for managing workplace grievances are efficient if grievance management can contribute to promoting more organizational fairness. This will derive quality outcomes from their employees. A probability of adoption of the above model has indicated the expected outcome and a unit increase in the independent variables indicates an appropriate number of times the factors have influenced overall satisfaction with the grievance management process. There is a need to further investigate, explore and contemplate other parameters of grievance management which the present study may not have considered as this domain of HRM stands important, diverse, and boundless. Moreover, this study is not the representative of insight of employees on the grievance management process in all the health institutions of India as it is limited to a particular health organization in a particular geographical area.
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