# A STUDY OF EXPECTANCY OF WELFARE MEASURES OUTSIDE THE WORKPLACE IN CEMENT INDUSTRY OF RAJASTHAN

## Anil. K. Bhatt

Professor, Pacific Institute of Business Studies, Udaipur **Lyamukuru Manirareba Olive** 

Research Scholar, Pacific University, Udaipur

## **ABSTRACT**

Labour welfare activities in India have emphasis on the organized sector like cement companies. Although provisions for workmen's compensation in case of industrial accidents and maternity benefits for women workforce had existed for long, a major development in the field of social security came only after independence. The Article 41 of Indian Constitution laid down that the State shall make effective provision for securing the right to public assistance in case of unemployment, old age, sickness and disablement and in other cases of underserved want. The Government took several steps in compliance of the constitutional requirements. There are some situational factors responsible for job satisfaction. Work environment includes many factors for overall job analysis of Workers, these are categorized into two parts Work environment inside and outside the workplace which will put an impact over the satisfaction of workers and their productivity. There are many factors which contribute for the satisfaction of workers and managers. The current study was undertaken to identify the variables essential as the respondent's perception which lead to improve their productivity. The study includes a sample of 199 workers and 51 managers and supervisors to identify their perception for welfare measures outside the workplace. For this purpose multiple regression analysis has been used with SPSS-19 software. The paper revealed that out of 17 variable 07 were found significantly important for improving the perception of the respondents.

Keywords: Labour Welfare Activities, Workers, Managers, Cement Industry, Welfare measures inside Workplace.

## INTRODUCTION

The concept of labour welfare is flexible and elastic and differs widely with time, region, industry, social values and customs, degree of industrialization, the general socio-economic development of the people and the political ideologies prevailing at a particular time (Chouhan & Verma, 2014 a&b). It is also molded according to the age-groups, socio-cultural background, marital and economic status and educational level of the workers in various industries. In its broad connotation, the

term welfare refers to a state of living of an individual or group in a desirable relationship with total environment-ecological, economic, and social. Conceptually as well as operationally, labour welfare is a part of social welfare which, in turn, is closely linked to the concept and the role of the State. The concept of social welfare, in its narrow contours, has been equated with economic welfare. The employee welfare work is done at two places viz. inside and outside the workplace with statutory welfare schemes. The statutory schemes are those schemes that are compulsory to provide by an organization as compliance to the laws governing employee health and safety (Chouhan, 2013; Chouhan et.al, 2014; Chouhan et. al, 2013). These include provisions provided in industrial acts like Factories Act 1948. The non-statutory schemes differ from organization to organization and from industry to industry.

As these goals are not always be realised by individuals through their efforts alone, the government came in to the picture and gradually began to take over the responsibility for the free and full development of human personality of its population Labour welfare is an extension of the term Welfare and its application to labour. During the industrialization process, the stress on labour productivity increased; and brought about changes in the thinking on labour welfare. An attempt is made to labour welfare measure outside the workplace in cement companies of Rajasthan for the various factors constitute to the labour welfare measures.

# **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Srivastava, S. K. (2004) analysed the effect of welfare activities/facilities on job satisfaction and attitude of workers towards management amongst the workers of private and public sectors. They indicated that welfare activities/facilities affect the workers' attitudes towards management and job satisfaction in both the sectors. In comparison between the two, the public sector is providing its workers with better facilities. If labourers/workers are satisfied, their attitudes are also pro and positive attitude pays a great role in the development of an organization.

Kang (2014) found that citizens' concerns about rapidly increasing inequality and dissatisfaction with the welfare regime were significantly related to their level of satisfaction with democracy. These results suggest that new democracies faced with similar economic challenges need to respond more competently to citizens' demands for effective policy performance in order to achieve unwavering support for democracy.

Wulfgramm (2014) expressed that the public policy shapes the lives of individuals, and even more so if they depend on state support. Unemployment has strong negative life satisfaction effects in all 21 European countries under study; the adverse effect of unemployment is almost doubled if unemployment benefits are

meagre. This moderating effect can be explained both by a resource as well as a non-pecuniary mechanism. The positive moderating effect of active labour market policy is less robust across model specifications.

Fasang, et.al, (2012) analysed the welfare regimes and found that it has indicated social policies interact with country differences in workforce composition, such as the overall prevalence of unemployment, to determine job satisfaction.

Boreham, et.al, (1996) indicated that while union involvement in economic policymaking and union movement strength are conducive to higher levels of welfare expenditure, the presence of left parties per se has no apparent effect on welfare effort.

Keane, et.al, (2012) found that union density is strongly associated with the general level of well-being but that this effect is conditioned, as they expected, by the level of democracy: in democratic countries, union density produces greater levels of life satisfaction, while in highly authoritarian settings, it appears to reduce satisfaction. In each case, these effects obtain for members and nonmembers alike, thus highlighting the importance of labor unions for the general, overall level of quality of life across nations.

Satyanarayana & Reddy (2012) measured satisfaction of 925 employees, and selected 90 covering all the departments. The results of the research reveal that majority of the employees are satisfied with all the welfare measures provided by the organization. They concluded that after analyzing the whole data it can be stated that the overall satisfaction levels of employees about welfare measures in the organization cover under study is satisfactory. They suggested that the existing welfare measures may be improved further. Such welfare measures enrich the employee's standard of living and their satisfaction levels.

Ramana et.al, (2015) has drawn with basis of observations are Extra-Mural particularly on Sports, Cultural, Library, Reading, Leaves on travel, Welfare Cooperatives, Vocational, Welfare facilities to Children and Women, where as in Intra-mural particularly protective clothing, crèches, restrooms and drinking facilities are in poor state to improve the rate of employee satisfaction

Tiwari (2014) concluded that the employee welfare facilities provided by the company to employees are satisfied and it is commendable, but still of scope is there for further improvement. So that efficiency, effectiveness and productivity can be enhanced to accomplish the organizational goals.

Sriya, & Krishna (2014) revealed that the employees are not very much aware of the facilities they are to be provided by the Factories Act, 1984, they are being provided with adequate health. Safety & welfare measured by the organisation

which is keeping the employees satisfied.

Manasa & Krishnanaik (2015) revealed that the main purpose of employees' welfare is to enrich or develop the quality of life of employees and keep them satisfied and contended. Extra - Mural benefits are the result of employer's generosity, enlightenment and philanthropic feelings. This paper contributes the in - depth of analysis of both Intra-Mural and Extra-Mural and its impact on employee satisfaction in Cement Corporation of India units in Thandur and Adilabad, and also focused on layoff benefits, welfare measures providing by the organisation to its temporary employees.

Parameshwaran & Shamina (2014) conducted the study with the aim to study the effectiveness of various Labour Welfare measures provided at Cheyyar Cooperative Sugar mill. It focuses on employee satisfaction also. Chi Square, correlation, Weighted Average and the findings showed that more than half of the employees were satisfied on the welfare measures provided by the company.

Yoganandan and Sivasamy (2015) found that there is a significant relationship between experience of the employees and their perception on health and safety measures in Chettinad Cement Corporation Limited, Karur. There is a significant relationship between designation of the employees and their perception on overall facilities provided by the organisation.

Chaudhay & Iqbal (2011) concluded that Employees' welfare schemes are not sufficient for the employees of the Indian Railways and other thongs that no improvements are found in any schemes. The data is either constant or has gone in to negative. Though there was a huge increase in the staff benefit fund i.e. by 800% but it was not utilized properly.

# **OBJECTIVE**

The objective of the paper includes following objective:

1. To analyze that the employee's welfare activities outside the workplace has a relation with their satisfaction

# **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Data Collection Tool:** primary data is collected from a structured questionnaire. Each participant was asked to fill out questionnaire indicating his or her agreement or disagreement related with welfare activities inside the workplace with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale with the end points being "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree".

Reliability Measures: Internal validity and consistency of the scale items are

analysed for each variables by pilot survey of 15 respondents. Hair et al. (2006) recommended that Cronbach alpha values from 0.6 to 0.7 were deemed the lower limit of acceptability. Cronbach's alpha reliability scores were all over 0.69, which is considered good.

**Sampling:** a sample of 199 workers and 51 managers working in 5 cement companies located in Rajasthan was selected. A non-probability sampling technique called convenience sampling is used. Personal contacts and expert forums are used for data collection.

**Hypothesis:** In accordance with the research objectives of the paper, the data was collected on dimensions of welfare measures inside the workplace or provided by Cement Company. Subsequently the hypothesis developed which has shown in data analysis part.

#### **DATA ANALYSIS**

As per the objective (To analyze that the employee's welfare activities has a relation with their satisfaction) the agreement of the respondents related with the **Welfare facilities** inside the workplace variables are checked with the broader hypothesis. The perceptions of the respondents are sought in relation to factors affecting Satisfaction from welfare activities. The following hypothesis was developed:

**H1:** The attributes configuring **Welfare Measures outside the Work Place** for **Welfare facilities** of respondents, significantly influence their Satisfaction form Welfare activities.

To identify key variables in multivariate regression analysis has been used with SPSS-19 software and results were shown in table-1 as under:

**Table-1: Multivariate Regression Analysis** 

## a. Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
SATIS_1	2.8520	.99703	250
W_1	3.3040	1.32158	250
W_2	3.6600	1.19588	250
W_3	2.7080	1.21517	250
W_4	3.3040	.70254	250
W_5	3.4480	.76000	250
C_1	3.2800	.94082	250
C_2	3.1480	1.06708	250
C_3	3.1440	.96279	250
C_4	2.5200	1.06496	250
H_1	2.7200	1.07994	250

H_2	2.8200	1.12814	250
H_3	2.8800	1.16233	250
H_4	2.4000	1.00201	250
O_W_1	2.4000	1.09764	250
O_W_2	2.9400	1.17555	250
O_W_3	2.7080	1.10436	250
O_W_4	2.6480	1.06989	250

# b. Variables Entered/Removed <sup>a</sup>

	Variables	Variables	
Model	Entered	Removed	Method
1	H_3	•	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050,
			Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	H_2		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050,
			Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	C_2		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050,
			Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	C_1	•	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050,
			Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
5	O_W_2	•	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050,
			Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
6	H_4		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050,
			Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
7	W_3	•	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050,
			Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
a. Dep	endent Va	riable: SAT	-IS_^

# c. Model Summary

or interest outstanding											
				Std. Error	Change Statistics						
		R	Adjusted	of the	R Square F Sig. F						
Model	R	Square	R Square	Estimate	Change	Change	df1	df2	Change		
7	.601 <sup>g</sup>	.362	.343	.80812	.019	7.083	1	242	.008		
g. Pred	dictors: (	(Constar	nt), H_3, H_	2, C_2, C_	1, O_W_2,	H_4, W_3	3				

# d. ANOVAh

VII / 1111	<del></del>					
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
7	Regression	89.483	7	12.783	19.574	.000 <sup>g</sup>
	Residual	158.041	242	.653		
	Total	247.524	249			
a Pred	ictors: (Constar	nt) H 3 H 2 C 2	2 C 1 O W	/ 2 H 4 W 3		

h. Dependent Variable: SATIS\_1

	_	effi		4	а
Δ	1.0	Δtti	nιΔ	nte	•
┖.	UU	CILI		HLO	

c. Odenie											
	Unstan	dardiz	Stand								
	ec	t	ardize					Collinearity			
	Coefficients		d				Correlations			Statistics	
			Coeffi								
			cients								
		Std.				Zero-			Toler		
Model	В	Error	Beta	t	Sig.	order	Partial	Part	ance	VIF	
7 (Consta	2.072	.380		5.454	.000						
nt)											
H_3	379	.062	442	-6.113	.000	372	366	314	.504	1.983	
H_2	.299	.057	.339	5.224	.000	.101	.318	.268	.627	1.594	
C_2	.528	.080	.565	6.613	.000	.243	.391	.340	.361	2.768	
C_1	457	.095	431	-4.827	.000	.143	296	248	.331	3.020	
O_W_2	.263	.053	.310	4.936	.000	.157	.302	.254	.671	1.491	
H_4	.197	.064	.198	3.106	.002	101	.196	.160	.646	1.548	
W_3	141	.053	172	-2.661	.008	337	169	137	.629	1.589	
a. Dependent Variable: SATIS_1											

#### **CONCLUSION**

The final Regression model with 07 independent variables (H\_3, H\_2, C\_2, C\_1, O\_W\_2, H\_4 and W\_3) explains almost 34.3% of the variance of satisfaction from Welfare facilities. Also, the standard errors of the estimate has been reduced to .80812, which means that at 95% level, the margin of errors for any predicted value of satisfaction from Welfare facilities can be calculated as ± 1.5839152 (1.96 X .80812). The 7 regression coefficients, plus the constraints are significant at 0.05 levels. The impact of multi collinerarity in the variable is not substantial. It has the tolerance value less than .629, indicating that over 38.1% of the variance is accounted for by the other variables in the equation. The ANOVA analysis provides the statistical test for overall model fit in terms of F Ratio. The total sum of squares (247.524) is the squared error that would accrue if the mean of Welfare facilities outside the workplace have been used to predict the dependent variable (Khan et.al, 2012; Chandra et.al, 2012; Chandra et.al, 2012). Using the values of O\_W\_3 these errors can be reduced by 36.15% (89.483/247.524). This reduction is deemed statistically significant with the F ratio of 19.574 and significance at level of 0.000g. With the above analysis it can be conclude that 07 variable i.e., H\_3, H\_2, C\_2, C\_1, O\_W\_2, H\_4 and W\_3explains the employee's satisfaction from Welfare Measures outside the Work Place.

# **REFERENCES**

 Boreham, Paul, Richard Hall and Martin Leet (1996), "Labour movements and welfare states: a reconsideration of how trade unions influence social change,"

- Journal of Sociology, 32(3), 1-20.
- Chandra, B., Chouhan, V., and Goswami, S.,(2012) Analyzing Trends and Profitability vis-à-vis Working Capital Organizations of India Management (WCM) A Study of Select Information Technology (IT), Indian Journal of Finance, ISSN: 0973-8711, 6(7), 13-26.
- Chandra, B., Goswami, S. and Chouhan, V., (2012) Investigating Attitude towards On-Line Advertising on Social Media – An Empirical Study, Management Insight, SMS Varanasi, VIII (1), 1-14.
- Chouhan, V. & Verma, P., (2014:b), Measuring validity of performance appraisal tools in Performance Appraisal System, Nirnay the Journal of Decision Science, 6(1), 57-64.
- Chouhan, V. & Verma, Pushpa (2014:a), Improving effectiveness of Performance appraisal tool: Who thinks that it uses improved techniques?, Business Spectrum, 4(1), 71-82.
- Chouhan, V., (2013), Global Convergence of Accounting Standard And Indian Perspective, International Journal of Research in Finance & Marketing, 33(7), 15-27.
- Chouhan, V., Chandra, B., Goswami, S. (2014), Predicting financial stability of select BSE companies revisiting Altman Z score, International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences, 15(2), 92-105.
- Chouhan, V., Verma, Pushpa, Sanghvi, Himanshu and Gupta, Apurv (2013), Assessing Worker's and Manager's Perception on Judgment Accuracy in Performance Appraisal System (PAS) International Journal of Engineering, Business and Enterprise Applications (IJEBEA), 5(1), 95-99.
- Chaudhay, A & Iqbal, Roohi (2011), An empirical study on effect of welfare measures on employees' satisfaction in Indian Railways, international journal of research in commerce & Management, 2(7), 130-137.
- Fasang, Anette Eva, Sara Geerdes, Klaus Schömann (2012), "Which type of job mobility makes people happy? A comparative analysis of European welfare regimes," International Sociology, 27(3), 349-383
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006).
  Multivariate data analysis (Vol. 6). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice
- Khan, S., Chouhan, V., Chandra, B. & Goswami, S. (2012). Measurement of Value Creation Vis-à-Vis EVA: Analysis of Select BSE Companies, Pacific Business Review, 5(3), 114-131.
- Kang, Woo Jin (2014), "Inequality, the welfare system and satisfaction with democracy in South Korea," International Political Science Review, doi: 10.1177/0192512114521053
- Keane, Lauren, Alexander Pacek, Benjamin Radcliff (2012), "Organized Labor, Democracy, and Life Satisfaction: A Cross-National Analysis," Labor Studies Journal, 37(3), 253-270.
- Manasa, B.R. & Krishnanaik, C.N. (2015). A Study on Cement Corporation of India Units, in Thandur and Adilabad, International Research Journal of

- Engineering and Technology (IRJET), 2(9), 219-226.
- Parameshwaran & Shamina, H., (2014), Effectiveness of labour welfare measures in Cheyyar sugar mills -an empirical study, International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review, 3(5), 129-134
- Ramana, T. Venkata & Reddy, E. Lokanadha (2015), A study on employee welfare measures with reference to south central railways in India, ZENITH International Journal of Business Economics & Management Research, 5(1), 1-11
- Satyanarayana, M. Rama & Reddy, R. Jayaprakash (2012), labour welfare measures in cement industries in India (a case of KCP limited, cement division, Macherla, Andhra Pradesh), International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences, IJPSS, 2(7), 257-264.
- Srivastava, S. K. (2004), "Impact of Labour Welfare on Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction," Management and Labour Studies, February, 29(1), 31-41.
- Sriya, A Keerthi & Krishna, Panatula Murali (2014), Status of Provisions of the Factories Act, 1948-A study at Penna Cement Industries Limited (PCIL), Tadipatri. IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), 16(3), 14-26
- Tiwari, Usha (2014). A study on employee welfare facilities and its impact on employees' efficiency at VindhaTelelinks ltd. Rewa (M.P.) India, Abhinav International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management & Technology, 3(11), 1-7.
- Wulfgramm, Melike (2014). Life satisfaction effects of unemployment in Europe: The moderating influence of labour market policy, Journal of European Social Policy, 24(3), 258-272
- Yoganandan, G. and Sivasamy, G. (2015). Health and Safety Measures in Chettinad Cement Corporation Limited, Karur, Bonfring International Journal of Data Mining, 5(1), 6-9.