

Imperativeness and Dimensions of Labour Welfare Measures for Employees' Fulfilment in Manufacturing Companies of Chennai

* P. Balaji

** P. Jagadeesan

Abstract

This empirical study was conducted to explore the fulfilment of labour welfare measures in selected manufacturing companies. Exploratory and descriptive research design was adopted to collect employees' perceptions through a structured questionnaire by adopting non-random convenient sampling technique. The data collected were subjected to analysis using PSPV Version 1.0.1. The statistical tools such as percentage analysis, factor analysis, independent samples *t*-test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and weighted average mean score were used in this study. The results indicated that fulfilment of welfare measures variables were reduced to seven independent factors, and the most dominant factor was found to be the Amenities Factor (AF) followed by Environment Factor (EF), Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF), Comfort Factor (CF), Yardstick Factor (YF), Food Factor (FF), and Supervision Factor (SF) in their order of dominance. We concluded that employees gave importance to counselling facilities, transport facilities, medical facilities, and housing facilities in order of importance to enhance their satisfaction levels.

Keywords : welfare measures, manufacturing industry, amenities, environment, physical well being

JEL Code : D6, K31

Paper Submission Date : June 24, 2018 ; **Paper sent back for Revision :** April 20, 2019 ; **Paper Acceptance Date :** April 25, 2019

In the recent past, labour welfare has become as a component of social right for employees. Labour welfare is a vital dimension of industrial relation practices, and labour welfare includes overall welfare facilities designed to take care of the well - being of employees to increase their standard of living (Cox, 1959 ; Khan & Islam, 2010 ; Rhodes, 1998). Labour welfare can also be provided by government as well as non - government agencies (Salamon, 1987 ; Tirole, 1994). The intervention of the state, however, is only to widen the area of its applicability (Briggs, 1961 ; Rhodes, 1998). Labour welfare is a concept of flexibility and changeability (Jesily, 2013). Implications of these labour welfare measures are heavily dependent on the nature of industries, geographical location, standard of living, and the socioeconomic condition of selected people hailing from same ideologies (Boserup, Tan, & Toulmin, 2007 ; Gourevitch, 1986 ; Inglehart, 2018). Labour welfare is done in the form of providing different amenities and measures to enhance and satisfy the desirable standard of living of beneficiaries (Patro, 2017; Venugopal, Bhaskar, & Usha, 2011). These amenities encourage the employees to attain satisfaction in personal and social life (Abramovitz, 2018 ; Sadyojathappa, 2015). Labour welfare measures are restricted to

* *Assistant Professor*, P.G Department of Business Administration, Guru Nanak College (Autonomous), Chennai, Tamil Nadu. E-mail : aravindbalaji23@gmail.com

** *Professor and Head (Corresponding Author)*, Department of Commerce, VELS Institute of Science Technology and Advanced Studies, Chennai, Tamil Nadu. E-mail : jagadeesansuba@gmail.com

certain statutory guidelines and norms prescribed by any established agency, the government, and own employers (Harilal, Kanji, Jeyaranjan, Eapen, & Swaminathan, 2006), which do not exist in certain social indemnity situations, and which leads to the enhancement in employees' personal and social well being (Gupta, 2007; Nyakwara, Shiundu, & Gongera, 2014). Thus, the term labour welfare covers not only the workers, but also their families (Banks, 1995) and labour welfare is commonly known as voluntary efforts and benefits given by the employer to employees for the betterment of working conditions (Jones, 1983 ; Pigou, 2002).

Review of Literature

Hudson and Kühner (2012) argued that productive welfare is a different theory from several welfare theories and they built a new theory by applying fuzzy approach which is a unique and unexplored phenomenon in dimensions of welfare. The authors concluded that fuzzy logic plays an imperative role in extending and elaborating the role of welfare modelling business for the better inclusiveness in productive and protective welfare dimensions in industries in East Asia.

Fritsch (2006) stated the importance of welfare legislations through interest groups or employees' organizations in a work place. The author elaborated upon the importance and various benefits of working through unions or associations. He said that doing so will encourage every stakeholder's participation in decision making in the labour market despite several internal and external influences.

Srivastava (2004) conducted an empirical investigation with a primary objective to explore the impact of labour welfare measures on employee attitudes and job satisfaction. The author conducted a primary survey among 200 private and public sector employees. The empirical evidences indicated that labour welfare measures were significantly differentiated by nature of employment and labour welfare measures played a important role and significantly induced the employees' attitude and job satisfaction positively. Perceived welfare measures and favourable attitudes of employees had an imperative role in determining the job satisfaction of both public and private-sector employees.

Azar (2012) elaborated upon the application of tipped workers' minimum wage theory in the hospitality industry. The researcher explained the importance of service charges in lieu of tips in order to enhance the social welfare of tipped workers. The empirical evidence revealed the relationship between tipped minimum wage and service charge. Service charge may increase the price of a product, which a customer might not be willing to pay, and if it is in the form of tipped wages, customers do not have any objection. To conclude, the hospitality industry, which allows service charges rather than tipped minimum wages, is ensuring and maximizing the social welfare of the tipped workers.

Logasakthi and Rajagopal (2013) conducted a research on employee health, safety, and welfare measures of the chemical industry in Salem region. The researchers found that providing employees health care services, safety, and welfare improved the labour satisfaction and also led to the enhancement of the quality of life of the working employees. Finally, they concluded that satisfaction with respect to welfare measures significantly influenced the quality of work life of the chemical industry employees.

Bhattacharjee (2015) carried an overview of labour welfare measures in India. The researcher pointed out that labour welfare measures increased the effectiveness of employees' performance and it made the employees' quality of work life better by improving their standards of living.

Patel, Gohil, and Shah (2017) conducted an exploratory study with a primary objective to understand the employees' satisfaction with respect to welfare measures and social security of selected engineering units of Ahmedabad. The empirical evidence proved that employees were highly satisfied with respect to welfare measures and social security. Further, the researchers found that age and designation did not have a significant association with welfare measures.

Tiwari (2014) carried out a case study to explore the influence of employee welfare facilities on employee's efficiency in Vindha Telelinks Ltd., Rewa, India. The empirical study revealed that employees were satisfied with the welfare measures provided by the company in both statutory and non-statutory aspects.

Sabarirajan, Meharajan, and Arun (2010) made an investigation to explore the influence of welfare measures' fulfilment on maintenance of quality of work life of textile industry employees. The results indicated that majority of the employees were satisfied with the welfare measures provided by the organization and these also had a significant impact on maintenance of quality of work life. Further, the researchers concluded that welfare measures played a vital role in determining the employees' satisfaction.

Yoganandhan and Sivasamy (2015) examined the employees' perception towards the fulfilment of health, safety, and welfare measures in the cement industry. The results indicated that the employees were moderately satisfied with respect to their fulfilment of welfare measures, and they concluded that there was a greater positive influence of welfare measures on the employees' satisfaction in the cement industry.

Lalitha and Priyanka (2014) made an attempt to explore the employees' welfare measures adopted in the information technology industry and its impact on employee satisfaction. The results revealed that employees were satisfied with the welfare measures provided by their companies and these measures also significantly contributed to employee satisfaction.

Ravi and Raja (2016) conducted an empirical study to explore the employee welfare measures of small scale industries in Hosur district of Tamil Nadu. The researchers adopted survey method to collect responses from small scale industry employees with respect to their welfare measures and the results indicated that canteen facilities, medical facilities, and other fringe benefits were the imperative welfare measures provided by the small-scale industries, and they concluded that employee welfare measures had a significant impact in increasing employees' commitment towards their organizations.

Objectives of the Study

- (1)** To study the demographic profiles of the employees of manufacturing companies in Chennai city.
- (2)** To explore the underlying dominant dimensions of labour welfare measures of employees of manufacturing companies.
- (3)** To identify the differences in employees' perception towards welfare measures fulfillment factors with respect to their nature of employment.
- (4)** To find the difference of opinion with respect to their age and welfare measures fulfillment factors of employees in manufacturing companies.

Research Methodology

The present study is analytical in nature and has adopted the survey method for obtaining the findings. This study is based mainly on the primary data collected from the employees working in the manufacturing sector using a well- designed and well- structured questionnaire. However, efforts were also taken to collect information from all available published data, especially from websites, newspapers, magazines, and journals.

(1) Sampling Size and Design : Non-random convenient sampling method was adopted for collecting primary data. A total of 350 questionnaires were issued and the respondents were given sufficient time for filling the questionnaires ; 300 of the issued questionnaires were received back from the respondents. On scrutiny of these, 50 of them were found to be incomplete. So, they were rejected and the remaining 250 questionnaires were taken

for the study. The primary data were collected from employees of manufacturing companies during January - June 2018.

(2) Questionnaire Design and Scaling Pattern : A questionnaire with three sections was finalized to collect information from the employees. Section 1 dealt with the various demographic profiles of the respondents. Section 2 contained the 25 welfare measures fulfillment variables and the responses were measured through the 5-point Likert scale. Section 3 comprised of four variables of perception towards important facilities in manufacturing companies. To test the reliability and consistency of the instrument, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was employed, and the value being 0.871 indicated that the scale was consistent and highly reliable in nature.

(3) Statistical Software and Selection of Tools : The data collected were subjected to analysis using PSPP Version 1.0.1, which is a free alternative software for IBM SPSS Statistics. The statistical tools such as percentage analysis, factor analysis, independent samples *t*-test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and weighted average mean score were used to draw meaningful answers to the research objectives.

Analysis and Results

(1) Demographic Profile of the Respondents : Percentage analysis was applied to understand the demographic profiles of the respondents such as age, educational qualifications, years of experience, monthly family income, and nature of employment of the respondents and the results are shown in the Table 1.

The Table 1 shows clearly that out of 250 respondents, majority of the respondents were aged between 26 to 30 years (55.6%) followed by : below 25 years (23.6%), between 36 to 40 years (14.4%), between 30 to 35 years (5.6%), and above 40 years (0.8%). Maximum number of respondents were diploma holders (29.6%) followed by others (28.4%), graduates (16.8%), post graduates (12.8%), and professionals (12.4%). Majority of them possessed above 8 years of experience (63.6%) followed by between 4 - 6 years (14.0%), between 7-8 years (14.0%), between 1-3 years (8.0%), and below 1 year (0.4%). Majority of the respondents earned ₹ 20,001 to ₹ 30,000 (64.8%) followed by above ₹ 30,000 (18.0%) and up to ₹ 20,000 (17.2%). Majority of the respondents

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographic Profiles		Frequency	%
Age	Below 25	59	23.6
	Between 26-30	139	55.6
	Between 30-35	14	5.6
	Between 36-40	36	14.4
	Above 40	2	0.8
Educational Qualifications	Graduates	42	16.8
	Post Graduates	32	12.8
	Professionals	31	12.4
	Others	71	28.4
	Diploma	74	29.6
Years of Experience	Below 1 Year	1	0.4
	1-3 Years	20	8.0
	4-6 Years	35	14.0

	7-8 Years	35	14.0
	Above 8 Years	159	63.6
Monthly Family Income	Upto ₹ 20,000	43	17.2
	Between ₹ 20,001 to 30,000	162	64.8
	Above ₹ 30,000	45	18.0
Nature of Employment	Semi-Skilled	212	84.8
	Highly Skilled	38	15.2

Table 2. Weighted Average Mean Ranking of Importance of Facilities for Satisfaction Provided by Organizational Variables

Sl. No	Importance of Facilities for Satisfaction	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank
1.	Housing Facilities	3.83	0.866	4
2.	Transport Facilities	4.13	0.773	2
3	Medical Facilities	4.12	0.951	3
4.	Counseling Facilities	4.14	0.510	1

were semi-skilled workers (84.8%) followed by highly skilled workers (15.2%).

The Table 2 shows that employees gave maximum importance to counselling facilities (4.14), transport facilities (4.13), medical facilities (4.12), and housing facilities (3.83) in order to enhance their satisfaction.

(2) Exploratory Factor Analysis of Fulfilment of Welfare Measures : The factor analysis was applied to understand the underlying dimensions of 25 fulfillment of welfare measures (AWM) variables and reduce them into a limited number of manageable and independent factors. Principal component analysis and rotation method of varimax with Kaiser normalization have been used in the factor analysis and the results are shown in the Table 3 and Table 4.

The Table 3 and Table 4 show that the range of communalities of the 25 fulfillment of welfare measures variables is from 0.438 to 0.760 with KMO value of 0.769 and chi-square value of 2.213 at *d.f* of 300 with *p* - value of 0.000 in Bartlett's test of sphericity. Hence, the factor analysis is applicable for factorization of fulfillment of welfare measures variables.

Seven factors have been extracted and they explain 62.184% of the variance in case of 25 fulfillment of welfare measures variables. The most dominant factor is Factor 1 with the explained variance of 14.069% and it has seven fulfillment of welfare measures variables : availability of public transport, availability of refreshments,

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Awareness of Welfare Measures

Awareness of Welfare Measures	Mean	Std. Deviation	Communalities
Following rules and regulations	4.48	0.561	0.678
Washing facilities, storing, and seating facilities are adequate	4.42	0.583	0.669
Sufficient lighting, ventilation, cooling in work environment	4.39	0.632	0.661
Canteen facility with air conditioner	4.20	0.821	0.723
Appropriate intervals are given	4.07	0.855	0.749
Clean working environment	4.42	0.604	0.546
Clean accommodation	4.36	0.621	0.617

Welfare officers are available	4.25	0.660	0.592
Accommodation available for night stay	4.15	0.699	0.554
Availability of safety officers	4.29	0.693	0.557
Availability of safety supervisors	4.32	0.773	0.614
Prescribing duties, qualification, and condition of employment	4.00	0.946	0.760
Adequate medical facility	3.96	0.966	0.657
Availability of safety measures to workers	3.73	1.070	0.658
Free medical checkups	3.63	1.105	0.728
Availability of recreation for workers	4.14	0.706	0.590
Providing industrial counseling to workers	4.13	0.869	0.566
Availability of loans and financial grants	3.97	0.954	0.624
Providing house rent allowance to the workers	4.10	0.693	0.584
Availability of water disposal facility	4.24	0.657	0.622
Availability of roads and parking facility	4.23	0.672	0.438
Availability of bank and ATM facility	4.21	0.656	0.535
Availability of public transport	4.14	0.783	0.615
Availability of refreshments	4.11	0.857	0.637
Conducting health awareness programs frequently	4.33	0.637	0.572

Table 4 . Factor Loadings of Awareness of Welfare Measures Variables

Factor Names	Awareness of Welfare Measures	Factor Loadings	Variance (Eigen Value)
Factor 1 : Amenities Factor (AF)	Availability of public transport	0.764	14.069
	Availability of refreshments	0.749	(3.517)
	Availability of bank and ATM facility	0.635	
	Availability of recreation for workers	0.623	
	Conducting health awareness programs frequently	0.593	
	Providing industrial counseling to workers	0.554	
	Availability of loans and financial grants	0.501	
Factor 2 : Environment Factor (EF)	Clean accommodation	0.750	11.721
	Welfare Officers are available	0.693	(2.930)
	Availability of Safety Officers	0.691	
	Clean working environment	0.642	
	Accommodation available for night stay	0.567	
	Availability of water disposal facility	0.452	
Factor 3 : Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF)	Prescribing duties, qualification, and condition of employment	0.806	9.920
	Adequate medical facility	0.769	(2.480)
	Availability of safety measures to workers	0.732	
	Free medical checkups	0.454	
	Availability of roads and parking facility	0.453	
Factor 4 : Comfort Factor (CF)	Washing facilities, storing, and seating facilities are adequate	0.772	7.357
	Following rules and regulations	0.741	(1.839)
Factor 5 : Yardstick Factor (YF)	Appropriate intervals are given	0.790	7.279
	Providing house rent allowance to the workers	0.606	(1.820)

Factor 6 : Food Factor (FF)	Canteen facility with air conditioner	0.774	6.465 (1.616)
Factor 7 : Supervision Factor (SF)	Availability of Safety supervisors	0.679	5.373
	Sufficient lighting, ventilation, cooling in work environment	0.480	(1.343)

Total Variance : 62.184; Total Eigen Value: 15.545

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy : 0.769

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: Approx. Chi-Square = 2.213; *df* = 300 ; Sig. = 0.000

availability of bank and ATM facility, availability of workers' recreation, conducting health fulfillment programs frequently, providing industrial counseling to workers, and availability of loans and financial grants. It has been labelled as Amenities Factor (AF).

The second most dominant factor is Factor 2 with explained variance of 11.721% and it has six variables : clean accommodation, welfare officers are available, availability of safety officers, clean working environment, accommodation available for night stay, and availability of water disposal facility. It has been labelled as Environment Factor (EF).

The third most dominant factor is Factor 3 with explained variance of 9.920% and it has five variables : Prescribing duties, qualification and condition of employment ; adequate medical facilities ; availability of safety measures to workers ; free medical checkups ; and availability of roads and parking facility. It has been labelled as Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF).

The fourth dominant factor is labelled as Comfort Factor (CF), which consists of two variables : washing facilities, storing and seating facilities are adequate and following rules and regulations and it has an explained variance of 7.357%.

The fifth dominant factor is labelled as Yardstick Factor (YF), which consists of two variables : Appropriate intervals are given and providing house rent allowance to the workers and it has an explained variance of 7.279%.

The sixth most dominant factor is Factor 6 with explained variance of 6.465% and it has only one variable : canteen facility with air conditioner. It has been labelled as Food Factor (FF).

The seventh dominant factor is labelled as Supervision Factor (SF), which consists of two variables : Availability of safety supervisors and sufficient lighting, ventilation, and cooling in work environment and it has an explained variance of 5.373%.

Thus, all the 25 fulfilment of welfare measures variables have been reduced to seven independent factors and the most dominant factor is Amenities Factor (AF) followed by Environment Factor (EF), Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF), Comfort Factor (CF), Yardstick Factor (YF), Food Factor (FF), and Supervision Factor (SF) in their order of dominance.

(3) Difference Between Nature of Employment and Fulfilment of Welfare Measures Factors (AWMF) : Independent sample *t* - test was applied to identify the difference between nature of employment and fulfilment of welfare measures factors (AWMF) and the results are shown in the Table 5.

The Table 5 indicates that nature of employment does not have significant differences in case of all the fulfilment of welfare measures factors (AWMF) such as, Amenities Factor (AF), Environment Factor (EF), Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF), Comfort Factor (CF), Yardstick Factor (YF), Food Factor (FF), and Supervision Factor (SF). Both semi - skilled and highly-skilled employees did not differ with respect to perception with regard to fulfilment of welfare measures factors.

Table 5. Significance of Difference Between Level of Employment and Awareness of Welfare Measures Factors (AWMF)

Description	Level of Employment		t-Value (Df = 248)	p - Value	Results
	Semi-Skilled	Highly Skilled			
	Mean (SD) N = 212	Mean (SD) N = 38			
Amenities Factor (AF)	28.24 (3.93)	28.89 (3.77)	0.96	0.83	NS
Environment Factor (EF)	25.62 (2.77)	26.21 (2.46)	1.23	0.68	NS
Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF)	19.38 (3.31)	20.55 (2.72)	2.07	0.32	NS
Comfort Factor (CF)	13.06 (1.30)	13.53 (1.25)	2.04	0.97	NS
Yardstick Factor (YF)	8.07 (1.30)	8.71 (0.90)	3.77	0.13	NS
Food Factor (FF)	4.19 (0.82)	4.26 (0.86)	0.51	0.92	NS
Supervision Factor (SF)	8.69 (1.16)	8.82 (1.20)	0.60	0.77	NS

Note. S = Significant, NS = Not Significant

Table 6. Significance of Difference Between Age and Awareness of Welfare Measures Factors (AWMF)

Description	Age (in Years)					F - Value (Df = 249)	P - Value	Results
	Below 25	26 - 30	31 - 35	36 - 40	Above 40			
	N = 59 Mean (SD)	N = 139 Mean (SD)	N = 14 Mean (SD)	N = 36 Mean (SD)	N = 2 Mean (SD)			
Amenities Factor (AF)	28.10 (3.88)	28.05 (4.00)	29.36 (3.00)	29.25 (3.86)	31.50 (2.12)	1.30	0.27	NS
Environment Factor (EF)	25.47 (2.90)	25.50 (2.72)	26.43 (2.82)	26.58 (2.33)	26.00 (2.83)	1.49	0.21	NS
Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF)	19.29 (3.31)	19.21 (3.39)	21.29 (1.49)	20.72 (2.73)	18.50 (2.12)	2.78	0.03	S
Comfort Factor (CF)	13.00 (1.14)	13.08 (1.37)	13.36 (0.93)	13.53 (1.28)	12.00 (2.83)	1.54	0.19	NS
Yardstick Factor (YF)	7.86 (1.36)	8.06 (1.25)	8.43 (1.28)	8.92 (0.84)	8.50 (2.12)	4.63	0.001	S
Food Factor (FF)	4.12 (0.72)	4.25 (0.82)	3.79 (1.05)	4.25 (0.87)	5.00 (0.00)	1.70	0.15	NS
Supervision Factor (SF)	8.64 (1.17)	8.68 (1.20)	8.64 (0.84)	8.97 (1.16)	9.00 (0.00)	0.57	0.68	NS

Note. S = Significant, NS = Not Significant

(4) Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Between Age and Fulfilment of Welfare Measures Factors (AWMF) : Analysis of variance was applied to explore the differences between age and fulfilment of welfare measures factors (AWMF), and the results are shown in the Table 6.

The Table 6 indicates that age has a significant difference in case of Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF) and Yardstick Factor (YF). All the other fulfilment of welfare measures factors (AWMF) such as, Amenities Factor (AF), Environment Factor (EF), Comfort Factor (CF), Food Factor (FF), and Supervision Factor (SF) do not have significant differences with respect to their age groups. In case of Physical Well-Being Factor (PBF), respondents in the age group of 30 to 35 years had higher fulfilment compared to all other age groups. In case of Yardstick Factor, respondents in the age group of 36 - 40 years experienced greater fulfilment compared to all other age groups.

Major Findings of the Study

(1) Majority of the respondents were aged between 26 to 30 years , were diploma holders, and had more than 8

years of experience. Majority of the respondents were semi-skilled employees and they were earning ₹ 20,000 - ₹ 30,000 as monthly family income.

(2) The 25 fulfilment of welfare measures variables have been reduced to seven independent factors and the most dominant factor is Amenities Factor (AF) followed by Environment Factor (EF), Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF), Comfort Factor (CF), Yardstick Factor (YF), Food Factor (FF), and Supervision Factor (SF) in their order of dominance.

(3) Age has a significant difference in case of Physical Well - Being Factor (PBF) and Yardstick Factor (YF). All the other fulfilment of welfare measures factors (AWMF) such as Amenities Factor (AF), Environment Factor (EF), Comfort Factor (CF), Food Factor (FF), and Supervision Factor (SF) do not have significant differences with respect to the age group of the respondents.

(4) Both semi - skilled and highly-skilled employees did not differ in case of perceptions with regard to fulfilment of welfare measures factors.

(5) Employees gave utmost importance to counseling facilities, transport facilities, medical facilities, and housing facilities in order importance to enhance their satisfaction.

Managerial Implications and Conclusion

(1) Manufacturing companies need to provide proper counseling facilities, transport facilities, medical facilities, and housing facilities in their order of importance to enhance the satisfaction of their employees.

(2) Employees opined that amenities such as, availability of public transport, availability of refreshments, availability of bank and ATM facility, availability of workers' recreation, conducting health fulfilment programs frequently, providing industrial counseling to workers, and availability of loans and financial grants were important aspects to enhance their satisfaction with their jobs. So, the manufacturing companies are suggested to focus on these important amenities .

(3) Since there were no significant differences in the perceptions of semi-skilled and highly skilled employees' welfare fulfilment, the companies are suggested to focus their attention upon overall fulfilment rather than skill based welfare measures in their premises.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Further Research

Due to time and cost constraints, this study restricted its sample size to 250 employees working in select manufacturing companies in Chennai city. This study adopted non - random convenient sampling technique to collect responses from employees. So, the limitations associated with these sampling techniques are also applicable to this study. This study can be further extended to other unexplored sectors in the near future. Labour welfare measures fulfilment and their impact on employee satisfaction and employee performance can be explored in the near future.

References

- Abramovitz, M. (2018). *Regulating the lives of women: Social welfare policy from colonial times to the present*. London : Routledge. doi : <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315228150>
- Azar, O. H. (2012). The effect of the minimum wage for tipped workers on firm strategy, employees and social welfare. *Labour Economics*, 19(5), 748 - 755.
- Banks, S. (1995). Introduction. In, *Ethics and values in social work* (pp. 1-7). London : Palgrave.
- Bhattacharjee, S. (2015). An overview of labour welfare measures in India in response to globalization. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 31(1), 66 - 76.
- Boserup, E., Tan, S. F., & Toulmin, C. (2007). *Woman's role in economic development*. London : Routledge. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315065892>
- Briggs, A. (1961). The welfare state in historical perspective. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Europeennes de Sociologie*, 2(2), 221 - 258.
- Cox, A. (1959). The role of law in preserving union democracy. *Harvard Law Review*, 72(4), 609 - 644.
- Fritsch, C. (2006). Business as usual ? Employees' organisations' strategies in welfare legislation in Austria. *Transfer : European Review of Labour and Research*, 12(1), 31-48.
- Gourevitch, P. (1986). *Politics in hard times : Comparative responses to international economic crises*. Ithaca, United States : Cornell University Press.
- Gupta, M. (2007). *Labour welfare and social security in unorganised sector*. New Delhi : Deep & Deep Publications.
- Harilal, K. N., Kanji, N., Jeyaranjan, J., Eapen, M., & Swaminathan, P. (2006). *Power in global value chains: Implications for employment and livelihoods in the cashew nut industry in India* (Summary Report). London, UK : International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED).
- Hudson, J., & Kühner, S. (2012). Analyzing the productive and protective dimensions of welfare : Looking beyond the OECD. *Social Policy & Administration*, 46(1), 35 - 60.
- Inglehart, R. (2018). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton, New Jersey : Princeton University Press.
- Jesily, M. (2013). Job - related factors vis-a-vis labour-management relations. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 6(3), 27 - 33. doi:10.17010/pijom/2013/v6i3/59980
- Jones, H. (1983). Employers' welfare schemes and industrial relations in inter - war Britain. *Business History*, 25(1), 61 - 75.
- Khan, N. A., & Islam, Q. (2010). Labour relations practices in sugar industry of Uttar Pradesh. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 3(1), 34 - 44. doi:10.17010/pijom/2010/v3i1/61045
- Lalitha, K., & Priyanka, T. (2014). A study on employee welfare measures with reference to IT industry. *International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences*, 2(7), 7 - 11.
- Logasakthi, K., & Rajagopal, K. (2013). A study on employee health, safety and welfare measures of chemical industry in the view of Salem region. *International Journal of Research in Business Management (IJRBM)*, 1(1), 1 - 10.

- Nyakwara, S., Shiundu, J., & Gongera, G. E. (2014). Evaluation of employee welfare facilities as an intervention strategy of industrial unrest on organization performance : Case of Mumias Sugar Company. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6 (29), 209 - 219.
- Patel, A., Gohil, A., & Shah, H. (2017). A study on labour welfare measures and social security on selected engineering unit of Ahmadabad. *IBMRD's Journal of Management & Research*, 6 (1), 19 - 26.
- Patro, C. S. (2017). Employee welfare measures in public and private sectors : A comparative analysis. In I. Management Association (Ed.), *Public health and welfare: Concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications* (pp. 1026 - 1042). Hershey, PA : IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-1674-3.ch047
- Pigou, A. (2002). *The economics of welfare*. New York : Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351304368>
- Ravi, S., & Raja, J. A. (2016). A study on employee welfare measures with reference to small scale industries at Hosur, Tamil Nadu. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 5 (1), 89 - 91.
- Rhodes, M. (1998). Globalization, labour markets and welfare states : A future of 'Competitive Corporatism'?. In, M. Rhodes & Y. Mény (eds), *The Future of European welfare* (pp. 178 - 203). London : Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sabarirajan, A., Meharajan, T., & Arun, B. (2010). A study on the various welfare measures and their impact on QWL provided by the textile mills with reference to Salem District, Tamil Nadu, India. *Asian Journal of Management Research*, 1(1), 15 - 24.
- Sadyojathappa, S. (2015). Social security measures in mining industries: A study with reference to manganese and iron ore industries in Ballari District, Karnataka. *Prabandhan : Indian Journal of Management*, 8 (12), 19 - 32. doi:10.17010/pijom/2015/v8i12/84374
- Salamon, L. M. (1987). Of market failure, voluntary failure, and third-party government: Toward a theory of government - nonprofit relations in the modern welfare state. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 16(1 - 2), 29 - 49.
- Srivastava, S. K. (2004). Impact of labour welfare on employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Management and Labour Studies*, 29 (1), 31-41.
- Tirole, J. (1994). The internal organization of government. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 46 (1), 1 - 29.
- Tiwari, U. (2014). A study on employee welfare facilities and its impact on employees efficiency at Vindhya Telelinks Ltd. Rewa (MP) India. *Abhinav International Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Management and Technology*, 3 (11), 1 - 7.
- Venugopal, D., Bhaskar, T., & Usha, P. (2011). Employee welfare activities with respective measures in industrial sector - A study on industrial cluster at Chittor District. *International Journal of Research in Commerce, IT & Management*, 1(6), 78 - 83.
- Yoganandan, G., & Sivasamy, G. (2015). Health and safety measures in Chettinad Cement Corporation Limited, Karur. *Bonfring International Journal of Data Mining*, 5 (1), 6 - 9.

About the Authors

P. Balaji has submitted his doctoral thesis in Commerce from the School of Business and Management Studies, University of Madras, Chennai. Currently he is working as an Assistant Professor at the PG Department of Business Administration, Guru Nanak College (Autonomous), Chennai. He has been awarded the ICSSR Doctoral Research Fellowship from Institute of Public Enterprise, Hyderabad for his doctoral thesis.

Dr. P. Jagadeesan (Ph.D.) is currently Professor and Head, Department of Commerce, VELS Institute of Science Technology and Advanced Studies, Chennai, Tamil Nadu. He has received doctoral degrees from University of Madras, Chennai and Dravidian University, Kuppam, Andhra Pradesh in the field of human resource management and marketing, respectively.