International Journal of Research in Business, Management & Accounting
ISSN (Online) : 2455-6114
Volume 02 Issue 03 September 2016
Available on-line at: https://ijrbma.com/index.php/bma/about
DOI: https://doi.org/10.53555/bma.v2i3. Received: 01 - July -2016 |Accepted:09 - Sept -2016

A Study of Expectancy of Welfare Measures in Cement Industry of Rajasthan

Anil. K. Bhatt[1] and Lyamukuru Manirareba Olive[2]

Professor[1], Pacific Institute of Business Studies, Udaipur
Research Scholar[2], Pacific University, Udaipur

ABSTRACT

Every individual has certain needs and motives which he/she wants to fulfill. Any job which fulfills their needs and motives give him satisfaction. 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 inside the workplace. For this purpose multiple regression analysis has been used with SPSS-19 software. The paper revealed that out of 31 variable 22 were found significantly important for improving the perception of the respondents.

Keywords: *Labour Welfare Activities, Workers, Managers, Cement Industry, welfare measures inside workplace.*

The term labour welfare proposes many philosophies, meanings and connotations, such as the state of well-being, health, happiness, prosperity and the development of human resources. As a total concept of welfare, it is a desirable state of existence involving physical, mental, moral and emotional well-being. The community concept of welfare implies the welfare of man, his family, and his community (Chandra et.al, 2012). Welfare is called a relative concept, for it is related to time and space. Changes in it have an impact on the system of welfare as well. Welfare is also a positive concept. In order to establish a minimum level of welfare, it demands certain minimum acceptable conditions of existence, biologically and socially. Workers attitudes are important to human resource management (HRM) because they affect organizational behaviour (Chouhan and Verma, 2014a;b; Chandra et, al, 2012). In particular, an attitude relating to job satisfaction and organizational commitment is of major interest to the field of organizational behaviour and the practice of HRM. Job satisfaction focuses on employee's attitudes toward their jobs and organizational commitment focuses on their attitudes toward the overall organization (Chouhan, 2013, Chouhan et.al, 2013; 2014)

Corresponding Author

Email:anilbhatt-ndhm@yahoo.com

ISSN : 2455-6114

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the paper includes following objective:

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

REVIEWS OF LITERATURE

Srivastava, S. K. (2004), in his paper on "Impact of Labour Welfare on Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction," checked 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, Woo Jin. (2014), in his paper on "Inequality, the welfare system and satisfaction with democracy in South Korea," revealed that in an emerging democracy one of the most important components of democratic consolidation is the public's attitude toward democracy. The finding of the study indicated 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, Melike (2014), in his paper on "Life satisfaction effects of unemployment in Europe: The moderating influence of labour market policy," revealed 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 generosity of passive labour market policy moderates this effect to a surprisingly large extent: 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), in their paper on "Which type of job mobility makes people happy? A comparative analysis of European welfare regimes," 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), in their paper on "Labour movements and welfare states: a reconsideration of how trade unions influence social change," indicated that while union involvement in economic policy-making 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.

ISSN : 2455-6114

Keane, et.al, (2012), in their paper on "Organized Labor, Democracy, and Life Satisfaction: A Cross-National Analysis," found that union density is strongly associated with the general level of well-being but that this effect is conditioned, as we expect, 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) in their paper on "labour welfare measures in cement industries in India (a case of KCP limited, cement division, Macherla, Andhra Pradesh, to measure 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. However, a few are not satisfied with welfare measures provided by the organization. Therefore it is 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), conducted a study with objectives of welfare measures in South Central Railways and its impact on employee satisfaction Finally, results 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) in his paper on A study on employee welfare facilities and its impact on employees efficiency at vindha telelinks Ltd. Rewa (M.P.) India, revealed that Health, safety and welfare are the measures of promoting the efficiency of employee. They revealed that the Employees welfare facilities and its impact on employees efficiency at Vindha Telelinks Limited, Rewa appeared to be good. The average mean score and percentage score of the overall of 22 items has been computed at 3.64(66%).They 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) in their paper on Status of Provisions of the Factories Act, 1948-A study at Penna Cement Industries Limited (PCIL), Tadipatri, targeted to know the awareness and satisfactory levels of the provisions of Factories act among the lower class of employees by taking a sample of 50 employees by Random Sampling method from the total population of lower class of employees in the organisation. Results indicated that the overall awareness levels of the various provisions of the Factories Act, 1948 is not very high but the satisfactory levels with the facilities provided by the organisation seems to be adequate among the sample employees. In simple words, though the sample 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) in their paper on "A Study on Cement Corporation of India Units, in Thandur and Adilabad," classified the welfare activities into two categories viz. Intra-mural and Extra-Mural. The Intra- Mural schemes are those schemes that are compulsory to provide by an organization as compliance to the laws governing employee health and safety. The Extra - Mural schemes differ from organization to organization and from industry to industry. 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) in their paper on Effectiveness of labour welfare measures in Cheyyar sugar mills -an empirical study, revealed that Employees play an important role in the industrial production of the country. Hence, organisations have to secure the cooperation of employees in order to increase the production and to earn higher profits. The cooperation of employees is possible only when they are fully satisfied with their employer and the working conditions on the job. The present study aims at studying 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) in their paper on "Health and Safety Measures in Chettinad Cement Corporation Limited, Karur," found that majority (88.7%)of employees are male in the cement industry, majority (90.4%) of employee are married, majority (66.1%)of employees are savings less than 3,000 per month and, majority (68%)of employees are working in both A & B shifts. The study also found majority (92.5%)of employees have joined the labour union, majority (71.5%)of employees travel around 5 KM every day to come for work in Chettinad Cement Corporation Limited, Karur. They 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) in their paper on "An empirical study on effect of welfare measures on employees' satisfaction in Indian Railways," expressed that studied the effect of welfare measures on employee's satisfaction in Indian Railways. Employees' welfare has acquired an important place in the modern commercial world. They have shown the clear picture of satisfaction level of Railways employees through statistical tools. They 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.

ISSN : 2455-6114

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 0.75, 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:

H_1: The attributes configuring **Welfare Measures inside 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
1.	SATIS_1	2.8520	.99703	250
2.	W_E_1	3.2000	.74983	250
3.	W_E_2	3.4800	.64128	250
4.	W_E_3	1.8880	.77838	250
5.	W_E_4	2.9200	1.05739	250
6.	W_E_5	2.1080	.71159	250
7.	W_E_6	3.3000	1.31793	250

ISSN : 2455-6114

8.	W_E_7	3.6600	1.19588	250
9.	W_E_8	2.7040	1.20923	250
10.	W_E_9	3.3040	.70254	250
11.	W_E_10	3.4440	.75441	250
12.	C_R_1	3.2840	.94600	250
13.	C_R_2	3.1480	1.06708	250
14.	C_R_3	3.1440	.96279	250
15.	C_R_4	3.0160	1.12285	250
16.	C_R_5	3.3400	.81674	250
17.	C_R_6	3.4160	.66688	250
18.	H_R_1	3.8800	.65369	250
19.	H_R_2	3.5640	.61270	250
20.	H_R_3	3.9640	.87508	250
21.	H_R_4	3.5640	.98478	250
22.	H_R_5	3.5480	.98161	250
23.	H_R_6	3.8280	.99719	250
24.	H_R_7	3.6160	1.04350	250
25.	O_W_A_1	3.7720	.94424	250
26.	O_W_A_2	3.5400	.97375	250
27.	O_W_A_3	3.7280	.96838	250
28.	O_W_A_4	3.5600	.98503	250
29.	O_W_A_5	3.5400	.98605	250
30.	O_W_A_6	3.8200	.99577	250
31.	O_W_A_7	3.3600	1.09324	250

b. Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	H_R_5	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	H_R_2	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	C_R_3	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	W_E_10	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
5	O_W_A_5	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
6	C_R_1	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
7	W_E_1	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

ISSN : 2455-6114

8	W_E_5	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
9	O_W_A_4	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
10	C_R_4	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
11	.	W_E_10	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
12	H_R_1	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
13	W_E_4	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
14	O_W_A_6	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
15	W_E_3	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
16	H_R_3	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
17	W_E_6	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
18	W_E_2	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
19	.	W_E_1	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
20	C_R_6	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
21	O_W_A_7	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
22	.	H_R_1	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
23	W_E_9	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
24	C_R_5	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
25	H_R_1	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
26	W_E_8	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
27	C_R_2	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
28	H_R_7	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

ISSN : 2455-6114

a. Dependent Variable: SATIS_1

c. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
28	.966[ab]	.933	.927	.26966	.002	7.446	1	227	.007

Predictors: (Constant), H_R_5, H_R_2, C_R_3, O_W_A_5, C_R_1, W_E_5, O_W_A_4, C_R_4, W_E_4, O_W_A_6, W_E_3, H_R_3, W_E_6, W_E_2, C_R_6, O_W_A_7, W_E_9, C_R_5, H_R_1, W_E_8, C_R_2, H_R_7

d. ANOVA[ac]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
28	Regression	231.018	22	10.501	144.411	.000[ab]
	Residual	16.506	227	.073		
	Total	247.524	249			

ab. Predictors: (Constant), H_R_5, H_R_2, C_R_3, O_W_A_5, C_R_1, W_E_5, O_W_A_4, C_R_4, W_E_4, O_W_A_6, W_E_3, H_R_3, W_E_6, W_E_2, C_R_6, O_W_A_7, W_E_9, C_R_5, H_R_1, W_E_8, C_R_2, H_R_7

ac. Dependent Variable: SATIS_1

e. Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
28	(Constant)	7.278	.475		15.33	.000					
	H_R_5	4.171	.167	4.106	24.96	.000	.518	.856	.428	.011	92.10
	H_R_2	-.557	.041	-.342	-13.4	.000	-.422	-.666	-.230	.454	2.203
	C_R_3	1.434	.079	1.385	18.06	.000	.219	.768	.310	.050	20.00
	O_W_A_5	-3.318	.161	-3.281	-20.5	.000	.498	-.806	-.352	.012	86.76
	C_R_1	-1.096	.054	-1.040	-20.2	.000	.151	-.803	-.347	.112	8.955
	W_E_5	-.995	.049	-.710	-20.3	.000	-.323	-.804	-.349	.242	4.140
	O_W_A_4	-.342	.042	-.337	-8.12	.000	.289	-.475	-.139	.170	5.870
	C_R_4	.620	.038	.698	16.41	.000	.382	.737	.281	.162	6.158
	H_R_1	.194	.055	.127	3.517	.001	-.274	.227	.060	.224	4.456
	W_E_4	-.216	.023	-.229	-9.57	.000	-.114	-.536	-.164	.515	1.942
	O_W_A_6	-.740	.038	-.739	-19.3	.000	.224	-.790	-.332	.202	4.942
	W_E_3	-.792	.050	-.618	-15.8	.000	-.156	-.724	-.271	.192	5.213
	H_R_3	-.436	.038	-.383	-11.4	.000	.141	-.603	-.195	.261	3.836
	W_E_6	-.206	.046	-.272	-4.50	.000	.181	-.287	-.077	.080	12.43
	W_E_2	.395	.037	.254	10.79	.000	.005	.583	.185	.529	1.889
	C_R_6	.564	.062	.377	9.033	.000	.008	.514	.155	.169	5.934

	O_W_A_7	-.498	.070	-.546	-7.08	.000	.307	-.425	-.121	.049	20.24
	W_E_9	-.164	.045	-.116	-3.68	.000	-.067	-.238	-.063	.298	3.352
	C_R_5	.077	.038	.063	2.039	.043	-.012	.134	.035	.307	3.253
	W_E_8	-.109	.031	-.132	-3.49	.001	-.346	-.226	-.060	.207	4.836
	C_R_2	.127	.044	.136	2.907	.004	.243	.189	.050	.134	7.436
	H_R_7	.054	.020	.057	2.729	.007	.181	.178	.047	.684	1.462
a. Dependent Variable: SATIS_1											

CONCLUSION:

The final Regression model with 22 independent variables (H_R_5, H_R_2, C_R_3, O_W_A_5, C_R_1, W_E_5, O_W_A_4, C_R_4, W_E_4, O_W_A_6, W_E_3, H_R_3, W_E_6, W_E_2, C_R_6, O_W_A_7, W_E_9, C_R_5, H_R_1, W_E_8, C_R_2 and H_R_7) explains almost 92.7% of the variance of **satisfaction from Welfare facilities**. Also, the standard errors of the estimate has been reduced to .26966, which means that at 95% level, the margin of errors for any predicted value of satisfaction from **Welfare facilities** can be calculated as ± 0.5285336 (1.96 X .26966). The 22 regression coefficients, plus the constraints are significant at 0.05 levels. The impact of multi colinerarity in the variable is not substantial. It has the tolerance value less than .648, indicating that over 35.2% 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 inside the workplace** have been used to predict the dependent variable. Using the values of O_W_3 these errors can be reduced by 93.33% (231.018/247.524). This reduction is deemed statistically significant with the F ratio of 144.411and significance at level of 0.000^{ab}. With the above analysis it can be conclude that 22 variable i.e., H_R_5, H_R_2, C_R_3, O_W_A_5, C_R_1, W_E_5, O_W_A_4, C_R_4, W_E_4, O_W_A_6, W_E_3, H_R_3, W_E_6, W_E_2, C_R_6, O_W_A_7, W_E_9, C_R_5, H_R_1, W_E_8, C_R_2 and H_R_7 explains the employee's satisfaction from **Welfare Measures inside the Work Place**.

REFERENCES

1. . 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
2. 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, Vol.6, No. 7, July, PP 13-26.
3. Chandra, B., Goswami, S. and Chouhan, V., (2012) Investigating Attitude towards On-Line Advertising on Social Media – An Empirical Study, Management Insight, SMS Varanasi, ISSN: 0973-936X, Vol. VIII, No. 1, June, PP 1-14.
4. Chouhan, V. & Verma, P., (2014:b), Measuring validity of performance appraisal tools in Performance Appraisal System, Nirnay the Journal of Decision Science, Vol. 6, No. 1, Jan-July, pp 57-64.

5. 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.
6. Chouhan, V., (2013), Global Convergence of Accounting Standard And Indian Perspective, International Journal of Research in Finance & Marketing, 33(7), 15-27
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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
12. Kang, Woo Jin (2014), "Inequality, the welfare system and satisfaction with democracy in South Korea," International Political Science Review, doi: 10.1177/0192512114521053
13. Keane, Lauren, Alexander Pacek, Benjamin Radcliff (2012), "Organized Labor, Democracy, and Life Satisfaction: A Cross-National Analysis," Labor Studies Journal, 37(3): 253-270
14. 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.
15. 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
16. 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
17. 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.
18. Srivastava, S. K. (2004), "Impact of Labour Welfare on Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction," Management and Labour Studies, February, 29(1): 31-41.
19. 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). PP 14-26

ISSN : 2455-6114

20. 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.
21. 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
22. 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