

# Labour Welfare Measures in Neyveli Lignite Corporation India Limited Neyveli, Cuddalore District



M. Rajarajan, R. Ranjitha

**Abstract—** Health, safety and welfare are the measures for increasing the ability of Labours. Those measures provided to labour will cause immediate impact on health, physical and mental ability that result in higher productivity. The facilities like medical, township administration, education and vocational training are the determining factors of welfare measures provided to labours. This article brings forth labour welfare measures at Neyveli lignite corporation India limited Neyveli, Cuddalore district.

**Keywords:** Neyveli Lignite Corporation India Limited (NLCIL), Labour welfare measures, Labour welfare facilities, Intra-mural facility, Extra-mural facility.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Labour welfare is also viewed as total, social and relative ideas. This full conception may be a fascinating state of existence involving physical, mental, ethical and emotional well-being. These elements comparatively represent the structure of welfare, on that its totality stands. The welfare consists of welfare of worker or employee, their family and their community. All aspects are interlinked and work along side these three dimensional approaches. The conception of welfare is expounded with terms of your time and place. It is dynamic and versatile because it is completely different from time to time, business to business, region to region and country to country, relying upon the worth system, level of education, social customs and degrees of manufacture and general customary of the socio-economic development of the folks. Welfare measures additionally embrace the supply of facilities like food, health, clothing, housing, medical, education, insurance, job security, recreation, etc. Such facilities build the worker and his family to steer an honest work life, family life and social life.

## II. CONCEPT OF LABOUR WELFARE MEASURES

Manuscript published on 30 September 2019

\* Correspondence Author

**Dr. M. Rajarajan\***, Associate Professor and Research Supervisor, Department of Commerce, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Cuddalore district, Tamilnadu, India.

**R. Ranjitha**, M.Phil Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Cuddalore district, Tamilnadu, India.

© The Authors. Published by Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP). This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

The term “Labour Welfare Measures” are the facilities provided to Labour within and outdoors of premises at the corporation. It includes the list of services or facilities like canteen, rest room, recreation, transportation, accommodation and different services that contribute to boost conditions underneath that staffs are being employed.

The Committee of consultants on Welfare Facilities for Industrial staff convened by International Labour Organization in 1963 had divided welfare services into two, namely, within the precincts of the institution and outdoors of the establishment; however the whole content of the activities is one at the same.

## III. NEED FOR THE STUDY

Welfare measures keep the boldness and involvement of labourers. The study is to acknowledge whether or not labour welfare facilities play very important role on work potency of labours. Organization must secure the cooperation of employees with the aim of accelerating productivity and to earn high profits by implementing multiple welfare schemes. This strengthens their feel of happiness and responsibility towards the organization. That the study is undertaken to understand the welfare facility of NLCIL labours and level of satisfaction.

## IV. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Human resources are most valuable sources of any organization and therefore the duty of the management is to provide reasonable welfare measures to its employees. If the workers are glad with the provided welfare measures, the result of output will increase. If we make an overall survey of the living and working condition of industrial workers, the necessity of labour welfare measures would be apparent. Therefore the study is carried out in view of health, safety and welfare amenities stated in the *Factories Act 1948* to understand how the activities are conducted smoothly and efficiently. The study will explain how these activities are implemented in a positive way and how they are useful, motivational and creating a healthy working environment.

## V. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To examine the level of awareness of sample respondents and Labour welfare facilities promoted by NLCIL.

## Labour Welfare Measures In Neyveli Lignite Corporation India Limited Neyveli, Cuddalore District

2. To analyse the level of satisfaction of sample respondents over the labour welfare measures in NLCIL.
3. To suggest standardised level of labour welfare measures in the organization under study.

### VI. HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

The following hypotheses are framed and tested.

**Ho1:** There is no significance difference between demographic variables and labour welfare measures of the NLCIL

**Ho2:** There is no significance difference between demographic variables and Level of Awareness provided by NLCIL.

### VII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY & RESULTS

The present study is based on survey method that includes both primary and secondary. The objectives of the research are achieved by collecting, analysing and interpreting of the primary data. Primary data are collected through well designed questionnaire with 5 point scales and distributed to labours at NLCIL.

### VII. SOURCES OF DATA

The sources of data for this research is absolutely primary, collected directly from the respondent by serving the questionnaire to them personally. However the use of

secondary data has also been made in the research. The survey has also been carried out to get clarification of data from the concern authorities.

#### Primary

The first hand information was collected from the different places of work like mines 1&2, township administration, central Service Units, Central Administration. As an essential part of the study, the primary data were collected from 121 respondents including Executives, Supervisors, and Labours.

#### Secondary

The secondary data were collected from the Newspaper, Journals, Magazines, books and unpublished dissertation. The relevant secondary sources of information were also collected from NLCIL documentation centre.

### VIII. SAMPLE SIZE

The proportionate stratified sampling method was used to select the respondents in labour welfare measures in Neyveli Lignite Corporation India Limited, Neyveli. The sample size of 121 (Executive 49, Supervisors 8, and Labour 64 covering almost all the departments) has taken out of the total population of 12,953 employees classified on the basis of their nature of employment

Table 1: Welfare Measures of NLCIL

S. No.	Variables	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Mean
1.	Canteen	43	25	28	9	16	121	3.58
		35.54	20.66	23.14	7.44	13.22	100.00	
2.	Footwear	35	39	30	5	12	121	3.66
		28.93	32.23	24.79	4.13	9.92	100.00	
3.	Provident Fund	58	38	18	0	7	121	4.16
		47.93	31.40	14.88	0.00	5.79	100.00	
4.	Water and Electricity	67	27	14	4	9	121	4.15
		55.37	22.31	11.57	3.31	7.44	100.00	
5.	Uniforms / Liveries	39	38	29	5	10	121	3.75
		32.23	31.40	23.97	4.13	8.26	100.00	
6.	Safety and Accident Prevention	39	42	26	6	8	121	3.81
		32.23	34.71	21.49	4.96	6.61	100.00	
7.	Family Relief scheme	47	41	18	6	9	121	3.92
		38.84	33.88	14.88	4.96	7.44	100.00	
8.	Death relief fund	50	37	19	5	10	121	3.93
		41.32	30.58	15.70	4.13	8.26	100.00	
9.	Library facility	71	21	16	1	12	121	4.14
		58.68	17.36	13.22	0.83	9.92	100.00	
10.	Medical facility in GH	57	30	20	4	10	121	3.99
		47.11	24.79	16.53	3.31	8.26	100.00	
11.	Post-Retirement medical assistant scheme	46	42	16	12	5	121	3.93
		38.02	34.71	13.22	9.92	4.13	100.00	
12.	Educational Facility	61	21	24	6	9	121	3.98
		50.41	17.36	19.83	4.96	7.44	100.00	
13.	Health care facility	59	25	23	6	8	121	4.00
		48.76	20.66	19.01	4.96	6.61	100.00	

14.	Club Facility	53 43.80	27 22.31	23 19.01	4 3.31	14 11.57	121 100.00	3.83
15.	Transport	45 37.19	22 18.18	23 19.01	14 11.57	17 14.05	121 100.00	3.53
16.	Accommodation Facility	42 34.71	42 34.71	21 17.36	4 3.31	12 9.92	121 100.00	3.81
17.	Sports Facility	53 43.80	25 20.66	22 18.18	11 9.09	10 8.26	121 100.00	3.83
18.	Maternity Benefit	39 32.23	41 33.88	22 18.18	13 10.74	6 4.96	121 100.00	3.78
19.	Crèches	31 25.62	18 14.88	36 29.75	32 26.45	4 3.31	121 100.00	3.33
20.	Entertainment	28 23.14	27 22.31	34 28.10	22 18.18	10 8.26	121 100.00	3.34
21.	Health care programmes for school children	37 30.58	31 25.62	28 23.14	19 15.70	6 4.96	121 100.00	3.61
22.	Women health care	53 43.80	23 19.01	28 23.14	13 10.74	4 3.31	121 100.00	3.89
23.	Parks	63 52.07	26 21.49	18 14.88	4 3.31	10 8.26	121 100.00	4.06
24.	Cultural Events	52 42.98	24 19.83	28 23.14	10 8.26	7 5.79	121 100.00	3.86

Source: Primary data 2019

The highest level of 58.68% of the respondents strongly agree and 34.71% agree with respondents are very interested in the job. The Respondents involvement in the job shows 34.71% of the respondents agree and 33.88% of the respondents agree with the job gives better status in the organization. About 33.88% of the respondents agree with the respondents are proud in the job and 32.23% of the respondents agree with the job in the organization is challenging. However the highest of 26.45% disagree and 14.05% strongly disagree with the respondents are really very

proud of their jobs in the organization. The average acceptance score reveals that the job is a very interesting is one of the most important factors (4.16) for the respondents labour welfare measures, followed the job gives them better status in the organization (4.15). However, with regard to the job of everyone in this organization is challenging the respondents assign least acceptance.

**Ho1:** There is no significance difference between demographic variables and labour welfare measures of the NLCIL.

**Table 2 Intra-Mural Welfare Facilities**

S. No.	Variables	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Mean
1.	Drinking water	54 44.63	57 47.11	7 5.79	2 1.65	1 0.83	121 100.00	4.33
2.	Facilities for sitting	39 32.23	60 49.59	17 14.05	4 3.31	1 0.83	121 100.00	4.09
3.	First aid appliances	46 38.02	50 41.32	19 15.70	3 2.48	3 2.48	121 100.00	4.10
4.	Rest rooms	27 22.31	51 42.15	21 17.36	17 14.05	5 4.13	121 100.00	3.64
5.	Changing rooms	23 19.01	45 37.19	29 23.97	19 15.70	5 4.13	121 100.00	3.51
6.	Facilities for washing	26 21.49	39 32.23	32 26.45	19 15.70	5 4.13	121 100.00	3.51
7.	Welfare officers	25 20.66	41 33.88	39 32.23	14 11.57	2 1.65	121 100.00	3.60
8.	Canteen facility	40 33.06	35 28.93	27 22.31	14 11.57	5 4.13	121 100.00	3.75
9.	Education Facilities to the labourers children	41 33.88	54 44.63	18 14.88	6 4.96	2 1.65	121 100.00	4.04
10.	Housing Facility	61 50.41	36 29.75	16 13.22	4 3.31	4 3.31	121 100.00	4.21

# Labour Welfare Measures In Neyveli Lignite Corporation India Limited Neyveli, Cuddalore District

11.	Medical Facility	61	40	14	3	3	121	4.26
		50.41	33.06	11.57	2.48	2.48	100.00	

**Source:** Primary data 2019

Table 2 shows that most of the respondents are agree with the facilities for sitting 49.59 percent provided by the industrial units, followed by the 47.11% of drinking water and 44.63% of educational facilities and 42.15% of rest room, 41.32% of the respondents are first aid appliances, 33.88% and 33.06 agree with the welfare officers and

medical facility respectively. However the facilities for washing and canteen facility have the low level agree, 32.23 percent and 28.93% respectively in the mines units. The mean score indicates the highest 4.33 for the drinking water provided by the mines units, followed by 4.26 for the medical facility, and housing facility provided by the 4.21.

**Table 3: Extra - Mural welfare Facilities**

S. No.	Variables	SA	A	N	DA	SDA	Total	Mean
1.	Personal Health Care	32	63	22	3	1	121	4.01
		26.45	52.07	18.18	2.48	0.83	100.00	
2.	Flexi-time	20	46	45	9	1	121	3.62
		16.53	38.02	37.19	7.44	0.83	100.00	
3.	Labour Assistance Programs	24	56	34	6	1	121	3.79
		19.83	46.28	28.10	4.96	0.83	100.00	
4.	Harassment Policy	11	59	41	7	3	121	3.56
		9.09	48.76	33.88	5.79	2.48	100.00	
5.	Maternity & Adoption Leave	27	55	29	10	0	121	3.82
		22.31	45.45	23.97	8.26	0.00	100.00	

**Source:** Primary data 2019

Table 3 reveals the strongly agree of Non-statutory welfare facilities provided in the organization. 52.07 percent of the respondents are personal health care provided by the industrial units, followed by the 48.76% are the harassment policy and 46.28% of labour assistance programs and

45.45% of maternity & adoption leave, 38.02% of the respondents are flexi-time. The mean score indicates the highest 4.01 for the personal health care provided by the mines units, followed by the 3.82 for the maternity & adoption leave.

**Table 4: Welfare Measures of NLCIL**

N	Demographic Variables	No.	Mean	S.D.	Std. Error	F/T Value	Sig.
Age	Up to 30 Years	13	97.15	17.14	4.75	2.818	0.042*
	30-40 Years	16	100.88	11.19	2.80		
	40-50 Years	32	83.41	31.75	5.61		
	Above 50 Years	60	92.82	17.85	2.30		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>91.86</b>	<b>22.26</b>	<b>2.02</b>		
Education	SSLC/+2	29	81.41	29.79	5.53	2.845	0.027*
	Diploma	14	95.14	22.87	6.11		
	Graduate	43	94.91	15.82	2.41		
	Post-graduate	19	90.21	20.06	4.60		
	Professional degree	16	101.69	17.77	4.44		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>91.86</b>	<b>22.26</b>	<b>2.02</b>		
Year of Service	Below 10 Years	15	93.13	14.99	3.87	8.306	0.001*
	10-20 Years	33	104.03	12.41	2.16		
	Above 20 Years	73	86.10	24.73	2.89		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>91.86</b>	<b>22.26</b>	<b>2.02</b>		
Total Pay Range	Up to Rs.40,000	12	98.83	11.92	3.44	2.450	0.067
	40,001 - 60,000	13	101.85	14.20	3.94		
	60,001 - 80,000	41	85.61	28.41	4.44		
	Above 80,000	55	92.64	19.08	2.57		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>91.86</b>	<b>22.26</b>	<b>2.02</b>		
Marital status	Married	112	91.26	22.87	2.16	0.632	0.533
	Single	7	101.00	10.88	4.11		
	Others (Divorce, Widowed etc.,)	2	93.50	6.36	4.50		

	Total	121	91.86	22.26	2.02		
Nature of Employment	Permanent Basis	109	91.37	22.98	2.20	0.400	0.672
	Temporary Basis	6	93.00	14.42	5.89		
	Contract Basis	6	99.67	14.14	5.77		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>91.86</b>	<b>22.26</b>	<b>2.02</b>		
Nature of Cadre	Executive	49	93.61	15.48	2.21	2.664	.074
	Supervisor	8	74.63	26.74	9.45		
	Labour	64	92.67	25.31	3.16		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>91.86</b>	<b>22.26</b>	<b>2.02</b>		
Number of family Members	Up to 3 Members	43	90.09	24.47	3.73	0.207	0.813
	4 to 6 Members	73	92.82	21.13	2.47		
	More than 6 Members	5	93.00	22.00	9.84		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>91.86</b>	<b>22.26</b>	<b>2.02</b>		
Residential Status	Urban	72	94.14	21.82	2.57	1.643	0.198
	Semi Urban	32	85.78	24.64	4.36		
	Rural	17	93.65	18.03	4.37		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>91.86</b>	<b>22.26</b>	<b>2.02</b>		
Gender	Male	108	92.69	22.58	2.17	1.379	0.186
	Female	13	84.92	18.75	5.20		
Nature of Family Members	Nuclear Family	63	95.05	15.08	1.90	1.617	0.110
	Joint Family	58	88.40	27.79	3.65		

**Source:** Computed Primary data \* Significant at five percent level

The calculated F value of 2.818, 2.845 and 8.306 is significant with respect to age, education and year of service. These values indicate that there is a significant difference between demographic variable and labour welfare measures of the NLCIL and the hypothesis is rejected.

However, the F value of 2.450, 0.632, 0.400, 2.664, 0.207 and 1.643 is not significant with respect to total pay, marital status, nature of employment, nature of cader, number of family members and residential stats. These values indicate that there is no significant difference between demographic variables and labour welfare measures of the NLCIL and the hypothesis is accepted.

The Calculated T value of 1.379 and 1.617 is not significant with respect to gender and nature of family. These

values indicate that there is no significant difference between demographic variables and labour welfare measures of the NLCIL and the hypothesis is accepted.

Further, the mean value indicates that the age category of 30-40 years are having more labour welfare measures whereas 40-50 years are having less welfare measures of the Neyveli Lignite Corporation India Limited.

Similarly, the highly educated are having more welfare measures whereas less educated are having less welfare measures provided by the Neyveli Lignite Corporation India Limited.

The service of 10-20 years is having more welfare measures provided by the NLCIL, followed by below 10 years' service and above 20 years service.

**Table 5: Awareness of Welfare Measures of NLCIL**

N	Demographic Variables	No.	Mean	S.D.	Std. Error	F/T Value	Sig.
Age	Up to 30 Years	13	2.92	1.26	0.35	1.415	0.242
	30-40 Years	16	3.44	0.96	0.24		
	40-50 Years	32	3.47	0.76	0.13		
	Above 50 Years	60	3.42	0.77	0.10		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.08</b>		
Education	SSLC/+2	29	3.41	0.95	0.18	1.045	0.387
	Diploma	14	3.43	0.85	0.23		
	Graduate	43	3.21	0.91	0.14		
	Post-graduate	19	3.68	0.58	0.13		
	Professional degree	16	3.38	0.81	0.20		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.08</b>		
Year of Service	Below 10 Years	15	3.00	1.20	0.31	2.715	0.070
	10-20 Years	33	3.61	0.70	0.12		
	Above 20 Years	73	3.36	0.82	0.10		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.08</b>		



Total Pay Range	Up to Rs.40,000	12	2.67	1.23	0.36	3.449	0.019*
	40,001 - 60,000	13	3.62	0.87	0.24		
	60,001 - 80,000	41	3.46	0.74	0.12		
	Above 80,000	55	3.42	0.79	0.11		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.08</b>		
Marital status	Married	112.00	3.42	0.81	0.08	3.070	0.050*
	Single	7.00	3.14	1.21	0.46		
	Others (Divorce, Widowed etc.,)	2.00	2.00	1.41	1.00		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.08</b>		
Nature of Employment	Permanent Basis	109	91.37	22.98	2.20	0.207	0.814
	Temporary Basis	109.00	3.39	0.84	0.08		
	Contract Basis	6.00	3.17	0.98	0.40		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>1.21</b>	<b>0.49</b>		
Nature of Cadre	Executive	49	3.61	0.57	0.08	3.175	0.045*
	Supervisor	8	3.13	0.99	0.35		
	Labour	64	3.23	0.99	0.12		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.08</b>		
Number of family Members	Up to 3 Members	43	3.51	0.70	0.11	1.093	0.339
	4 to 6 Members	73	3.29	0.95	0.11		
	More than 6 Members	5	3.60	0.55	0.24		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.08</b>		
Residential Status	Urban	72	3.35	0.89	0.10	1.500	0.227
	Semi Urban	32	3.28	0.92	0.16		
	Rural	17	3.71	0.47	0.11		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.08</b>		
Gender	Male	108	3.44	0.81	0.08	1.605	0.031
	Female	13	2.92	1.12	0.31		
Nature of Family Members	Nuclear Family	63	3.37	0.77	0.10	0.199	0.843
	Joint Family	58	3.40	0.95	0.13		

**Source:** Computed Primary data\* Significant at five percent level

The calculated F value of 1.415, 1.045, 2.715, 0.207, 1.093 and 1.500 is significant with respect to age, education, year of service, nature of employment, number of family members and residential status. These values indicate that there is a significant difference between demographic variable and awareness labour welfare measures of the NLCIL and the hypothesis is accepted.

However, the F value of 3.449, 3.070, and 3.175 is significant with respect to total pay, marital status and nature of cadre. These values indicate that there is no significant difference between demographic variables and awareness of labour welfare measures of the NLCIL and the hypothesis is rejected.

The Calculated T value of 1.605 and 0.199 is not significant with respect to gender and nature of family. These values indicate that there is no significant difference between demographic variables and awareness labour welfare measures of the NLCIL and the hypothesis is accepted.

The mean value reveals that the income categories of Rs.40, 001 to Rs.60, 000 are having more awareness than the other income category of respondents.

The married category of respondents is having more awareness than the other marital status of respondents.

The executive category of respondents is having more awareness than the other cadre of respondents in the labour welfare measures provided by the NLCIL.

## IX. SUGGESTIONS

- The corporation has to improve the hygienic condition in the canteen and quality of food. The transport facility provided by the corporation could be revised by increase the frequency of services and facilities available in the bus terminal. It is also suggested to construct new terminal at important places.
- A special committee for safety measure is suggested in the area of Mines-II to educate employees on hazard management. In order to render quality safety service, the members of the safety committee may undergo first aid training.
- The employees of the Neyveli Lignite Corporation India Limited are necessarily looking for their dependant benefits. Hence, it is suggested that the reasonable benefits could be extended to the dependants of the employees.
- It suggested that the female employees are less satisfied with majority of the employee welfare measures. This should be considered seriously and given special attention to provide the reasonable facilities for them.

## X. CONCLUSION

The present study observed that, over all welfare measures are having significant positive result at the Neyveli Lignite Corporation India Limited. In the discussions with labours of different places of work in the corporation, we have found that intramural facilities like medical, colleges and schools can be modernised. The present study has identified that those labours working in the mines units are more affected with lack of health and safety measure. The female labours are less satisfied with the recreational facility and the crèches provided by the corporation.

## REFERENCES

1. Archana.V, "A Study on Employee Job Satisfaction in Jayamalli Industries Pvt. Ltd, SIPCOT, Ranipet", International Research Journal of Business and management, Apr 2014, Vol. IV, Pp 32-34.
2. Arun Kumar, N. Meenakshi, "Management & Labour Studies Developing Work Culture Through Collective Bargaining at Escorts Limited", August 2004, Vol. 29, No. 3, Pp. 205-224.
3. Bennet, "Labour Welfare Measures towards Effective Industrial Relations", Southern Economist, Dec 2009, Pp 43-44.
4. Gi Choon Kang, Sonya Kostova Huffman, Helen H. Jensen, "An Empirical Analysis of Joint Decisions on Labour Supply and Welfare Participation", Applied Economics Letters, November 2004, Pp. 869-872.
5. Gilmer.B.A, "Labour Welfare Amenities and Management", Industrial and Labour Relations, Ithaca: Commel University, 1998, Vol.36, pp-34.
6. Itishree Mohanty, "Evaluating a Training Development Program", HRM Review, Feb 2009, PP 53-54.
7. Gayathri, "A Study of Labour Welfare Measure in Neyveli lignite Corporation in Neyvel, Asia Pacific Journal of Research, Vol: I. Issue XLIV, October 2016, Pp.79-81