EMPLOYEE ATTITUDE AND WELFARE: CASE STUDY

In order to highlight the actual functioning of the employees' perception of labour welfare it is now necessary to explore labourers' attitude towards welfare at micro level. With this end in view, an attempt will be made in this chapter to institute a case study of some important aspects of labour welfare at plant level of two Companies.

In essence, this case study is empirical and fact finding in nature. Its main purpose is to reveal employees' attitude towards prevailing concept of labour welfare and its working at the plant level. The study is likely to be helpful for managements, trade unions and government besides the researchers. The study is also intended to reinforce and supplement the outcome of our foregoing macro level assessment of labour welfare in the developing economy of India.

Two important firms have been selected in Calcutta where sampled workers and clerical staff have been administered specially designed questionnaires in order to elicit information regarding their perception of the concept of welfare and various other aspects of the operation of welfare work at the plant. Apart from clerical staff and workers, managerial, administrative and supervising staff at the two plants are also interviewed on a smaller scale.
It should be noted, however, that as this case-study is not a full-fledged research project of the type we are generally familiar with, the survey design is not strictly based on sophisticated sampling technique on a big scale. As the dissertation is one-man type of research, a purposive sampling design method has been adopted under which a few workers have been selected at random and are administered specially designed questionnaires with a view to giving a pragmatic slant.

With the above approach to the research technique, two firms have been selected in Calcutta for case study. First, Company 'A', employing about 8000 employees, and the second firm, Company 'B', is a medium sized textile mills employing 600 workers.

In both these two types of firms, as required under specific labour legislations, normal welfare facilities are expected to be provided for various categories of workers. With full accord of management and Union free and unbiased investigation work has been satisfactorily carried on, and the workers particularly have displayed greater zeal and co-operation in matter of interview.

Case-study of Company - A.

In the first firm, Company A, altogether 42 workers including a few clerks have been interviewed evenly spread over three important departments of the factory. Information, have been collected on the following heads of the subject matter: (I) Socio Economic background, (II) Concept of Welfare, (III) Perception of welfare work, (IV) Employee attitude towards
employer initiated welfare work, (V) Employee attitude towards
union initiated welfare work, (VI) Employee attitude towards
Union leaders vis-a-vis welfare work, (VII) Government's role
in welfare, (VIII) Indian Welfare State and Ideology, (IX)
Job Behaviour and Welfare and (X) Trade Union and Industrial
Relations.

Socio-economic background of the work force

In Company A, employees who have been interviewed
constitute predominantly two communities, viz. (1) Bengalee
and (2) inhabitants of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Rajasthan,
though most of the respondents' happen to be lower middle
class Bengalee.

It is well known that average lower middle class
Bengalees are marked by two racial traits. First, they are
noted for their generally sensitive rebellious temperament.
And, second, they are indolent and suspicious in nature and
are generally averse to money making.

In all probability, for these complex racial traits
Bengali Employees fall easy prey to violence and political
influence. During 1967-71, West Bengal witnessed worst kind
of political instability and violence, and a violent trade
Union behaviour known as 'Gherao' was the immediate outcome
of political bankruptcy. During this period a large number
of factories were closed due to lock-outs, strikes and other
kinds of work stoppages. Under such an atmosphere objective
research investigation proved a futile task. At the time when the present work was being carried on, much of the political heat and instability subsided. Yet the imprint was perhaps there in the minds of the employees in the Company under reference.

Considering such unusual industrial relations, environmental factors and socio-cultural backdrop of Bengali working class people, their attitude towards various aspects of labour welfare might seem to be little sharp and critical. Whereas other non-Bengali employees are found to be more normal in their behaviour and approach though they might have been influenced by political misguidance.

In 1972, however, with the installation of Congress Government in Calcutta, things assumed proper shape and industrial relations improved and in fact, became much happier. Hence, response from the workers specially is found to be quite encouraging and co-operative at this period.

With such political backdrops, workers, however, have exhibited remarkable intelligence while they are administered questionnaires. The socio economic background of the interviewed workers is shown in Table I. It will be seen from the table that of total interviewed workers, 28 people belong to the age group above thirty and 14 workers are below thirty. A closer scrutiny of the respondents reveals that they are mostly nearing middle age, and come from lower middle class average Bengali Community.
Table - I

Socio-Economic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Educational Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>Above 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below School</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (above 5 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding educational standard, only one is graduate and a diploma holder, while 11 are undergraduates, and 16 people have passed school final and 14 are found to be below school final standard.

Thus, it is evident, that most of them, altogether 28 workers are fairly literate out of 42, which means their perception of the concept of welfare ought to be expected to be fairly high. While interviewing, it reveals that many of the respondents aspire to lead a better working life and, given chance, they could have improved their educational qualifications.

The workers are generally found to belong to the skilled category, i.e., die maker, machine man, fitter, welder. However, they are found to be lacking in adequate training background.
Information on work experience shows that high majority of respondents i.e., 40 have work experience above 5 years. It is found that most of them are working in the Company for fairly long years and they have little job mobility. Lack of training and skill formation may be responsible for such low mobility. However, the majority of workers are experienced.

In this connection it would be relevant to refer to an important case-history of Labour Market behaviour in Engineering industry in West Bengal which was undertaken by the Planning Commission, Government of India in Calcutta during 1965-66. Some special findings of this case-study on mobility and socio-economic characteristic of Engineering labour force in West Bengal are worth noting.

According to this study, 74 per cent of the sampled workers are found to be skilled and about 54% are literate. While literacy percentage is quite high, formally trained personnel percentage is very low, only 8% and also equally low is the proportion of the workers who have received some form of technical education.

Regarding the level of earnings, about 60% of average worker is found to earn between ₹ 3.35 and ₹ 7.69 per day which compares favourably with similar workers in other manufacturing industries in West Bengal. Although earnings are tolerably

better, the standard of living of average worker is not what is expected. It is found that 60% of the sampled workers have high family burden and 63% of the workers suffer from some form of indebtedness. Most of the workers come from either agricultural society or from working itself.

**Concept of Labour Welfare**

On the question of the concept of welfare, at the outset, it must be noted that surely sophisticated assessment and response are not expected from ordinary workers of rather low standard of education. Yet it is remarkable how near sophisticated remarks have come from the respondents. Table 2 shows the workers' idea about the concept of labour welfare.

It will be evident from Table 2 that regarding basic nature of welfare, 28 workers feel it as psychological, 13 as economic and only 1 as sociological. This shows that most of the workers have the ability of understanding the fundamental character of Welfare concept, though economic factors presumably ought to have influenced their perception in view of their poverty. Insignificant response to sociological nature of welfare may be due to their poor understanding of the subject. Although labour welfare constitutes a core element of economic welfare as the general body of knowledge, the contemporary literature is inclined to believe more in its subjective utilitarian content which is basically psychological and partly sociological. It is indeed remarkable how the
ordinary workers have been able enough to grasp the real nature of the subject. This bears a testimony to the high standard of intelligence of the workers.

Table - 2

Concent of Labour Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic nature of Welfare</th>
<th>Approach to Welfare</th>
<th>Welfare as Wage substitute for wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Psychosocial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsibility of Welfare Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Joint Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding approach to welfare, the table shows that all of the respondents consider it as humanitarian and not at all paternalistic. This again confirms the prevailing thinking on the subject according to which labour welfare problems are approached by Government and other agencies. Workers' attitude towards welfare is therefore to be considered by private entrepreneur realistically. Any sort of traditional paternalism is now abhorred by workers and employers should never consider welfare any other than humanitarian measure. This finding is likely to remove much misunderstanding in the field of industrial
relations, and management should have clear vision about workers' reaction to the approach of labour welfare.

In reply to the question whether welfare is a substitute for wage, majority of workers, 39 are found to consider welfare as not substitutable for wage, while only 3 think welfare as wage substitute. This means that workers are not prepared to part with welfare benefits in lieu of better wages. In fact, welfare benefits are not to be considered as something which are competitive with wage, rather complementary. Welfare, therefore, should be regarded as something additional over and above wage. In the light of this revelation employers should not complain against welfare costs which are indirect costs and which are as essential as wage costs in an enterprise.

The table also indicates workers' reaction to the question of responsibility of welfare work. The table shows that, majority of 29 workers think welfare work as joint responsibility of union, management and government, while 5 workers think it as the responsibility of management and 8 as that of government. It is strange, however, that none of the workers find it necessary to consider welfare work as union responsibility. While the respondents have clearly understood the basic nature of welfare responsibility, their reaction to union role in this respect may either be misjudged or politically motivated. Probably, this reaction may be due to very insignificant welfare actually done by trade unions in our country. In this connection, workers' response also confirms
the general attitude of management who are not inclined to think welfare as their prime responsibility clearly, as we have seen already welfare work, by and large should be state sponsored and the implementation should be the joint responsibility. This also confirms our previous finding that in the concept of labour welfare, the role and significance of welfare state should be of paramount importance.

**Perception of Welfare Work:**

Next to the concept of labour welfare, the actual perception of welfare work by employees is to be considered as of strategic importance which is illustrated in Table 3. Perception of welfare work is indicative of workers' real functioning of mind in relation to welfare. Management, union or Government may initiate any type of welfare work, but workers' reaction to all such performance is to be ascertained in order to determine the real usefulness of such work from the viewpoint of those for whom these are meant. In India, large scale socio-psychological researches are important for assessing various categories of employee attitude and reaction in this respect. Any welfare work without taking into consideration employees' perception may lead to misunderstanding and consequent bad industrial relations.
Table - 3

Perception of Welfare Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Welfare Work Preferred</th>
<th>Effects of employer initiated Welfare on Productivity (Plant level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inplant Welfare</td>
<td>Favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Plant Welfare</td>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 26                             | 16                             | 3                               | 39                             |

Welfare Preference Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Wages</th>
<th>Less wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less Welfare</td>
<td>more welfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some ideas of this phenomenon is shown in Table 3. It will be seen in the table that, the type of welfare work preferred by most of the workers are inplant welfare work, i.e. 26 workers, while 16 workers, prefer outside plant welfare work. This means that employees, in general, perceive welfare work as inplant welfare, a notion which is also confirmed by the experts. However, this does not minimise the importance of outside plant welfare work which is equally important. But, probably, unsatisfactory welfare arrangements inside the plant where the case study has been undertaken may have influenced the employee perception. In fact, this is largely true when one takes note of some specific comments made by some workers at the plant. For example, it has been prompted out that
adequate arrangements of games, recreation and canteens are lacking in the factory. Obviously, these elementary welfare arrangements should have been made in the biggest automobile firm in India employing several thousands of workers.

Closely related to this view, as it will be seen in the table, on the question of effects of employer initiated welfare work on productivity 39 workers think it as unfavourable, while only 3 consider it as favourable. This poses a serious problem to motivation, morale and productivity.

It will be seen in the table that, regarding welfare preference pattern, 24 workers are found to favour more wages and less welfare work, while 18 are found to prefer more welfare work. Still, one may contend, from this workers's preference for welfare work is not insignificant. It seems, notwithstanding good wages and largeness of the latest modern plant, neglect of welfare work is actually felt by all categories of employees, especially workers. In West Bengal, it is really a pity that even some big private entrepreneurs are blissfully oblivious of the importance of welfare work. It is no wonder therefore that industrial relations often deteriorate in the State culminating in political misguidance and violence.

Employee attitude towards Employer initiated Welfare Work:

An examination of the perception of welfare work will now be logically pursued for the assessment of employee attitude
towards Employer initiated welfare work which is shown in Table 4. This finding is likely to be extremely useful for personnel management development. It is wellknown, all bigger firms have to initiate and to develop some forms of welfare programmes under the rules of Factory Act 1948 and other welfare legislations. It is necessary to ascertain employees attitude towards management, and more specifically employers and the modus operandi of welfare personnel.

It will be evident from Table 4 that, 40 workers are dissatisfied with employer initiated welfare - this is indeed the vast majority - which is the logical conclusion of the preceding perceptive reaction. About the form of welfare work, 26 are found to favour non-monetary type of welfare work, while 16 are found to favour monetary welfare. This signified, as is expected, that most of workers are not inclined to consider welfare in terms of monetary payment. There are some benefits essential for labour efficiency which can only be initiated by employer as large-scale investment such as housing, educational facilities, canteens and games etc. No monetary payment, however high might be, can substitute such essential welfare.

In this context, employees' psychological attitude towards welfare should be highly interesting. The table shows that, 31 workers dislike their employers, and 11 workers like their employers. This is indicative of employee feeling about
employers in the context of prevailing welfare work. Alongside this attitude towards employer most of the workers, 30 are found to like their welfare officers, and 12 dislike welfare officers. This is symptomatic of labour behaviour in our country where employee dissatisfaction is often employer directed who are the owners of the organisation. This psychological and behaviouristic attitude is also reflected in their attitude towards management. It is to be noted from the table that, 34 workers are unhappy with management and 8 are found to be happy with management.

Table - 4

Employee Attitude Towards Employer initiated Welfare Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied with Welfare Work</th>
<th>Dissatisfied with Welfare work</th>
<th>Preference to Monetary welfare</th>
<th>Preference to Non-monetary Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likes employer EMPLOYER Dislikes EMPLOYER Likes Employer Officers Dislikes Welfare Officers

| 11 | 31 | 30 | 12 |

This finding is highly significant for personnel management. It appears that while workers are dissatisfied with
both employers and management in relation to welfare work, they are not unhappy with their welfare officers, who are entrusted with actual supervision of welfare work. It indicates that workers are highly intelligent in perceiving the real nature of the problem. Welfare Officers are also themselves employees who have little to do in improving or rationalising welfare matters. Perhaps personnel officers, in larger perspective, also realise this problem and workers are not unaware of this state of affairs. The mental unhappiness and resultant job behaviour may give rise to serious personnel problems, which management must take into account. Personnel policy should be so reformed as to remove such unhappy misconception about employers.

In all probability, because of general apathy of management to welfare work employees, in general, as we have already seen, consider welfare work as joint responsibility of all concerned.

Employee attitude towards Union initiated welfare work

In this connection, it would be interesting to know possible employee attitude towards union initiated welfare work. The position has been stated in Table 5.

It is clear from the table that 26 workers consider union-initiated welfare work as insignificant and 16 workers feel that Union initiated welfare work is significant. This finding, is of course, at the plant level. But in a previous chapter it has been noted that in India generally speaking
union initiated on welfare is insignificant as compared with advanced countries. In order to fully assess this reaction, workers have been asked to clarify whether welfare work is really neglected by union. To this question, it is found that 22 workers think welfare work is neglected by union, while 20 workers think otherwise. This means, on this question workers are almost evenly divided. This attitude may be attributable to workers' incapacity to grasp the crux of the problem and, partly, union leaders' propaganda against employers.

On this issue, a clear picture will emerge if one considers the important question whether workers are generally consulted by union leaders. It will be seen in the table that, 27 workers have expressed that they are not consulted by union
leaders for welfare work, while 15 workers are found to think that workers are consulted in the matter.

It would appear from this reaction that workers' almost evenly divided contention about the general neglect of welfare work by union stems from this lack of confidence by union leaders in workers' capacity to be consulted. It may be noted here that, political indoctrination of workers may seriously disturb and corrode their own power of judgement with regard to their assessment of the union initiated welfare work. Probably, all employees are not well informed of real state of union affairs for political reasons.

That this might be the case can be understood from the question whether workers are aware of the manner of utilization of union funds for welfare work. It appears that 33 workers think union funds are well utilized but are not sure of the extent of utilization of union fund specifically for welfare work. However, 9 workers, only think union funds are not at all utilized for welfare work.

**Employee attitude towards Union Leaders Vis-a-Vis Welfare Work**

It is against this background that employee attitude towards union leaders, not merely union as institution, Vis-a-Vis welfare work should be judged. This is shown in Table 6.
union leaders' attitude is unfavourable in this respect. Obviously this majority opinion in favour of union leaders' attitude is quite expected, and it is quite unlikely that workers would say anything damaging against their Union leaders. But it is quite interesting, 27 workers feel that Trade Union leaders are mainly preoccupied with industrial disputes matters rather than welfare problems, and 15 workers think union leaders' main preoccupation is welfare issues. This also generally confirm the prevailing state of affairs in union activities. Closely related to this, it will be found from the table that, 20 workers are found to consider union leaders' political views are interfering with welfare work, and 22 consider union leaders' political activities are not interfering with welfare work.

It appears that on this question, which is traditionally controversial, workers are evenly divided and they
may be sceptic of union leaders' real attitude in the matter. However, comparing Table 7 with Table 6, one may discern the inherent apathy of unions for welfare work. It is, however, difficult to say how far this apathy is deliberate or due to financial weakness. As already explained, workers interviewed also are extremely critical of employer initiated welfare work and not satisfied either with employer or management. It is because of this both union and management apathy that workers are found to consider welfare work properly a joint responsibility.

**Government's role in welfare**

Let us now turn to government's role in labour welfare. At this stage, a clearer picture is emerging about the crucial and strategic role of government. In the light of foregoing labour attitude towards welfare, vis-a-vis government, it is now necessary to reaffirm labourers' conviction for government's positive role.

Workers' assessment of government role in welfare is illustrated in Table 7.

**Table - 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It will be seen in the table that 33 workers think welfare as State government responsibility and 9 workers think it as Central Government responsibility. This means workers attach greater importance to the local government for initiating welfare work. The policy of Central subsidy and other types of organizational aid hitherto made available for welfare work should be reviewed in the light of workers' assessment of the problem. As expected and obviously corroborated by our earlier findings, 31 workers are found to prefer more Government initiative and 11 workers are found to have preference for less government initiative.

It is clear, workers' general reaction in this regard is to have more positive State Government role which can supplement Central government welfare policy and programme. Employee attitude towards prevailing employer oriented and union oriented welfare work being unfavourable, the State Government in West Bengal should come forward immediately with increasing quantum of welfare fund to facilitate and to augment labour efficiency.

It is interesting to note employees' assessment
of the reasons for government subsidy in welfare work. It will be seen in the table that most of the employees, 26 consider predominantly economic reasons which are the main-spring, 11 consider humanitarian reasons and only 5 attach political significance to governmental assistance. It would, therefore, be evident that despite political turmoil in West Bengal during 1967-71, most of the workers are found not to have lost their mental power of objective assessment of the problem which is indeed a tribute to the employees.

In order to identify the comparable employee attitude towards welfare in other industries, it is extremely important to undertake this type of attitudinal inter-industry surveys in different cross sections of industries in West Bengal. It would be interesting to note what type of attitude one can find in Company B in our next analysis of similar aspects of welfare.

**Indian Welfare State and Ideology**

In almost all the countries of the world, the role of state as the mainspring of welfare is now well recognised irrespective of ideological differences. The contention that economic growth and welfare state is irreconcilable and can not proceed simultaneously is untenable on the basis of observed facts, especially in the context of national income changes. This have been examined and concluded in Chapter - 4.

Most of us now believe that India is a welfare state,
or at least at the threshold of being a welfare state. The proclaimed welfare policy and programmes for national economic development as enunciated and laid down in Five Year Plan are the avowed objectives and performances of Indian Welfare State.

It is now pertinent to inquire how the working class people in India feel and think about the question, whether India is really a Welfare state in the perspective of ideological controversies. Table 8 indicates employees thinking about Indian Welfare State and ideology.

**Table - 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>India considered as</th>
<th>Welfare State preferred in lieu of freedom of</th>
<th>Communist State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India not considered as</td>
<td>Welfare not precluded</td>
<td>Fullest Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare State</td>
<td>不了</td>
<td>necessarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table reveals amazingly significant response and reading of the issue. It will be noticed that all of 42 employees interviewed believe India is not a welfare state, which sounds extremely critical and significant in the context of the prevailing spate of activities of Indian welfare state. It is indeed a sad commentary on the performances of the welfare state of India from the viewpoint
of those who are really the main concern of the government. It is, therefore, high time that government of India should take cautious note of the reading of the working class people.

That this critical assessment of employees is not connected with any political belief or is in no way an anti-government stand, is to be clear from their next objective observations concerned ideology. For example, most of the employees, 28 of them, think communist state is not necessarily a welfare state, while 14 think fullest welfare is possible in Communist State.

It is to be noted that this employee assessment is particularly significant from the group of employees in Company A where trade union is a Marxist Union. Further more, to the question of a choice between individual freedom and greater welfare amenities, an overwhelming majority of 38 workers are found to be in preference for greater welfare in lieu of freedom, while only 4 are found to favour more freedom than welfare.

This finding is of greater significance for India not only for the present state of development, but also for the future as well. If this employee reaction is any indication for the future, it should be kept in mind that, vast majority of workers would like to have more welfare benefits irrespective of ideology, and communist ideology has no special
appeal to them for this purpose. If violent Marxism has made any headway in India, it is because of Union and management apathy and neglect of labour welfare. And, even if some employees are Marxists, majority of them have no illusion for communist state. Notwithstanding, political propaganda for years, by and large, working class people in the country have not lost their capacity of objective assessment of welfare problem.

It is in this context, it is quite surprising that both management and union do not think it necessary to consult and to take into confidence the ordinary employees for formulating welfare schemes. It is, however, gratifying that government is aware of this sentiment of employees, and workers participation in management in public sector has been adopted both as a principle and as a performance.

**Job Behaviour and Welfare**

Employees' Job behaviour is conditioned by many factors - some are connected with non-welfare factors and some with welfare factors. A separate and exclusive research design may be necessary only to find out the nature and pattern of job behaviour in relation to welfare. However, in Table - 9, some idea has been given regarding job behaviour and welfare.
It will be evident from Table 9 that 36 interviewed workers would like to work more with extra welfare benefits and only 6 are found to be unwilling to work more with more welfare benefits. This signifies that job performance is positively correlated with welfare. But this finding is to be read with a question of choice between wages and welfare. For example, 32 workers are found to prefer more wages for extra work rather than welfare benefits, and 10 workers are found not to favour extra wages for extra work. This indicate, employees' clear preference for wages when they are put to choice between wages and welfare. This preference may possibly be accounted for by the fact that employees generally are inclined to consider wage as not substitutable with welfare which must be provided over and above required amount of wages.
Regarding direct job satisfaction, it will be found that 23 workers are not satisfied with their job while 19 appear to be satisfied with job. This phenomenon of job satisfaction is, however, extremely difficult to analyse without collecting more relevant data. Because job satisfaction is related to many complex factors, some of which are highly psychological and others may be economic or sociological. As our foregoing findings are predominantly welfare oriented, causes of job dissatisfaction are apt to be heavily influenced by welfare factors, which, in fact, may be the real case. But one can not be certain about the role of welfare in job satisfaction as there may be so many non-welfare factors to go by. This aspect of the problem constitutes the subject matter of personnel management which will be examined in the next chapter.

The nature of job behaviour may also be influenced by the nature of managerial policy. For example, in this respect, 24 respondents are found to be of opinion that they are not consulted by management for formulating any welfare scheme, while 18 think they are consulted by management in this matter.

From this brief analysis of job behaviour, a complex subject matter of personnel management, it is evident that personnel policy of overall management technique should be critically examined. The contemporary literature on job behaviour is heavily influenced by theories of productivity,
motivation and morale. Meaningful attitude surveys are necessary for testing the prevailing hypothesis, theory and conception of job behaviour. In advanced countries, especially in the U.S., socio-psychological researches are being carried on to identify the real nature of job satisfaction. In India also, it is extremely important to undertake a series of such researches at the plant level particularly to explore to what extent welfare factors are functionally related to overall job behaviours at the plant level.

**Trade Union and Industrial Relations**

The nature of trade unionism and industrial relations may be functionally connected with job behaviour at the plant level. In order to find out the underlying tendencies of job behaviour in relation to welfare, it would be appropriate to explore the nature of trade unionism and industrial relations in Company A, which is illustrated in Table 10.

It will be seen in the Table 10 that as expected, 39 workers are found to be members of Union dominated by Marxist party, and only 3 are found to be not members of Union.
Table - 10

Trade Union and Industrial Relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of Union</th>
<th>Not member of different Union</th>
<th>Number of workers</th>
<th>Number of workers indifferent to welfare</th>
<th>Number of workers indifferent to welfare</th>
<th>Subjected to disciplinary action</th>
<th>Not subjected to disciplinary action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does not</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Happy fellow</th>
<th>Unhappy with supervision</th>
<th>Welfare as personal affairs</th>
<th>Welfare not personal affairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>fellow workers</td>
<td>workers</td>
<td>workers</td>
<td>workers</td>
<td>workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the question whether union is indifferent to welfare, workers are found to be equally divided i.e., 21 or half the interviewed workers think union is indifferent and the others do not think so. This means there is equally strong opinion both in favour and against unions with regard to their interests in welfare. It seems work force in our country are equally politically indoctrinated and of independent character who can judge the important issues dispassionately.

To the question if the workers are subjected to disciplinary action in relation to their union activities, all of the interviewed workers are found not being subjected to disciplinary action, which is admittedly the index of good union behaviour.
Further to industrial relations and regarding job attitude an overwhelming majority of 39 workers are found to like their fellow workers. It is also important to note that most of the workers, 34 are found to be happy with their supervisor and only 8 are found to be unhappy with supervision. At present, a good deal of researches and literature on supervision as an important element of job satisfaction are being developed, which will be examined in a following chapter with a view to analysing the existing nature of job dissatisfaction, as is revealed at the plant under reference.

Finally, it is pertinent to identify that, in this regard, 28 interviewed workers are found to consider welfare as personal affairs, while 14 think it otherwise. This appears to be rather extraordinary thinking on the part of the workers who invariably find fault with either management or government in the matter of welfare. If welfare issue is really considered to be personal affairs, the workers themselves are to be responsible for this and they are supposed to solve their own problem without depending on Government or employer.

Summary, Conclusions and Comments on the findings of Case-Study:

It would now be relevant to make summary conclusions and some comments of the findings of the case-study of Company A.

As already noted, the Company A is large-scale industry. The 42 workers, which have been randomly selected for interview from three important engineering sections of
the plant represent the most literate and intelligent part
of the universe or population as technically called. The
respondents' replies to various questions put to them, by
and large, reveal remarkable maturity of thinking on several
important issues of welfare. Although the respondents are
not supposed to be conversant with current literature on wel-
fare and other related subjects, their working experience
relating to welfare and their own power of judgement have
revealed fascinating information. It seems, they are fully
conscious of prevailing state of affairs in the field of
industrial relations in West Bengal.

Notwithstanding, political instability and violent
trade union behaviour in West Bengal during 1967-71, the
experienced working class people have retained their own
power of judgement, if however, the case-study is any index
of this special labour behaviour phenomenon. That this is
ture, has been amply justified by subsequent stable political
development in the state.

It must be remembered that the concept and practice
of welfare are substantially psychological and administrative
involving largely workers and government. From a study of
a series of interviews and discussions with personnel mana-
gers in Calcutta, it appears that management is largely
inclined to believe, wages and welfare issues are to-day
becoming less significant objectively, and that labour atti-
tude and behaviour are of greater significance for industrial
relations
relations. 1 While this may be true, it is necessary to know why and to what extent this phenomenon is occurring. To this question management appears to be blissfully ignorant.

The findings have amply demonstrated employees' genuine concern for the neglect of Welfare work both by union and management. They are equally critical of union leaders' attitude and role in welfare though in subdued form.

In the process of analysis of the findings, important observations have already been made. However for the convenience of comparison the following specific conclusions may be reaffirmed.

1. Labour Welfare, as a concept, is largely psychological though heavily influenced by economic considerations.

2. General approach to welfare is humanitarian.

3. Welfare benefits are not substitutable with wages, which should be provided over and above wages.

4. Responsibility for welfare work is to be jointly undertaken by union, management and government.

5. Generally speaking, welfare work at plant is unsatisfactory and its effects are unfavourable on productivity.

1 Workshop on "Personnel Policy and Industrial Relations" - Institute of Industrial Relations Research and All-India Manufacturers' Organisation, May 16, 1972, Calcutta.
6. Employees have preference for inside plant welfare work and they prefer non-monetary type of welfare benefits.

7. While the employees dislike management and employees, they like welfare officers.

8. Union's role in welfare work is insignificant though union leaders' attitude towards welfare is favourable.

9. Union leaders are more preoccupied with industrial disputes matters than welfare work.

10. India is not considered a Welfare State and a Communist state is not necessarily a welfare state.

11. As a matter of choice welfare is preferred to freedom.

12. Employees are generally willing to intensify work efforts with extra welfare benefits though higher wages are preferred.

13. Job satisfaction is low though workers are happy with supervision and fellow workers.

14. Industrial relations at the plant are, generally speaking, good notwithstanding unfavourable employee attitude towards management. But it seems there is simmering discontent.
15. Specific suggestions for more adequate and good canteens, games, recreation facilities have been offered with a view to streamlining better welfare facilities.

16. Despite Marxist party dominated union, employees are not blind followers of any ideology as they are acutely conscious of their real needs.

This general reaction to labour welfare is all the more surprising in view of the fact that, company A being a big firm should provide adequate arrangements for modern welfare facilities. If this is the reaction of a big company's labour force, where benefits and facilities can be legitimately claimed, the welfare conditions in medium sized or smaller firms can be well imagined. An idea of employee attitude in a medium sized firm would be given next when the case study of Company B, a medium firm, will be undertaken.

One possible explanation of the neglected of labour welfare by management may be heavy government subsidy and greater involvement in welfare programmes. This has produced an idea in the minds of employees that managements have not much stake in labour welfare. In fact, according to many personnel managers' views managements in India are much more worried about industrial relations problems in which welfare issues are found not to be much involved. For example, in Company A,
it has been pointed out that, wage structure being quite good, strikes, lockouts and other types of work stoppages are few and far between. This has obviously created an impression that workers are generally happy with working conditions and there is nothing to be worried.

Notwithstanding any overt deterioration in industrial relations, job satisfaction may not be present, as can been seen in Company A, and this phenomenon should be inquired into. It is, however, to be noted that job satisfaction is a thing which is seldom found even among the highest paid staff. The possible reasons of job unhappiness might be traced to many factors some of which are related to unscientific management and some to purely psychological factors of employees.

Purely psychological factors are however, more difficult to locate and remedial prescription requires intensive morale and attitude surveys. Elements involved in unscientific management are traceable to outdated and unimaginative managerial styles. As has been seen in the findings in Company A, effects of unfavourable welfare perception on productivity are considered to be unsatisfactory and, therefore, there is reason to believe that employee motivation and morale are far from satisfactory.

It is to be noted that strikes, lockouts and prolonged closures due to serious labour troubles leading to loss of production are clear indications of bad industrial relations. But,
even if, there are no such objective manifestations of work stoppages, productivity may still hamper due to go slow, wild cat strikes or deliberate indiscipline at the plant level. Absence of pronounced deterioration in industrial relations does not necessarily mean the existence of industrial peace. As a matter of fact, industrial peace may be extremely misleading and is far from an ideal situation, if it is accompanied with prolonged go slow resulting in stagnant productivity. Under such a situation there is no overt manifestation of work stoppage and apparently industrial peace exists. Thus industrial peace is not enough, what is urgently needed is industrial harmony.

The findings of this case-study are welfare centred, and it is clear that employee dissatisfaction, in so far as the findings are concerned, mainly originates in lack of adequate welfare amenities and certain specific benefits. Obviously this may result in low work motivation and morale which might be reflected in low productivity. Inasmuch as the Company A, is a big one, unsatisfactory job behaviour leading to low productivity has not resulted in closure. In our next case-study. Company B, which is medium sized, was subjected to a very prolonged strike and violent labour trouble during 1969-71 resulting in serious production and capital loss.

Therefore, case-studies in two different sizes of
firms will provide an ample opportunity of comparison of
attitude and behaviour relating to welfare where one is
marked by industrial peace and the other by worst form of
industrial relations proceeding the survey.

Unfavourable employee attitude for inadequate wel-
fare, as has been explored, in the present case-study and in
the next case-study, is likely to lead to serious lapses in
motivation, morale and productivity.

In the current theories of personnel management,
problems of motivation, morale and incentives are often dis-
cussed as inherent constituents of productivity which are
inter-related. There is, however, a good deal of loose
thinking about their concepts and implications. What might
be the most acceptable definitions of motivation and morale?
Any such definition is an arduous and complex undertaking
because individual and group reactions are different things.

Morale is primarily a zest of mind of employees
management problem while motivation is commonly ascribed to
workers as if there is no motivation problem for executives
and other non-labour employees. Clearly, the problem of
motivation from wider perspective must be visualised as the
problem of team-work comprising the entire plant. This team
work is essential for any type of sustained productive work
which is often forgotten by the top-management. It is also
often arg
basic physical requirements of life while high-level needs are only important to high level employees. But recent researches in motivation have explored this myth. Productivity cannot be increased unless the motivation is conceptualised and practised in an integrated form in three important approaches.\(^1\) First, human needs, attitudes and morale are elements of motivation as a person-centered approach. Second technical aspects and requirements are to be considered as qualitative elements of motivation as skill centered approach. Thirdly, administrative procedures and personnel policy are to be considered as elements of motivation as organisation-centered approach.

The most fundamental and driving aspect of personnel management is to motivate people to work. This, however, based on the crucial assumption that work motivation is possible for those who are willing and have ability to work. Contemporary theory of motivation has many complex facets and it is perhaps difficult to pin-point any acceptable unique theory of motivation. But basically, motivation springs from a human urge of ego satisfaction, whatever might be the type of ego. In human life, motivation has a hierarchy of closely inter related needs which may not always function logically or rationally. However, every person has a priority of such ego needs which run one after another. As motivation is a human trait it differs from a person to person and it is

---

difficult to identify any interpersonal motivation pattern.

However, if motivation is conceived of as "inside voice" of every individual, it is possible to discern motivational pattern as an individual basis. According to Gellerman, some type of "unifying forces run through each individual's motivational history." Each individual as bread earner has his own self-image which seeks fulfilment, whatever it is and he is usually pursuing his "psychological advantage" for the self-fulfilment. Probably McGregor has characterised this aspect of human work motivation as 'self-actualisation'.

However, it must be noted that what a person may feel about his self-image is the outcome of his response to his environment or experience. In a sense, an individual's motivation if divorced from the group to which he belongs and if considered independently of his colleagues is extremely difficult to measure. This type of inner motivation aiming at individual goals is highly psychological and springs from his childhood psychology. Subsequent adult experience in life and his environment which he inherits and gradually forms himself find expression in his job behaviour. If a person's adult behaviour is found to express itself in aggressive self-assertion his relative subordinate position is almost certainly to come into conflict with any authoritarian management. In other words, his self-image may probably be unduly high in

the context of the existing environment. Conversely, if a person changes his self-image drastically by tending to lose self-assertion in order to cope with the authoritarian management, he may lose motivation in his work by not responding to his inner motivation.

**Case Study of Company 'B'**

Now a similar case-study will be undertaken in Company B, a medium-sized textile mill in Calcutta in order to explore the nature and specific pattern of welfare reaction in a different setting.

The findings of Case-study in Company A will now be helpful for instituting a more critical assessment of welfare variables in Company B. Before analysing the situation in this case-study, it is appropriate to refer to the special background of Company B. The Company is a medium-sized mill employing 600 workers. Before the present case-study is undertaken, the Marxist Union launched more than a year-old strike to redress the workers' grievances and demands. The strike resulted in serious production and capital loss. Industrial relations and union behaviour were found in its worst forms during the closure. The strike was ultimately called off and a mutual settlement was concluded following the installation of a new Congress dominated Union. It is after this political change-over that the present case-study has been undertaken. Thus a certain amount of political shadow probably
has moulded the employee reaction, attitude and behaviour pattern in the case-study.

As in Company A, the similar research technique has been adopted in Company B, where total 32 employees, predominantly workers and clerks spreading over eight departments have been randomly selected and interviewed.

Information collected and processed on the following similar heads, as in Company A, will be analysed: (I) Socio-economic background (II) Concept of welfare (III) Perception of welfare work (IV) Employee attitude towards employer initiated welfare work (V) Employee attitude towards union initiated welfare work (VI) Employee attitude towards union leaders vis-a-vis welfare work (VII) Government's role in welfare (VIII) Indian welfare state and ideology (IX) Job behaviour and welfare and (X) Trade union and industrial relations.

Socio-economic background

The employees of Company B belong to lower middle class of Bengali Community and communities inhabiting in North India. An idea of their socio economic background is given in Table 1. Of 32 workers interviewed, 20 are found to be below thirty years and 12 are found to be above thirty.
Regarding educational standard, most of the workers, i.e. 22 are below school final and 10 of school final standard. None is found to be graduate or undergraduate. This means employees' literary level is not good as compared with Company A. It is presumable therefore, that employees' level of expectation and capacity of assessment might be comparatively poor.

About the work experience, the table shows that majority of the workers, 27 have quite high work experience, over 5 years, while only 5 are found to have low experience. On further investigation, it has been found that workers' mobility is somewhat low, and most of them started their work-life quite earlier. This has made their total work experience fairly long.
The workers are found to have poor standard of living with low income level and high incidence of dependants. As their family background is poor, most of the employees have not the opportunity of completing their studies. This is also responsible for their early start of work-life. Though majority of the respondents are of comparatively younger age group, they are mostly married which is indicative of their lack of sophisticated attitude towards life. As already noted, the work-force in the Company B belong to politically Congress dominated trade union, and, expectedly, their response and attitude might be different from that of Company A which is Marxist labour force.

Concept of labour welfare

Table 2 indicates workers' thinking on the concept of labour welfare. It will be seen in the table that, as regards the basic nature of welfare, most of the workers, i.e. 18 think it psychological; but 14 consider it economic which means concept of labour welfare is found to be basically psycho-economic in nature.

Regarding approach to welfare, all of the respondents think it humanitarian and none paternalistic, which is surprisingly similar to the findings of Company A. This confirms the contemporary expert thinking on the subject according to which classical paternalistic approach to welfare is to-day untenable. The concept of labour welfare has thus close affinity with the concept of social security which had its origin in the concept of charity and assistance but subsequently
has turned to be humanitarian and economic.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept of Labour Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic nature of Welfare:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsibility of welfare work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Joint Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overwhelming majority of workers are found to consider, i.e., 31, welfare benefits not substitutable with wages which also confirms the earlier findings. It seems, in India, workers are not prepared to accept or enjoy welfare benefits at the cost of wages, a line of thinking which unfortunately the managements do not accept. The gross negligence of welfare work by employers is probably based on the belief that, workers prefer high wages and they have no consideration for welfare benefits. But, on the basis of these findings, it is now proved that employers' notion is highly mistaken.

On the question of the responsibility of welfare work, as is expected, most of the workers do not consider it joint only 1 manage-
ment's responsibility while, surprisingly, none think union has any responsibility in the matter. This assessment is quite revealing because, although, welfare work is considered a joint responsibility of all concerned, fundamentally the responsibility devolves on government. This is quite realistic assessment of the situation in view of the apathy and neglect of welfare work both by union and management.

Workers' this attitude towards the assessment of welfare responsibility is likely to empower the government more and more to impose welfare legislations on employers which the employers are found to disfavour. But the only way to halt increasing government in roads in the matter is to undertake greater welfare responsibility by employers. After all, it is the management who has greater stake in productivity and good industrial relations. This can be better achieved by taking recourse to increasing labour welfare programmes even at the cost of immediate profit. Failure to do this is to invite political influence of both government and trade unions.

Perception of Welfare Work

Perception of welfare work, in real sense, is difficult to quantify as it involves many interconnected complex variables. However, some idea has been given about the phenomenon in Table 3. It will be evident that on this question, workers are almost evenly divided, 18 appear to favour inplant welfare, while 14 appear to favour outside plant welfare
facilities. This is perhaps indicative of workers' inclination to consider both equally important. A slight preference is, however, demonstrated more for implant welfare facilities.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of welfare work preferred</th>
<th>Effects of employer initiated welfare work on productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inplant welfare</td>
<td>Favourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside plant welfare</td>
<td>Unfavourable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Welfare preference pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More wages</th>
<th>Less wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less welfare</td>
<td>More welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding effects of welfare work on productivity at the plant, it is found that the large majority of respondents, 30 think it as unfavourable which also corroborates the findings in Company A. To management, this labour attitude may pose a serious problem of motivation and morale which have very important bearing on productivity. This exploration of the possible unfavourable impact of welfare on productivity in Indian industries—taking the case-study as an index—may represent the general management problem of motivating people to work. As already noted, the Company B, prior to the
case-study, suffered serious production and investment loss as a result of prolonged strike which may be interpreted as phenomenal lapses of work motivation and employee morale. Continuance of unfavourable mental attitude towards inadequate welfare work may subsequently lead to go-slow and other forms of labour behaviour not conducive to optimum productivity, even if, there is no overt deterioration in industrial relations. As mentioned in Chapter VII, this labour behaviour also hampered productive activities in Company A. To this question of motivation and morale, as a possible behavioural effect of unfavourable welfare performance, we shall turn in the next chapter for fuller analysis.

The table also indicates welfare performance pattern of workers. It will be seen that, 25 workers appear to favour more wages and less welfare, and only 7 workers are in favour of converse welfare performance. This signifies that confronted with a problem of choice, most of the workers favour higher wages. But it would be wrong to say that this preference pattern minimises the importance of welfare. It only demonstrates workers' anxiety to keep wage level unaffected in the face of welfare choice.

Employees Attitude towards Employer initiated welfare work

From the standpoint of plant level labour behaviour, employee attitude towards employer initiated welfare work is important which is shown in Table 4.
It is to be noticed that the vast majority of workers, i.e., 30 appear to be dissatisfied with welfare work, and only 2 are found to be satisfied with welfare work. Regarding preference for a particular form of welfare, it is found that 23 appear to prefer monetary welfare while 9 prefer non-monetary type of welfare. This means most of the respondents would like to have some accompaniment of monetary benefits along with conventional types of welfare.

In this connection, employee attitude towards welfare may be reviewed along with their attitude towards employer and management. The table shows that all of 32 respondents like employer and like welfare officers. Also 29 respondents appear to be happy with management, while only 3 are found to be
unhappy with management. This is remarkably the best possible demonstration of good labour-management relations at the plant despite unfavourable attitude towards welfare.

This attitude also signifies identical image approach to both employer and management which is not always witnessed elsewhere. In most cases employers' image and management's image do not coincide which breeds discontent. But this happy reaction is no guarantee for higher productivity, for motivation of higher productivity is a complex phenomenon with which job satisfaction may not be functionally related.

**Employee attitude towards Union Initiated welfare work**

At this stage, an examination of employee attitude towards union initiated welfare work would seem appropriate. Table 5 will provide necessary information in this regard. It will be seen in the table that, 14 respondents appear to think union welfare as significant, while 18 consider it is insignificant. More specifically, 24 workers are found to think welfare work is generally neglected by union and only 8 think otherwise. This confirms the overwhelming condemnation of union apathy for welfare work as much as management apathy.

On the question of utilization of union fund for welfare work, 21 are found to think union fund is utilized for welfare, while 11 respondents do not think union fund is utilized for welfare work. Probably, this information is not
quite clear as, it seems, workers are not well informed of
the exact extent of fund utilization specifically for welfare
purpose.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Insignificant</th>
<th>Welfare Work</th>
<th>Welfare Work not neglected by Union Work</th>
<th>Welfare Work not neglected by Union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Welfare Work</td>
<td>Union Welfare Work</td>
<td>Welfare Work neglected by Union</td>
<td>Welfare Work neglected by Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilization of Union Fund for Welfare</th>
<th>Non-utilization of Union Fund for Welfare</th>
<th>Consulted by Union leaders for Welfare</th>
<th>Not consulted by Union leaders for Welfare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This presumption is based on the next question as to
whether workers are consulted by union leaders for welfare
work. It will be seen in the table that the large majority
of 28 workers do not think they are consulted by union leaders
for welfare work, and only 4 appear to think so.

Broadly speaking, general attitude of workers towards
union in relation to welfare work is unfavourable. This also
confirms the findings in Company A. It is the consensus of
general public also, and as analyzed in a previous chapter,
union investment for welfare in India is very insignificant
when unions' professed sympathy for the downtrodden is considered
in larger perspective. The next information regarding employee attitude towards union leaders in relation to welfare will further strengthen this general opinion on this issue.

Employee attitude towards union leaders vis-a-vis welfare work

Workers' views on Union's role in welfare work will be more specifically known from their attitude towards union leaders vis-a-vis welfare work and this is illustrated in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union leaders</th>
<th>Union leaders</th>
<th>Union leaders</th>
<th>Not interfering with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preoccupied with political views</td>
<td>preoccupied with industrial disputes</td>
<td>interfering with welfare work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welfare activities</td>
<td>with industrial disputes</td>
<td>welfare work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Union leaders' attitude towards welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favourable</th>
<th>Unfavourable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be evident from the table that all of the 32 respondents are found to believe that union leaders are preoccupied with problems related to industrial disputes and they are not available for welfare work.
Interestingly, however, it is found that 31 workers, with solitary exception of 1, believe that union leaders' political views are not interfering with welfare work. This means that union leaders preoccupation with non-welfare activities is not guided or motivated by any political consideration. This is, therefore, a creditable assessment of union leaders' intentions about their apparent apathy for welfare.

Union leaders' preoccupation with industrial disputes is, of course, indicative of the prevailing trends in industrial relations in India, for which union leaders perhaps may not be possibly blamed. Weak financial condition of trade unions in the country is also responsible for this apparent aloofness from welfare work.

That this is fairly true is evident from the respondents' assessment of union leaders' attitude towards welfare. It is clear from the table that 29 workers think, despite union leaders' preoccupation with industrial disputes, that leaders' attitude towards welfare is favourable and only 3 think it otherwise. This demonstrates workers' inherent faith in union leadership despite inter-union rivalry and other political misguidance.

In India, general backwardness of trade unionism must be reckoned as the background picture of this employee attitude where good union leadership is not easily available, more so of internal leadership. Hence, in spite of some known
union drawbacks, employees cannot but depend on external leadership till employees of all categories are educated sufficiently.

**Government's role in Welfare**

It is in the context of management and union apathy for welfare, that Government's role in welfare should be judged, which is illustrated in Table 7.

**Table 7**

**Government's Role in Welfare**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare as State Responsibility</th>
<th>Welfare as Central Responsibility</th>
<th>More Govt. initiative preferred</th>
<th>Less Govt. initiative preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Govt. Subsidy in Welfare Work</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned before, welfare responsibility is considered by majority of workers as joint responsibility of all concerned. A more clearer picture will now emerge about government's specific role in federal form of Government in India. It will be noticed in the table that 30 respondents think that welfare should be State responsibility, while only 2 are found to think that welfare should be Union Government's responsibility. And, obviously, all 32 workers have clear preference for more government initiative in welfare work. This is the consensus
of not only employees in general, but also the public opinion.

In the absence of any employers' initiative readily forthcoming in welfare, greater State Government's involvement is the only remedy, which is necessary not only for labour welfare, but also for regional economic growth.

Table 7 will also provide employees' assessment of possible reasons of such government subsidy.

It will be evident from the table that 25 respondents think main reason for government subsidy is economic and 7 think main reason is humanitarian, while none attach any political significance. This indicates clear thinking on the part of employees about the prevailing state of economic growth in the country. It is gratifying to note that government subsidy is looked at in proper perspective, although it is difficult to say whether the findings in the present case study on this issue is representative of an all India situation.

Employees' general assessment of government's role in welfare indicates great expectation from the state with regard to welfare work, and much of the prospect of welfare state in India will depend on how and to what extent this expectation is fulfilled.

**Indian Welfare State and Ideology**

The concept and underlying theories of welfare state and their significance have already been examined. In this
matter, employees' attitude and their views are demonstrated in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>India considered as Welfare</th>
<th>India not considered as Welfare</th>
<th>Welfare preferred</th>
<th>not preferred</th>
<th>Rul...</th>
<th>Communist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare in lieu of freedom</td>
<td>as Welfare in lieu of freedom</td>
<td>State freedom</td>
<td>State freedom</td>
<td>in Comm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom in lieu of State</td>
<td>Freedom in lieu of State</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen in the table that excepting 1, the rest of 31 respondents think India is not a welfare state. This is indeed a clear warning to Governments' performance with regard to welfare, which is yet to be proved for a creditable vindication of its existence. Notwithstanding, several Five Year Plans, the poorer and unorganized sections of the labouring class, especially agricultural class are still neglected. And, therefore, the existence of welfare state in India has to be proved irrespective of ideological beliefs.

On the question of choice between welfare and freedom the vast majority of 30 workers indicate their clear preference for welfare, which suggests the line of thinking of the employees in general as well in a poor country like India.

Ideology has always played an important part in
moulding the shape of welfare state. The general belief that welfare state is a midway between full fledged communist state and capitalist state, may itself prove a deterrent to its satisfactory performance. For example, the majority of workers i.e. 29 believe that the fullest welfare is possible only in communist state, while 3 workers think communist state is not necessarily a welfare state.

This is indeed revealing in view of the fact that political verdict in West Bengal has probed the general lack of faith in the communist ideology. Employee reaction in favour of welfare when confronted with a choice problem between freedom and welfare is still more revealing. This signifies that workers' greatest concern is their welfare and the question of so called freedom in democratic set up has no particular appeal for them, as they believe fullest possible welfare is only possible in communist state. This attitude is to be seriously taken into consideration by the government even if political verdict is contrary to communist ideology in West Bengal. This may further lead one to believe that transitory political changeover is no guarantee for future stability of democratic set up if labour welfare is continued to be neglected in future.

Job Behaviour and Welfare

Prima facie, it may be conceived that job behaviour and welfare attitude are inter-related. Though, logically this may be true, there may not be any functional relationship.
The situation in Company B, during the closure in this regard tends to establish such a relationship though job satisfaction is high otherwise. Job behaviour is the mixture of so many diverse psychological and economic considerations which is not easy to analyse. For example, low job satisfaction logically should result in low productivity. But there are cases where productivity is maintained at high level inspite of low job satisfaction and vice-versa. An analysis will be made to inquire into the problems of productivity at the end of this chapter.

Information regarding job behaviour and welfare in Company B is indicated in Table 9.

Table 9
Job Behaviour and Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likes to work</th>
<th>Does not like to work</th>
<th>More wages preferred</th>
<th>Wages not preferred for extra work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more with extra Welfare benefits</td>
<td>more with Welfare benefits</td>
<td>for extra work</td>
<td>for extra work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied with present job</th>
<th>Not satisfied with present job</th>
<th>Consulted by management for Welfare Scheme</th>
<th>No consulted by management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table will exhibit a complicated nature of job behaviour in relation to welfare. It will be seen in the table
that, without reference to wage choice, all 32 respondents appear to intensify work efforts with extra welfare benefits. It is also found that 25 respondents appear to work more while preferring wage increase, while 7 do not appear to prefer wages for extra work. Apparently, this might seem to be rather contradictory. But the underlying inclination of workers is to work more with extra welfare benefits if wages are not curtailed, as the labourers are found to have strong preference for wage incentives in a poor country like India.

In advanced countries, supply curve of labour is found to be backward sloping, as work efforts tend to decline after a certain maximum limit in spite of high wages for the quest of leisure. For this reason shorter working hours is the current demand of labourers in advanced countries. But, in a national developing economy of India, supply curve of labour is positive, workers mostly poor as they are, would like to work more with each extra payment of wages. Thus wage incentives have stronger appeal to Indian workers. The concepts of incentives in relation to productivity will be explored as an evaluation of contemporary thinking on productivity later on in this chapter, to signify the impact of job behaviour on productivity.

It will be noticed that 23 workers are satisfied with their present job. This means high job satisfaction. But this high job satisfaction may not necessarily be connected
with their assessment of welfare which is found to be critical in the company. This has already been examined. It is important to note that despite critical assessment of welfare, workers' job satisfaction is high and their attitude towards both management and employer is favourable. But for example, 25 workers are found to think they are not consulted by management for welfare scheme, while 7 think they are consulted by management in the matter. This observed job behaviour is demonstrated despite favourable image for employer.

It is necessary to mention in this connection that high job satisfaction and good image of management despite criticism of welfare may be due to two important factors in the Company. The personnel set up is new after the closure which has good image for the employer especially following a new union formed in the Company. Second, good management image is a personal triumph for employers who are noted for their good behaviour and understanding for the staff. A more clear picture in this regard will emerge from the next table regarding trade union and industrial relations.

Trade Union and Industrial Relations

Information regarding trade union and industrial relations is behavioural in approach, not strictly factual, according to the objective of study. The case-study seeks to analyse the behavioural aspects of welfare, and to fulfil this limited objective, the following responses have been analysed on the basis of Table 10.
It will be seen in the table that, obviously, all of 32 respondents are found to be Union members. Regarding union welfare relations, it is found 18 respondents think union is not indifferent to welfare, while 14 think union is indifferent to welfare. This means respondents are almost evenly divided on this question, though we have already seen workers are extremely critical in the matter. Probably, the respondents may think that union's apathy for welfare not so much stems from its inherent indifference as its financial weakness. Regarding industrial discipline, all of 32 respondents are found not subjected to any disciplinary action. This speaks well of harmonious industrial relations at the plant, though union is new one.

To the question about workers' attitude towards their fellow workers, obvious reply has been all of 32 respondents appear to like their fellow workers.

Regarding the role of supervision in industrial
relations and consequently in job behaviour, it is found that 26 respondents are happy with supervision, while 6 are unhappy with supervision. This indicates good supervisory role in management and industrial relations are harmonious due to good supervision. In a large majority of case-studies, in the U.S. and U.K., unsatisfactory supervision has been found instrumental in deteriorating industrial relation despite high wages. The low job satisfaction is largely due to bad supervision for which managements are generally held responsible.

Finally, it is interesting to note many respondents feel welfare questions are mainly personal affairs. For example, 17 workers feel welfare questions are mainly personal affairs, while 15 think otherwise. Though controversial, this suggests itself welfare problems are basically subjective, which again confirms the earlier findings that concept of welfare is basically psychological in nature. It follows logically that welfare attitude is related to the concept of motivation and morale, which is also by and large psychological.

Summary conclusions of the findings

It is now necessary to sum up the important findings and conclusions thereof in this case study which are as follows:

(1) Concept of labour welfare is mainly found to be psychological and partly economic and, therefore, the concept may be interpreted as psycho-economic in nature.
Welfare benefit is not substitutable with wages.

Welfare responsibility is predominantly considered as joint responsibility of management, union and government.

Larger preference is found to be for implant welfare and monetary welfare.

Effects of welfare work on productivity at the plant are found to be unfavourable.

While dissatisfied with employer initiated welfare work employee attitude towards management and employer is favourable.

Employee attitude towards union initiated welfare work is unfavourable though employees' assessment of union leaders' attitude towards welfare is favourable.

Union leaders' political views are not found interfering with welfare work.

Union leaders are mainly preoccupied with industrial relations issues concerning industrial disputes.

Welfare responsibility of government is considered as state responsibility rather than union responsibility.

More government initiative is found necessary in
welfare work and main reasons for government subsidy in welfare are economic.

(12) India is not considered as welfare state and welfare is preferred to freedom as a choice.

(13) Fullest welfare is considered possible in communist state.

(14) Extra work is considered to vary positively with extra welfare benefits, but as a choice extra wages are preferred to extra welfare benefits.

(15) Job satisfaction is high despite adverse attitude towards welfare.

(16) Attitude towards fellow workers and supervisors is good and labour discipline is encouraging.

(17) Welfare is considered as largely personal affairs of employees.

Comparing with the findings of Company A, the findings of this Company B, would appear to follow a strikingly similar pattern in respect of employee attitude towards welfare. The important noteworthy difference is that the Company B enjoys a good management image despite adverse reaction to prevailing welfare system.