International Academic Institute for Science and Technology

International Academic Journal of Business Management
Vol. 6, No. 1, 2019, pp. 120-145.
ISSN 2454-2768

International Academic Journal of Business Management

www.iaiest.com

A Study on Employee Welfare Measures in Dairy Industry: With Reference to Selected Dairy Units in Andhra Pradesh: A Comparative Study

Dr Shaik Mastan Vali [a], Dr.Battu Nagaraju [b]

(a) Associate Professor &Head, Dept of MBA in Malla Reddy Engineering College and Management Sciences, Kistapur, Medhcla, Hyderabad – 501 401, Telangana

(b) Associate Professor &Head Dept of HRM, Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur - 522510, Andhra Pradesh.

ABSTRACT

The Present Scenario of Employee Welfare Measures, the modern concept of social security came to attract attention of the authorities concerned in India only in the early twenties of the present century. With the growth of industrialization in the wake of World War I, and under the impact of modern economic forces, the joint family system came to be gradually undermined. Migration of workers from villages to urban areas led to an increase in the ranks and industrial workers in the country which generated demands for protection and improvements in the working and living conditions of industrial workers, it is a Tool for Improving Organizational Performance in the Public or Private Sectors. The concept of social security is multidimensional in its form, and it has social, psychological, legal, ethical and political overtones, besides economic one. Social security is increasingly recognized as a dynamic concept which was wide! Influenced the social and economic policies of all the developed and the developing countries. The concept of social security from a modern welfare state is much too broad enough provisional comprehensive social security from 'Womb to Tomb'. Within the report, a lot of empirical information was collected, systematized and analyzed, the main part of which is Presented in this report. The respondents, as well as for designing an perception of the respondents by using the percentage methods in SPSS 17.0 and statistical tools are used for the study like Correlation and ANOVA, Cronbach Alpha Test.

KeyWords: Employees, Welfare Measures, Heritage, Thirumala, Jersey & Dodla Dairy Units and Andhra Pradesh.

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

Introduction:

Employee Welfare Measures: The myriad of hazards to which a worker of modern industrial society: exposed, have forced various social groups to jointly explore measures for assuaging the workers' feeling of uncertainty. These measures are chiefly aimed at fighting against the contingencies which the individual, who has small means, cannot afford himself. These contingencies include sickness, invalidism, widowhood, orphan hood, unemployment and death. The concept of social security can be said to be inherent in the traditional joint family system which has been prevalent in India since ages. Nevertheless, the modern concept of social security came to attract attention of the authorities concerned in indie only in the early twenties of the present century. India, a signatory member of International Labour Organization, has been showing pioneering zeal in almost all matters of roller formulation as well as implementation. Many recommendations and conventions suggested by the International Labour Organization have also been adopted by India.

Employees Welfare Schemes: - (1) Statutory and (2) Non Statutory Welfare Schemes: - It includes:

(1) Statutory Schemes include: (a) Drinking Water (b) Facilities for sitting (c) First aid appliances (d) (e) Canteen facilities (f) Spittoons (g) Lighting (h) Washing places (i) Changing rooms (j) Rest rooms.

2. Non Statutory Schemes: - It includes: (a) Personal Health Care (Regular medical check-ups): (b) Flexi-time(c) Employee Assistance Programs (d) Harassment Policy (e) Maternity & Adoption (f) Medi-claim Insurance Scheme (g) Employee Referral Scheme

Review of Literature:

Review of the related literature, allows the researcher to acquaint him with the findings of some of the earlier research studies and the method adopted therein. Such review of literature connected with the Employee Welfare Measures of the study in the dairy units consistent with the review of literature is presented under the following heads:- on employee welfare measures in dairy industry: with reference to selected dairy units in Andhra Pradesh: a comparative study.

Srinivas KT (2012) A Study on Employees Welfare Facilities Adopted at Bosch Limited, Bangalore **The** present study is made an attempt to identify welfare facilities and employee's satisfaction level about welfare facilities adopted at Bosch limited, Bangalore. To achieve the aforesaid objective data is gathered from 100 employees of the organization with random sampling technique. It is found that most of the respondents are aware about the legislative and non - legislative employee welfare facilities provided at the Company, welfare facilities like medical, canteen, working environment, safety measures etc., are provided by the company. And most of the employees are satisfied with the welfare facilities adopted by the company towards the employee's welfare.

Dr.K.Lalitha (2014) A Study on Employee Welfare Measures With Reference To IT Industry The present study is made an attempt to identify the employee welfare measures adopted in IT industry. Employee welfare means anything done for the comfort and improvement of the employees over and above the wages paid which is not a necessity of the industry. The basic purpose of employee welfare is to enrich the life of employees and keep them happy. Employees spend at least half their time at work or getting to it, or leaving it. They know that they contribute to the organization when they are reasonably free from worry and they feel that when they are in trouble/problems, they are due to get something back from the organization. People are entitled to be treated as full human beings with personal needs, hopes and anxieties.

Dr. K. Vijaya Rani (2015) Employees Welfare Measures Towards Productivity Of Neyveli Lignite Corporation Limited The present study identified the employees working in the mines and thermal power station is more affected with the health facilities, and safety measurements for the workers provided by the corporation. The female employees are less satisfied with the recreational facility and the crèches in the provided by the corporation. The extramural like facilities of medical, township administration, education, and vocational training are also important factors among the employee productivity. This article highlights employees' welfare programme towards productivity of Neyveli Lignite Corporation limited.

Methodology of the Study:

In this Research Methodology includes the Statement of Problem, Objectives of the study, Hypothesis of the study, and Data Collection. The researcher also described the processing of data by adopting the Statistical Tools of the study are Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach Alpha test, Correlation and ANOVA, and Limitations of the study.

Statement of the problem The Statement of the Study is stating that the Employees Welfare Schemes as Tool for Improving Organizational Performance in the Public and Private Sectors and to identify the employees working in the dairy industries is more affected with the health facilities, and safety measurements for the workers provided by the organisation. The researcher has taken the aspects of Employee Welfare Measures in the selected four dairy units in Andhra Pradesh: a comparative statement has been under taken for this study.

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

Objectives of the study:

(1) To study the perception of the Employee Welfare Measures in the Selected Four Dairy units in Andhra Pradesh.

(2) To analyze the Impact of the Employee Welfare Measures in the Selected Four Dairy units in Andhra Pradesh.

(3) To offer suggestions to Improve the Employee Welfare Measures in the Selected Four Dairy units in Andhra Pradesh.

Hypothesis of the study:

(1) Null Hypothesis: Ho: There is no significant relationship between Employee Welfare Measures Practices and the four dairy units.

(2) **Alternate Hypothesis: H1**: There is significant relationship between Employee Welfare Measures Practices and the four dairy units.

Data collections: The information and data for the present study has been obtained from both the primary and secondary resources from the select the Four Dairy units of Andhra Pradesh.

Primary Data: The researcher has collected the data by distributing the questionnaire to respondents in four dairy units such as Heritage Dairy, Jersey Dairy, Dodla Dairy, and Thirumala Dairy. The data was collected through observation and interviewing the respondents.

Secondary Data: Available Books, Thesis and Dissertation, Published research studies, journals, reports, articles, research papers, etc. Data through internet source and Annual Reports of the selected Dairy.

Universe and Sample Size: Simple Random sampling technique was adopted to choose the respondents from the universe in the selected dairy units under study.

Table 1 Universe and sample size:

S.No	Dairy Units	Total		
		Universe	Sample (5%)	Sample Size
1	Heritage Dairy	1500	75	75
2	Thirumala Dairy	1500	75	75
3	Jersey Dairy	1500	75	75
4	Dodla Dairy	1500	75	75
Total		6000	300	300

From the Table 1 stating that the four Dairy units of Heritage Dairy, Jersey Dairy, Thirumala Dairy and Dodla Dairy of total employees are 6000, the sample size are taken at 5% in Heritage Dairy, Jersey Dairy, Thirumala Dairy, Dodla Dairy . The filled questionnaires are collected in Heritage Dairy-75, Jersey Dairy-75, Thirumala Dairy-75, and Dodla Dairy 75.

Respondents Opinion on Employee Welfare Measures: Every individual has certain needs and motives which he/she wants to fulfil. Any job which fulfils their needs and motives give him satisfaction. There are some situational factors responsible for job satisfaction .The important causes of job satisfaction are wage incentive systems, the work environment, length of working hours, behavior of the supervisor, security, scope for promotion and recognition of merit.

Table 2 what is the overall opinion on the Employee Welfare Measures Practices in the Selected Four Dairy Unit:

Sl.No.	Opinion	Dairy Unit									
		Heritage Dairy		Thirumala Dairy		Jersey Dairy		Dodla Dairy		Total	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Excellent	1	1.3	1	1.3	2	2.7	2	2.7	6	2
2	Very Good	2	2.7	20	26.7	10	13.3	10	13.3	42	14
3	Good	59	78.7	48	64	45	60	45	60	197	65.66
4	Average	13	17.3	5	6.7	18	24	18	24	54	18
5	Poor	0	0	1	1.3	0	0	0	0	1	0.33
Total		75	100	75	100	75	100	75	100	300	100

From the above table 2 designs that the overall opinion on the Practices in the Selected Four Dairy Units. In the Heritage Dairy the respondents opine that good are 78.7%, Thirumala Dairy good are 64%, Jersey Dairy good are 60%, Dodla Dairy the respondents opine that good are 60%.

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

Data Analysis and Interpretation:

This Study has analyzed the data from four Dairy Units of Heritage Dairy, Thirumala, Jersey and Dodla. The researcher has taken the aspects of Employee Welfare Measures by comparing the Four Dairy Units the researcher has taken the statistical tools of *Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach Alpha ANOVA, and Correlation.*

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics for the four Dairy units of Heritage, Thirumala, Jersey and Dodla dairy Units on Employee Welfare Measures:

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q34- leave Facilities	75	4.0800	.58725	3.9467	.46188	3.8933	.74568	4.0267	.59214
Q35- Medical Facilities	75	3.9467	.54260	3.8800	.56854	3.7200	.76335	4.0267	.46421
Q36- Safety Measures	75	3.8800	.49210	3.7867	.68366	3.4667	.89039	3.7867	.66360
Q37- First Aid Boxes	75	3.8667	.50225	3.6667	.79412	3.4667	.96329	3.7333	.90544
Q38-Ambulances	75	2.1733	.52949	2.0933	.47000	1.9467	1.01200	2.4800	1.11936
Q39-Drinking water	75	4.1200	.36613	3.9467	.46188	3.8667	1.00449	4.1467	.83332
Q40-Canteen	75	3.9467	.32438	3.8400	.71735	3.5733	.88796	4.1200	.73448
Q41-Rest and Lunch Room	75	3.0000	.83827	2.7333	1.04407	2.8800	1.19639	3.2667	.99095
Q42-Children and Educational Facilities	75	2.0400	.25680	1.9467	.32438	2.0267	.80494	2.5600	.93346
Q43-Supply of Uniform	75	2.4667	.64375	2.1600	.57044	1.7733	.50866	2.4800	.74180
Q44-Housing Facilities	75	2.0533	.27964	1.9467	.32438	1.9067	.66115	2.5733	.97500
Q45-Retirement Benefits	75	2.1067	.35157	2.0533	.54260	2.2400	.95634	3.2400	.99784
Q46- Dearness Allowances	75	3.9733	.36663	3.8933	.64877	3.3600	.98145	3.6000	.95860
Q47-Conveyance Allowances	75	4.0000	.28475	3.8933	.64877	3.5067	.94973	3.8667	.68445
Q48-Sickness benefit	75	3.8533	.39227	3.8533	.69152	3.3733	.89704	3.8267	.60120
Q49-Maternity Benefit	75	3.6933	.56886	3.6400	.84853	3.4800	.92063	3.7333	.82746
Q50-Disablement Benefit	75	2.8800	.67704	2.4800	.81141	2.5867	.95992	3.1867	1.00933
Q51-Oldage Benefit	75	2.7067	.53960	2.2400	.58909	2.2667	.92024	3.0400	1.01927
Q52-Provident Fund Benefit	75	4.1600	.36907	3.8933	.64877	4.0405	.83484	4.0533	.83655
Q53-Gratuity	75	3.9467	.56696	3.8933	.64877	3.9733	.77063	3.9200	.95521
Q54-Creches	75	1.7467	.54756	1.9467	.32438	1.3600	.89503	2.0400	1.17910
Q61- What is the overall opinion of HRM Practices in the Dairy unit	75	2.8000	.63671	3.1067	.55928	3.0533	.69542	3.5333	2.68798

Analysis: A committed work force is one that is pulling together, with everyone doing their best, and getting satisfaction from the common effort to do as well as possible. Manage increasing technological complexity and create a climate in which people will understand and welcome technological development. Manage to achieve higher level of performance and innovation than hitherto. The problems and challenges that dairy units face today are numerous. This aspect is dominant in management of dairy units in Andhra Pradesh. The respondents in the four Dairy units of Heritage, Thirumala, Jersey and Dodla are satisfied with the variables of the study are Compensation and Employee Welfare Measures. The researcher used the statistical tools of Mean and standard deviation of the four Dairy units. It states the mean values of employees are satisfied with the parameters of the study.

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

Table 4 Cronbach Alpha Table for the Four Dairy units:

Cronbach Alpha	Heritage Dairy	Thirumala Dairy	Jersey Dairy	Dodla Dairy
No.of.Items – 61	**0.860**	**0.760**	**0.867**	**0.764**

From the Table.4 the Number of items is taken for the study 61 with the parameters of selected variables for the study. For the four dairy units of Heritage value is 0.860, Thirumala is 0.760, Jersey is 0.867 and Dodla is 0.764. The value of four dairy units is above 0.87 so it proves the reliability is very strong for the four dairy units.

Hypothesis:

(i) Ho: Null Hypothesis- There is no significance difference in the means of opinion of the Compensation and Employee Welfare Measures in four Dairy Units of Heritage, Thirumala, Jersey and Dodla Units,

(ii) $\mathbf{H_{1:}}$ **Alternate Hypothesis**- There is significance difference in the means of opinion of the Compensation and Employee Welfare Measures in four Dairy Units of Heritage, Thirumala, Jersey and Dodla Units.

Table 5 ANOVA Table for Heritage and Thirumala Dairy Units for Employee Welfare Measures:

		HERITAGE					THIRUMALA				
		Sum of SQuares	**df**	**Mean SQuare**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Sum of SQuares**	**df**	**Mean SQuare**	**F**	**Sig.**
Q34	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.152	.698	.107	1	.107	.308	.580
	Within Groups	15.754	73	.216			25.413	73	.348		
	Total	15.787	74				25.520	74			
Q35	Between Groups	.166	1	.166	.511	.477	.267	1	.267	.905	.345
	Within Groups	23.754	73	.325			21.520	73	.295		
	Total	23.920	74				21.787	74			
Q36	Between Groups	.002	1	.002	.004	.948	.206	1	.206	.848	.360
	Within Groups	34.585	73	.474			17.714	73	.243		
	Total	34.587	74				17.920	74			
Q37	Between Groups	.051	1	.051	.080	.778	.254	1	.254	1.007	.319
	Within Groups	46.615	73	.639			18.413	73	.252		
	Total	46.667	74				18.667	74			
Q38	Between Groups	.101	1	.101	.452	.504	.001	1	.001	.002	.962
	Within Groups	16.246	73	.223			20.746	73	.284		
	Total	16.347	74				20.747	74			
Q39	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.152	.698	.031	1	.031	.230	.633
	Within Groups	15.754	73	.216			9.889	73	.135		
	Total	15.787	74				9.920	74			
Q40	Between Groups	.295	1	.295	.571	.452	.041	1	.041	.383	.538
	Within Groups	37.785	73	.518			7.746	73	.106		
	Total	38.080	74				7.787	74			
Q41	Between Groups	.013	1	.013	.012	.915	.893	1	.893	1.275	.262

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

	Within Groups	80.654	73	1.105			51.107	73	.700		
	Total	80.667	74				52.000	74			
Q42	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.309	.580	.023	1	.023	.344	.560
	Within Groups	7.754	73	.106			4.857	73	.067		
	Total	7.787	74				4.880	74			
Q43	Between Groups	.042	1	.042	.126	.723	.036	1	.036	.085	.771
	Within Groups	24.038	73	.329			30.631	73	.420		
	Total	24.080	74				30.667	74			
Q44	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.309	.580	.041	1	.041	.516	.475
	Within Groups	7.754	73	.106			5.746	73	.079		
	Total	7.787	74				5.787	74			
Q45	Between Groups	.248	1	.248	.841	.362	.163	1	.163	1.321	.254
	Within Groups	21.538	73	.295			8.984	73	.123		
	Total	21.787	74				9.147	74			
Q46	Between Groups	.131	1	.131	.309	.580	.010	1	.010	.075	.785
	Within Groups	31.015	73	.425			9.937	73	.136		
	Total	31.147	74				9.947	74			
Q47	Between Groups	.131	1	.131	.309	.580	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	31.015	73	.425			6.000	73	.082		
	Total	31.147	74				6.000	74			
Q48	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.068	.795	.307	1	.307	2.025	.159
	Within Groups	35.354	73	.484			11.079	73	.152		
	Total	35.387	74				11.387	74			
Q49	Between Groups	.295	1	.295	.407	.526	.280	1	.280	.864	.356
	Within Groups	52.985	73	.726			23.667	73	.324		
	Total	53.280	74				23.947	74			
Q50	Between Groups	.074	1	.074	.111	.740	.019	1	.019	.041	.839
	Within Groups	48.646	73	.666			33.901	73	.464		
	Total	48.720	74				33.920	74			
Q51	Between Groups	.780	1	.780	2.287	.135	.023	1	.023	.078	.781
	`Within Groups	24.900	73	.341			21.524	73	.295		
	Total	25.680	74				21.547	74			
Q52	Between Groups	.131	1	.131	.309	.580	.001	1	.001	.005	.946
	Within Groups	31.015	73	.425			10.079	73	.138		
	Total	31.147	74				10.080	74			

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

Q53	Between Groups	.131	1	.131	.309	.580	.013	1	.013	.039	.843
	Within Groups	31.015	73	.425			23.774	73	.326		
	Total	31.147	74				23.787	74			
Q54	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.309	.580	.413	1	.413	1.384	.243
	Within Groups	7.754	73	.106			21.774	73	.298		
	Total	7.787	74				22.187	74			

1. The Heritage Dairy had provided leave facilities available for the employee the significant value is (0.033) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.580) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**2**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Medical facilities for the employee the significant value is (0.477) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.345) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**3**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Safety Measures for the employee the significant value is (0.948) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.360) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees.

4. The Heritage Dairy had provided First aid boxes for the employee the significant value is (0.778) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.319) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**5**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Ambulance facility for the employee the significant value is (0.504) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.962) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**6**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Drinking water facility for the employee the significant value is (0.698) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.633) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees

7. The Heritage Dairy had provided Canteen facility for the employee the significant value is (0.452) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.538) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**8**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Rest and Lunch room facility for the employee the significant value is (0.915) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.262) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**9**) The Heritage Dairy had provided for Children Education facilities for the employees the significant value is (0.580) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.560) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees

10. The Heritage Dairy had provided Supply of Uniform for the employee the significant value is (0.723) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.771) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**11**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Housing facilities for the employee the significant value is (0.580) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.475) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**12**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Retirement Benefits for the employee the significant value is (0.362) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.254) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees.

13. The Heritage Dairy had provided Dearness Allowances for the employee the significant value is (0.580) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.785) it proves

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**14**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Conveyance Allowances for the employee the significant value is (0.580) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (1.000) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**15**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Sickness Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.795) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.159) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**16**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Maternity Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.526) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.356) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees.

17. The Heritage Dairy had provided Disablement Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.740) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.839) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**18**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Old age Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.135) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.781) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**19**) The Heritage Dairy had provided provident fund Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.309) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.946) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**20**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Gratuity Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.580) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.243) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**21**) The Heritage Dairy had provided Crèches Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.580) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Thirumala Dairy the significant value is (0.243) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees.

Hypothesis:

(i) Ho: Null Hypothesis- There is no significance difference in the means of opinion of the Employee welfare measures and Gender in four Dairy Units of Heritage, Thirumala, Jersey and Dodla Units.

(ii) H_1: Alternate Hypothesis- There is significance difference in the means of opinion of the Employee welfare measures and Gender in four Dairy Units of Heritage, Thirumala, Jersey and Dodla Units

Table 6 ANOVA Table for Jersey and Dodla Dairy Units for Employee Welfare Measures:

		JERSEY					DODLA				
		Sum of SQuares	**df**	**Mean SQuare**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Sum of SQuares**	**Df**	**Mean SQuare**	**F**	**Sig.**
Q34	Between Groups	.012	2	.006	.010	.990	.702	3	.234	.659	.580
	Within Groups	41.135	72	.571			25.244	71	.356		
	Total	41.147	74				25.947	74			
Q35	Between Groups	.385	2	.192	.324	.724	.445	3	.148	.679	.568
	Within Groups	42.735	72	.594			15.502	71	.218		
	Total	43.120	74				15.947	74			
Q36	Between Groups	.229	2	.115	.141	.869	3.257	3	1.086	2.628	.057
	Within Groups	58.438	72	.812			29.330	71	.413		
	Total	58.667	74				32.587	74			
Q37	Between Groups	1.326	2	.663	.709	.495	3.746	3	1.249	1.558	.207

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

	Within Groups	67.340	72	.935			56.921	71	.802		
	Total	68.667	74				60.667	74			
Q38	Between Groups	.959	2	.480	.462	.632	2.527	3	.842	.663	.578
	Within Groups	74.827	72	1.039			90.193	71	1.270		
	Total	75.787	74				92.720	74			
Q39	Between Groups	.639	2	.320	.311	.734	.918	3	.306	.431	.732
	Within Groups	74.027	72	1.028			50.468	71	.711		
	Total	74.667	74				51.387	74			
Q40	Between Groups	1.406	2	.703	.889	.415	.443	3	.148	.266	.850
	Within Groups	56.940	72	.791			39.477	71	.556		
	Total	58.347	74				39.920	74			
Q41	Between Groups	3.913	2	1.957	1.381	.258	5.387	3	1.796	1.895	.138
	Within Groups	102.007	72	1.417			67.280	71	.948		
	Total	105.920	74				72.667	74			
Q42	Between Groups	.391	2	.196	.296	.745	.790	3	.263	.294	.830
	Within Groups	47.556	72	.660			63.690	71	.897		
	Total	47.947	74				64.480	74			
Q43	Between Groups	1.085	2	.543	2.163	.122	1.891	3	.630	1.153	.334
	Within Groups	18.062	72	.251			38.829	71	.547		
	Total	19.147	74				40.720	74			
Q44	Between Groups	.901	2	.450	1.031	.362	.253	3	.084	.086	.968
	Within Groups	31.446	72	.437			70.093	71	.987		
	Total	32.347	74				70.347	74			
Q45	Between Groups	2.234	2	1.117	1.229	.299	.567	3	.189	.184	.907
	Within Groups	65.446	72	.909			73.113	71	1.030		
	Total	67.680	74				73.680	74			
Q46	Between Groups	5.919	2	2.960	3.260	.044	5.457	3	1.819	2.065	.113
	Within Groups	65.361	72	.908			62.543	71	.881		
	Total	71.280	74				68.000	74			
Q47	Between Groups	6.945	2	3.472	4.181	.019	6.215	3	2.072	5.169	.003
	Within Groups	59.802	72	.831			28.452	71	.401		
	Total	66.747	74				34.667	74			
Q48	Between Groups	5.724	2	2.862	3.829	.026	1.999	3	.666	1.912	.135
	Within Groups	53.822	72	.748			24.747	71	.349		
	Total	59.547	74				26.747	74			
Q49	Between Groups	.566	2	.283	.328	.721	2.016	3	.672	.981	.407

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

	Within Groups	62.154	72	.863			48.650	71	.685		
	Total	62.720	74				50.667	74			
Q50	Between Groups	3.359	2	1.680	1.865	.162	2.152	3	.717	.696	.558
	Within Groups	64.827	72	.900			73.234	71	1.031		
	Total	68.187	74				75.387	74			
Q51	Between Groups	5.378	2	2.689	3.379	.040	1.673	3	.558	.526	.666
	Within Groups	57.289	72	.796			75.207	71	1.059		
	Total	62.667	74				76.880	74			
Q52	Between Groups	1.385	2	.693	.994	.375	1.913	3	.638	.908	.442
	Within Groups	49.493	71	.697			49.874	71	.702		
	Total	50.878	73				51.787	74			
Q53	Between Groups	.962	2	.481	.806	.451	5.021	3	1.674	1.901	.137
	Within Groups	42.985	72	.597			62.499	71	.880		
	Total	43.947	74				67.520	74			
Q54	Between Groups	.504	2	.252	.309	.735	1.296	3	.432	.302	.824
	Within Groups	58.776	72	.816			101.584	71	1.431		
	Total	59.280	74				102.880	74			

1. The Jersey Dairy had provided leave facilities available for the employee the significant value is (0.990) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.580) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**2**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Medical facilities for the employee the significant value is (0.724) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.568) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**3**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Safety Measures for the employee the significant value is (0.864) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.057) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**4**) The Jersey Dairy had provided First aid boxes for the employee the significant value is (0.495) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.207) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**5**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Ambulance facility for the employee the significant value is (0.632) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.578) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees.

6. The Jersey Dairy had provided Drinking water facility for the employee the significant value is (0.734) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.732) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**7**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Canteen facility for the employee the significant value is (0.415) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.850) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**8**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Rest and Lunch room facility for the employee the significant value is (0.258) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.138) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**9**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Children and Education facilities for

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

the employee the significant value is (0.745) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.830) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**10**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Supply of Uniform for the employee the significant value is (0.122) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.334) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees

11. The Jersey Dairy had provided Housing facilities for the employee the significant value is (0.362) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.968) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (**12**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Retirement Benefits for the employee the significant value is (0.299) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.907) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees.. (17) The Jersey Dairy had provided Disablement Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.162) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.558) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees. (18) The Jersey Dairy had provided Oldage Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.040) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is rejected so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.666) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees.(**20**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Gratuity Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.451) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.157) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees.(**21**) The Jersey Dairy had provided Crèches Benefit for the employee the significant value is (0.735) so it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees between the Employee welfare facilities and Gender In the Dodla Dairy the significant value is (0.824) it proves that Null Hypothesis is accepted so there is no significant difference in means of opinion of employees.

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

Table 7 Correlation Table for Employee welfare measures in HERITAGE DAIRY UNIT:

		q34	q35	Q36	q37	q38	Q39	q40	q41	q42	q43	q44	q45	q46	q47	q48	Q49	q50	q51	q52	q53	q54
q34	Pearson Correlation	1	.799**	.648**	.540**	.521**	1.000**	-0.026	-0.142	-0.019	-0.172	-0.019	0.012	-0.019	-0.019	-0.025	-0.05	-0.075	-0.151	-0.019	-0.019	-0.019
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0	0	0	0	0.824	0.224	0.87	0.139	0.87	0.922	0.87	0.87	0.833	0.672	0.522	0.196	0.87	0.87	0.87
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q35	Pearson Correlation	.799**	1	.802**	.658**	.396**	.799**	-0.048	-0.032	-0.035	-0.148	-0.035	0.021	-0.035	-0.035	-0.045	-0.091	-0.02	-0.115	-0.035	-0.035	-0.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0	0	0	0	0.684	0.786	0.765	0.204	0.765	0.858	0.765	0.765	0.699	0.439	0.865	0.328	0.765	0.765	0.765
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q36	Pearson Correlation	.648**	.802**	1	.813**	.315**	.648**	-0.071	-0.175	-0.052	-0.119	-0.052	-0.005	-0.052	-0.052	-0.067	-0.134	-0.008	-0.14	-0.052	-0.052	-0.052
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0		0	0.006	0	0.548	0.132	0.658	0.308	0.658	0.964	0.658	0.658	0.567	0.251	0.947	0.232	0.658	0.658	0.658
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q37	Pearson Correlation	.540**	.658**	.813**	1	0.012	.540**	-0.095	-0.043	-0.07	-0.06	-0.07	0.01	-0.07	-0.07	-0.09	-0.14	0.042	-0.058	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0		0.918	0	0.418	0.711	0.551	0.611	0.551	0.929	0.551	0.551	0.441	0.23	0.721	0.622	0.551	0.551	0.551
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q38	Pearson Correlation	.521**	.396**	.315**	0.012	1	.521**	0.045	-0.114	0.033	0.095	0.033	0.086	0.033	0.033	0.043	0.052	-0.013	0.064	0.033	0.033	0.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0.006	0.918		0	0.702	0.331	0.778	0.419	0.778	0.462	0.778	0.778	0.716	0.661	0.914	0.583	0.778	0.778	0.778
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Q39	Pearson Correlation	1.000**	.799**	.648**	.540**	.521**	1	-0.026	-0.142	-0.019	-0.172	-0.019	0.012	-0.019	-0.019	-0.025	-0.05	-0.075	-0.151	-0.019	-0.019	-0.019
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0	0	0		0.824	0.224	0.87	0.139	0.87	0.922	0.87	0.87	0.833	0.672	0.522	0.196	0.87	0.87	0.87
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q40	Pearson Correlation	-0.026	-0.048	-0.071	-0.095	0.045	-0.026	1	.447**	.892**	.592**	.892**	.578**	.892**	.892**	.824**	.792**	.505**	.604**	.892**	.892**	.892**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.824	0.684	0.548	0.418	0.702	0.824		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

q41	Pearson Correlation	-0.142	-0.032	-0.175	-0.043	-0.114	-0.142	.447**	1	.436**	.322**	.436**	.359**	.436**	.436**	.413**	.409**	.361**	.347**	.436**	.436**	.436**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.224	0.786	0.132	0.711	0.331	0.224	0		0	0.005	0	0.002	0	0	0	0	0.001	0.002	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q42	Pearson Correlation	-0.019	-0.035	-0.052	-0.07	0.033	-0.019	.892**	.436**	1	.631**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	1.000**	.929**	.715**	.509**	.634**	1.000**	1.000**	1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.87	0.765	0.658	0.551	0.778	0.87	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q43	Pearson Correlation	-0.172	-0.148	-0.119	-0.06	0.095	-0.172	.592**	.322**	.631**	1	.631**	.409**	.631**	.631**	.574**	.484**	.445**	.688**	.631**	.631**	.631**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.139	0.204	0.308	0.611	0.419	0.139	0	0.005	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q44	Pearson Correlation	-0.019	-0.035	-0.052	-0.07	0.033	-0.019	.892**	.436**	1.000**	.631**	1	.631**	1.000**	1.000**	.929**	.715**	.509**	.634**	1.000**	1.000**	1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.87	0.765	0.658	0.551	0.778	0.87	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q45	Pearson Correlation	0.012	0.021	-0.005	0.01	0.086	0.012	.578**	.359**	.631**	.409**	.631**	1	.631**	.631**	.453**	.306**	.371**	.467**	.631**	.631**	.631**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.922	0.858	0.964	0.929	0.462	0.922	0	0.002	0	0	0		0	0	0	0.007	0.001	0	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Q46	Pearson Correlation	-0.019	-0.035	-0.052	-0.07	0.033	-0.019	.892**	.436**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	.631**	1	1.000**	.929**	.715**	.509**	.634**	1.000**	1.000**	1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.87	0.765	0.658	0.551	0.778	0.87	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q47	Pearson Correlation	-0.019	-0.035	-0.052	-0.07	0.033	-0.019	.892**	.436**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	1	.929**	.715**	.509**	.634**	1.000**	1.000**	1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.87	0.765	0.658	0.551	0.778	0.87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q48	Pearson Correlation	-0.025	-0.045	-0.067	-0.09	0.043	-0.025	.824**	.413**	.929**	.574**	.929**	.453**	.929**	.929**	1	.761**	.488**	.585**	.929**	.929**	.929**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.833	0.699	0.567	0.441	0.716	0.833	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q49	Pearson Correlation	-0.05	-0.091	-0.134	-0.14	0.052	-0.05	.792**	.409**	.715**	.484**	.715**	.306**	.715**	.715**	.761**	1	.431**	.446**	.715**	.715**	.715**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.672	0.439	0.251	0.23	0.661	0.672	0	0	0	0	0	0.007	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q50	Pearson Correlation	-0.075	-0.02	-0.008	0.042	-0.013	-0.075	.505**	.361**	.509**	.445**	.509**	.371**	.509**	.509**	.488**	.431**	1	.547**	.509**	.509**	.509**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.522	0.865	0.947	0.721	0.914	0.522	0	0.001	0	0	0	0.001	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q51	Pearson Correlation	-0.151	-0.115	-0.14	-0.058	0.064	-0.151	.604**	.347**	.634**	.688**	.634**	.467**	.634**	.634**	.585**	.446**	.547**	1	.634**	.634**	.634**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.196	0.328	0.232	0.622	0.583	0.196	0	0.002	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q52	Pearson Correlation	-0.019	-0.035	-0.052	-0.07	0.033	-0.019	.892**	.436**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	1.000**	.929**	.715**	.509**	.634**	1	1.000**	1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.87	0.765	0.658	0.551	0.778	0.87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q53	Pearson Correlation	-0.019	-0.035	-0.052	-0.07	0.033	-0.019	.892**	.436**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	1.000**	.929**	.715**	.509**	.634**	1.000**	1	1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.87	0.765	0.658	0.551	0.778	0.87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q54	Pearson Correlation	-0.019	-0.035	-0.052	-0.07	0.033	-0.019	.892**	.436**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	.631**	1.000**	1.000**	.929**	.715**	.509**	.634**	1.000**	1.000**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.87	0.765	0.658	0.551	0.778	0.87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a positive correlation between the Leave facilities and Medical facilities in the Heritage Dairy at Pearson correlation value of (0.799) and the significant value is (0.000) the null hypothesis is rejected there is significant relationship between the Employee welfare measures in Heritage Dairy. In Thirumala Dairy there is a positive correlation for the Leave facilities and Medical facilities at Pearson correlation value of (0.735) and the significant value (0.000) the null hypothesis is rejected there is a significant relationship between Employee welfare measures and Thirumala Diary .

Table 8 Correlation Table for Employee welfare measures in TIRUMALA DAIRY UNITS:

		q34	q35	q36	q37	q38	Q39	q40	q41	q42	q43	q44	q45	q46	q47	q48	Q49	q50	q51	q52	q53	q54

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

q34	Pearson Correlation	1	.735**	.361**	.403**	-0.089	.395**	.590**	-0.11	-.470**	0.079	-0.026	-.238*	.512**	.647**	-0.066	0.115	-0.01	-0.096	.314**	.297**	-.230*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0	0.001	0	0.449	0	0	0.348	0	0.502	0.823	0.04	0	0	0.575	0.326	0.935	0.415	0.006	0.01	0.047
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q35	Pearson Correlation	.735**	1	.684**	.618**	-0.061	.373**	.521**	0.03	-.372**	0.072	-0.07	-.253*	.400**	.525**	0.153	0.165	0.056	-0.054	.313**	0.21	0.09
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0		0	0	0.6	0.001	0	0.8	0.001	0.538	0.55	0.028	0	0	0.189	0.157	0.634	0.644	0.006	0.07	0.441
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q36	Pearson Correlation	.361**	.684**	1	.755**	0.133	.381**	.467**	0.164	-0.068	0.051	-0.149	-0.081	0.057	0.096	0.118	.253*	0.078	0.018	.330**	0.074	.387**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001	0		0	0.256	0.001	0	0.16	0.56	0.663	0.201	0.488	0.628	0.41	0.315	0.029	0.507	0.876	0.004	0.53	0.001
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q37	Pearson Correlation	.403**	.618**	.755**	1	0.088	.456**	.453**	0.16	-0.063	0.028	-0.141	-0.148	0.201	0.094	.242*	.233*	-0.008	-0.096	.335**	0.07	.367**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0		0.452	0	0	0.169	0.592	0.812	0.227	0.205	0.084	0.42	0.036	0.044	0.946	0.411	0.003	0.553	0.001
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q38	Pearson Correlation	-0.089	-0.061	0.133	0.088	1	0.031	0.133	0.061	.346**	0.037	-0.155	-0.028	-0.115	-0.179	-0.071	0	.285*	0.038	-0.006	0.076	0.2
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.449	0.6	0.256	0.452		0.794	0.254	0.604	0.002	0.753	0.186	0.811	0.325	0.124	0.544	0.996	0.013	0.743	0.962	0.516	0.085
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Q39	Pearson Correlation	.395**	.373**	.381**	.456**	0.031	1	.396**	0.044	-0.052	-0.011	-0.063	-0.101	0.226	.259*	0.03	0.114	0.113	0.112	.556**	0.096	-0.116
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.001	0.001	0	0.794		0	0.708	0.659	0.922	0.589	0.39	0.052	0.025	0.798	0.329	0.333	0.338	0	0.411	0.322
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q40	Pearson Correlation	.590**	.521**	.467**	.453**	0.133	.396**	1	0	-.298**	-0.009	-0.117	-.305**	.329**	.439**	0.044	0.13	-0.091	-0.168	0.185	0.131	-0.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0	0	0.254	0		1	0.009	0.941	0.317	0.008	0.004	0	0.708	0.267	0.437	0.15	0.112	0.262	0.993
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q41	Pearson Correlation	-0.11	0.03	0.164	0.16	0.061	0.044	0	1	0.126	0.2	-0.115	-0.138	0.044	-0.057	0.082	0.113	0.024	-0.03	0.044	0.085	0.118
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.348	0.8	0.16	0.169	0.604	0.708	1		0.283	0.085	0.325	0.239	0.708	0.629	0.483	0.333	0.839	0.799	0.71	0.467	0.314
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q42	Pearson Correlation	-.470**	-.372**	-0.068	-0.063	.346**	-0.052	-.298**	0.126	1	-0.033	0.158	.401**	-.563**	-.739**	-0.075	0.085	0.183	.281*	-0.068	-0.171	.361**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.001	0.56	0.592	0.002	0.659	0.009	0.283		0.781	0.176	0	0	0	0.522	0.468	0.115	0.015	0.56	0.143	0.001

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q43	Pearson Correlation	0.079	0.072	0.051	0.028	0.037	-0.011	-0.009	0.2	-0.033	1	0.16	0.076	0.111	0.074	-0.046	0.138	.316**	0.166	-0.034	-0.042	0.11
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.502	0.538	0.663	0.812	0.753	0.922	0.941	0.085	0.781		0.17	0.519	0.344	0.53	0.693	0.239	0.006	0.155	0.771	0.721	0.348
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q44	Pearson Correlation	-0.026	-0.07	-0.149	-0.141	-0.155	-0.063	-0.117	-0.115	0.158	0.16	1	.491**	0.014	0	-0.174	0.019	0.177	0.105	-0.084	0.018	-0.087
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.823	0.55	0.201	0.227	0.186	0.589	0.317	0.325	0.176	0.17		0	0.905	1	0.135	0.87	0.129	0.37	0.475	0.877	0.458
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q45	Pearson Correlation	-.238*	-.253*	-0.081	-0.148	-0.028	-0.101	-.305**	-0.138	.401**	0.076	.491**	1	-0.187	-.270*	-0.179	-.240*	0.055	.381**	-0.133	-.310**	0.072
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.04	0.028	0.488	0.205	0.811	0.39	0.008	0.239	0	0.519	0		0.108	0.019	0.124	0.038	0.642	0.001	0.254	0.007	0.539
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Q46	Pearson Correlation	.512**	.400**	0.057	0.201	-0.115	0.226	.329**	0.044	-.563**	0.111	0.014	-0.187	1	.777**	-0.028	-0.04	-0.068	-0.177	.232*	.253*	-0.169
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0.628	0.084	0.325	0.052	0.004	0.708	0	0.344	0.905	0.108		0	0.814	0.735	0.565	0.129	0.045	0.028	0.148
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q47	Pearson Correlation	.647**	.525**	0.096	0.094	-0.179	.259*	.439**	-0.057	-.739**	0.074	0	-.270*	.777**	1	0	0	-0.07	-0.176	.257*	.335**	-.347**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0	0.41	0.42	0.124	0.025	0	0.629	0	0.53	1	0.019	0		1	1	0.55	0.131	0.026	0.003	0.002
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q48	Pearson Correlation	-0.066	0.153	0.118	.242*	-0.071	0.03	0.044	0.082	-0.075	-0.046	-0.174	-0.179	-0.028	0	1	.462**	0.035	-0.078	-0.022	-0.036	.454**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.575	0.189	0.315	0.036	0.544	0.798	0.708	0.483	0.522	0.693	0.135	0.124	0.814	1		0	0.768	0.504	0.849	0.761	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q49	Pearson Correlation	0.115	0.165	.253*	.233*	0	0.114	0.13	0.113	0.085	0.138	0.019	-.240*	-0.04	0	.462**	1	0.184	-0.121	0.108	0.158	.355**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.326	0.157	0.029	0.044	0.996	0.329	0.267	0.333	0.468	0.239	0.87	0.038	0.735	1	0		0.114	0.301	0.356	0.176	0.002
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q50	Pearson Correlation	-0.01	0.056	0.078	-0.008	.285*	0.113	-0.091	0.024	0.183	.316**	0.177	0.055	-0.068	-0.07	0.035	0.184	1	.457**	.240*	0.159	0.063
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.935	0.634	0.507	0.946	0.013	0.333	0.437	0.839	0.115	0.006	0.129	0.642	0.565	0.55	0.768	0.114		0	0.038	0.173	0.593
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q51	Pearson Correlation	-0.096	-0.054	0.018	-0.096	0.038	0.112	-0.168	-0.03	.281*	0.166	0.105	.381**	-0.177	-0.176	-0.078	-0.121	.457**	1	0.171	-0.184	-0.026

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.415	0.644	0.876	0.411	0.743	0.338	0.15	0.799	0.015	0.155	0.37	0.001	0.129	0.131	0.504	0.301	0		0.142	0.113	0.823
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q52	Pearson Correlation	.314**	.313**	.330**	.335**	-0.006	.556**	0.185	0.044	-0.068	-0.034	-0.084	-0.133	.232*	.257*	-0.022	0.108	.240*	0.171	1	.300**	-0.064
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.006	0.006	0.004	0.003	0.962	0	0.112	0.71	0.56	0.771	0.475	0.254	0.045	0.026	0.849	0.356	0.038	0.142		0.009	0.584
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q53	Pearson Correlation	.297**	0.21	0.074	0.07	0.076	0.096	0.131	0.085	-0.171	-0.042	0.018	-.310**	.253*	.335**	-0.036	0.158	0.159	-0.184	.300**	1	-0.218
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.01	0.07	0.53	0.553	0.516	0.411	0.262	0.467	0.143	0.721	0.877	0.007	0.028	0.003	0.761	0.176	0.173	0.113	0.009		0.06
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q54	Pearson Correlation	-.230*	0.09	.387**	.367**	0.2	-0.116	-0.001	0.118	.361**	0.11	-0.087	0.072	-0.169	-.347**	.454**	.355**	0.063	-0.026	-0.064	-0.218	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.047	0.441	0.001	0.001	0.085	0.322	0.993	0.314	0.001	0.348	0.458	0.539	0.148	0.002	0	0.002	0.593	0.823	0.584	0.06	
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a positive correlation between the Leave facilities and Medical facilities in the Heritage Dairy at Pearson correlation value of (0.799) and the significant value is (0.000) the null hypothesis is rejected there is significant relationship between the Employee welfare measures in Heritage Dairy. In Thirumala Dairy there is a positive correlation for the Leave facilities and Medical facilities at Pearson correlation value of (0.735) and the significant value (0.000) the null hypothesis is rejected there is a significant relationship between Employee welfare measures and Thirumala Diary .

Table 9 Correlation Table for Employee welfare measures in JERSEY DAIRY UNITS:

		q34	**q35**	**q36**	**q37**	**q38**	**Q39**	**q40**	**q41**	**q42**	**q43**	**q44**	**q45**	**q46**	**q47**	**q48**	**Q49**	**q50**	**q51**	**q52**	**q53**	**q54**
q34	Pearson Correlation	1	.303**	.280*	0.164	0.064	0.107	0.196	0.122	0.072	0.042	0.171	0.131	0.053	.287*	0.202	0.213	0.164	0.14	0.16	0.113	0.038
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.008	0.015	0.159	0.585	0.361	0.093	0.298	0.537	0.719	0.141	0.262	0.65	0.012	0.083	0.066	0.159	0.229	0.173	0.336	0.746
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q35	Pearson Correlation	.303**	1	.473**	0.217	.260*	-0.085	0.14	.451**	.276*	0.217	.242*	0.149	0.01	0.105	.352**	.367**	.283*	.281*	0.15	.332**	0.169
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.008		0	0.062	0.024	0.471	0.23	0	0.016	0.061	0.036	0.203	0.931	0.369	0.002	0.001	0.014	0.015	0.203	0.004	0.146
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q36	Pearson Correlation	.280*	.473**	1	.452**	.238*	.237*	.324**	.650**	.360**	.356**	.419**	.375**	.331**	.340**	.557**	.349**	.434**	.489**	0.121	0.137	.278*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.015	0		0	0.04	0.041	0.005	0	0.002	0.002	0	0.001	0.004	0.003	0	0.002	0	0	0.306	0.243	0.016
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

q37	Pearson Correlation	0.164	0.217	.452**	1	-0.113	.317**	.362**	.460**	.263*	.246*	.239*	0.082	.249*	.373**	.359**	.232*	.445**	.254*	0.214	0.217	0.053
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.159	0.062	0		0.336	0.006	0.001	0	0.023	0.033	0.039	0.484	0.031	0.001	0.002	0.046	0	0.028	0.067	0.061	0.65
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q38	Pearson Correlation	0.064	.260*	.238*	-0.113	1	-.393**	0.095	0.207	.251*	0.081	0.114	0.111	-0.062	0.113	.320**	0.187	.227*	.248*	-.241*	0.085	.439**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.585	0.024	0.04	0.336		0	0.419	0.075	0.03	0.489	0.332	0.342	0.597	0.335	0.005	0.107	0.05	0.032	0.039	0.47	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
Q39	Pearson Correlation	0.107	-0.085	.237*	.317**	-.393**	1	-0.019	0.223	-0.029	0.099	0.144	.231*	0.214	.242*	0.101	0.085	0.096	0.083	.428**	-0.005	-.412**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.361	0.471	0.041	0.006	0		0.87	0.055	0.805	0.399	0.218	0.046	0.065	0.037	0.389	0.47	0.411	0.48	0	0.968	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q40	Pearson Correlation	0.196	0.14	.324**	.362**	0.095	-0.019	1	0.129	0.054	0.112	0.138	0.138	0.225	.532**	.423**	.237*	.234*	.257*	0.097	0.22	.230*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.093	0.23	0.005	0.001	0.419	0.87		0.269	0.646	0.338	0.236	0.237	0.052	0	0	0.04	0.043	0.026	0.409	0.058	0.047
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q41	Pearson Correlation	0.122	.451**	.650**	.460**	0.207	0.223	0.129	1	.480**	.554**	.498**	.333**	0.187	.304**	.496**	0.2	.603**	.582**	0.143	.246*	.243*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.298	0	0	0	0.075	0.055	0.269		0	0	0	0.004	0.108	0.008	0	0.085	0	0	0.226	0.034	0.036
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q42	Pearson Correlation	0.072	.276*	.360**	.263*	.251*	-0.029	0.054	.480**	1	.675**	.386**	.343**	-0.012	.283*	.267*	0.037	.522**	.483**	-0.064	0.175	0.212
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.537	0.016	0.002	0.023	0.03	0.805	0.646	0		0	0.001	0.003	0.916	0.014	0.021	0.751	0	0	0.588	0.132	0.068
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q43	Pearson Correlation	0.042	0.217	.356**	.246*	0.081	0.099	0.112	.554**	.675**	1	.660**	.447**	.274*	.577**	.366**	0.178	.608**	.651**	0.151	0.122	0.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.719	0.061	0.002	0.033	0.489	0.399	0.338	0	0		0	0	0.017	0	0.001	0.127	0	0	0.198	0.296	0.777
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q44	Pearson Correlation	0.171	.242*	.419**	.239*	0.114	0.144	0.138	.498**	.386**	.660**	1	.656**	.302**	.421**	.401**	-0.014	.428**	.597**	0.056	-0.005	0.126

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.141	0.036	0	0.039	0.332	0.218	0.236	0	0.001	0		0	0.008	0	0	0.904	0	0	0.635	0.966	0.281
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q45	Pearson Correlation	0.131	0.149	.375**	0.082	0.111	.231*	0.138	.333**	.343**	.447**	.656**	1	.281*	.415**	.367**	0.067	.227*	.448**	0.107	-0.046	0.04
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.262	0.203	0.001	0.484	0.342	0.046	0.237	0.004	0.003	0	0		0.015	0	0.001	0.568	0.05	0	0.362	0.694	0.735
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q46	Pearson Correlation	0.053	0.01	.331**	.249*	-0.062	0.214	0.225	0.187	-0.012	.274*	.302**	.281*	1	.527**	.521**	.270*	.232*	.341**	.314**	0.049	-0.103
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.65	0.931	0.004	0.031	0.597	0.065	0.052	0.108	0.916	0.017	0.008	0.015		0	0	0.019	0.045	0.003	0.006	0.679	0.377
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q47	Pearson Correlation	.287*	0.105	.340**	.373**	0.113	.242*	.532**	.304**	.283*	.577**	.421**	.415**	.527**	1	.632**	.367**	.500**	.508**	.403**	.296*	-0.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.012	0.369	0.003	0.001	0.335	0.037	0	0.008	0.014	0	0	0	0		0	0.001	0	0	0	0.01	0.717
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q48	Pearson Correlation	0.202	.352**	.557**	.359**	.320**	0.101	.423**	.496**	.267*	.366**	.401**	.367**	.521**	.632**	1	.386**	.401**	.483**	0.161	.327**	0.184
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.083	0.002	0	0.002	0.005	0.389	0	0	0.021	0.001	0	0.001	0	0		0.001	0	0	0.17	0.004	0.114
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
Q49	Pearson Correlation	0.213	.367**	.349**	.232*	0.187	0.085	.237*	0.2	0.037	0.178	-0.014	0.067	.270*	.367**	.386**	1	.411**	.357**	0.222	.361**	-0.098
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.066	0.001	0.002	0.046	0.107	0.47	0.04	0.085	0.751	0.127	0.904	0.568	0.019	0.001	0.001		0	0.002	0.057	0.001	0.404
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q50	Pearson Correlation	0.164	.283*	.434**	.445**	.227*	0.096	.234*	.603**	.522**	.608**	.428**	.227*	.232*	.500**	.401**	.411**	1	.662**	0.123	.387**	0.128
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.159	0.014	0	0	0.05	0.411	0.043	0	0	0	0	0.05	0.045	0	0	0		0	0.297	0.001	0.272
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q51	Pearson Correlation	0.14	.281*	.489**	.254*	.248*	0.083	.257*	.582**	.483**	.651**	.597**	.448**	.341**	.508**	.483**	.357**	.662**	1	0.11	0.124	.276*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.229	0.015	0	0.028	0.032	0.48	0.026	0	0	0	0	0	0.003	0	0	0.002	0		0.349	0.287	0.017
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

q52	Pearson Correlation	0.16	0.15	0.121	0.214	-.241*	.428**	0.097	0.143	-0.064	0.151	0.056	0.107	.314**	.403**	0.161	0.222	0.123	0.11	1	.255*	-.457**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.173	0.203	0.306	0.067	0.039	0	0.409	0.226	0.588	0.198	0.635	0.362	0.006	0	0.17	0.057	0.297	0.349		0.028	0
	N	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74	74
q53	Pearson Correlation	0.113	.332**	0.137	0.217	0.085	-0.005	0.22	.246*	0.175	0.122	-0.005	-0.046	0.049	.296*	.327**	.361**	.387**	0.124	.255*	1	-0.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.336	0.004	0.243	0.061	0.47	0.968	0.058	0.034	0.132	0.296	0.966	0.694	0.679	0.01	0.004	0.001	0.001	0.287	0.028		0.704
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75
q54	Pearson Correlation	0.038	0.169	.278*	0.053	.439**	-.412**	.230*	.243*	0.212	0.033	0.126	0.04	-0.103	-0.043	0.184	-0.098	0.128	.276*	-.457**	-0.045	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.746	0.146	0.016	0.65	0	0	0.047	0.036	0.068	0.777	0.281	0.735	0.377	0.717	0.114	0.404	0.272	0.017	0	0.704	
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	74	75	75

**. Correlation Is Significant At The 0.01 Level (2-Tailed).

Table 10 Correlation Table for Employee Welfare Measures in DODLA DAIRY UNITS:

		q34	**q35**	**q36**	**q37**	**q38**	**Q39**	**Q40**	**q41**	**q42**	**q43**	**q44**	**q45**	**q46**	**q47**	**q48**	**Q49**	**q50**	**q51**	**q52**	**q53**	**q54**
q34	Pearson Correlation	1	.243*	0.221	0.19	0.021	0.211	0.148	0.149	0.07	0.094	0.09	0.195	0.067	0.209	0.203	0.097	0.195	0.133	0.215	0.195	-0.098
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.036	0.057	0.103	0.857	0.069	0.205	0.202	0.548	0.425	0.442	0.094	0.57	0.072	0.081	0.406	0.094	0.257	0.064	0.094	0.401
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q35	Pearson Correlation	.243*	1	.589**	.499**	-0.129	.304**	0.189	0.043	-0.035	0.198	0.145	.278*	.237*	0.139	.307**	.230*	.278*	0.198	.379**	0.066	-0.002
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.036		0	0	0.27	0.008	0.105	0.714	0.766	0.089	0.215	0.016	0.041	0.235	0.007	0.047	0.016	0.089	0.001	0.575	0.987
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q36	Pearson Correlation	0.221	.589**	1	.466**	-0.042	.228*	.386**	0.088	0.021	.321**	0.108	0.078	0.204	0.175	.346**	.289*	.323**	.233*	.313**	0.207	-0.093
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.057	0		0	0.719	0.049	0.001	0.454	0.858	0.005	0.356	0.504	0.079	0.134	0.002	0.012	0.005	0.045	0.006	0.074	0.43
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q37	Pearson Correlation	0.19	.499**	.466**	1	0.141	.482**	0.089	-0.04	-0.077	0.153	0.191	.356**	.265*	.334**	.361**	0.21	0.188	0.026	.483**	.241*	-0.053
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.103	0	0		0.226	0	0.446	0.732	0.513	0.19	0.101	0.002	0.022	0.003	0.001	0.07	0.106	0.822	0	0.038	0.651
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

q38	Pearson Correlation	0.021	-0.129	-0.042	0.141	1	0.054	-0.022	.285*	.373**	.353**	.302**	0.113	0.018	0.226	0.085	0.125	0.171	0.196	0.174	0.163	0.149
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.857	0.27	0.719	0.226		0.646	0.853	0.013	0.001	0.002	0.009	0.333	0.881	0.051	0.468	0.283	0.143	0.092	0.135	0.163	0.202
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Q39	Pearson Correlation	0.211	.304**	.228*	.482**	0.054	1	0.059	-0.212	0.136	0.191	.328**	.331**	.345**	.272*	.402**	0.214	0.192	.248*	.415**	.354**	-0.226
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.069	0.008	0.049	0	0.646		0.614	0.068	0.244	0.101	0.004	0.004	0.002	0.018	0	0.065	0.099	0.032	0	0.002	0.051
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q40	Pearson Correlation	0.148	0.189	.386**	0.089	-0.022	0.059	1	0.141	0.039	-0.033	0.035	0.126	0.127	-0.075	0.17	0.209	0.133	0.12	0.033	0.226	-0.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.205	0.105	0.001	0.446	0.853	0.614		0.227	0.742	0.78	0.767	0.281	0.279	0.521	0.144	0.072	0.254	0.306	0.776	0.051	0.754
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q41	Pearson Correlation	0.149	0.043	0.088	-0.04	.285*	-0.212	0.141	1	.260*	0.173	-0.035	0.126	0.185	.312**	0.124	0.203	.422**	0.029	0.162	0.208	0.141
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.202	0.714	0.454	0.732	0.013	0.068	0.227		0.024	0.138	0.769	0.282	0.112	0.006	0.289	0.08	0	0.802	0.165	0.073	0.227
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q42	Pearson Correlation	0.07	-0.035	0.021	-0.077	.373**	0.136	0.039	.260*	1	.387**	.459**	.260*	0.042	0.118	0.055	0.196	0.217	.388**	-0.004	0.005	.397**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.548	0.766	0.858	0.513	0.001	0.244	0.742	0.024		0.001	0	0.024	0.719	0.311	0.64	0.092	0.061	0.001	0.972	0.963	0
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q43	Pearson Correlation	0.094	0.198	.321**	0.153	.353**	0.191	-0.033	0.173	.387**	1	.436**	0.153	0.217	0.181	0.007	0.101	.312**	.296**	.285*	0.15	0.256
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.425	0.089	0.005	0.19	0.002	0.101	0.78	0.138	0.001		0	0.191	0.062	0.12	0.951	0.387	0.006	0.01	0.013	0.198	0.027
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q44	Pearson Correlation	0.09	0.145	0.108	0.191	.302**	.328**	0.035	-0.035	.459**	.436**	1	.509**	.422**	.238*	.264*	0.226	0.109	.548**	.393**	0.137	.238*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.442	0.215	0.356	0.101	0.009	0.004	0.767	0.769	0	0		0	0	0.04	0.022	0.052	0.35	0	0	0.241	0.039
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q45	Pearson Correlation	0.195	.278*	0.078	.356**	0.113	.331**	0.126	0.126	.260*	0.153	.509**	1	.511**	.542**	.250*	0.16	.344**	.230*	.389**	.290*	0.176
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.094	0.016	0.504	0.002	0.333	0.004	0.281	0.282	0.024	0.191	0		0	0	0.03	0.169	0.003	0.048	0.001	0.012	0.132
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q46	Pearson Correlation	0.067	.237*	0.204	.265*	0.018	.345**	0.127	0.185	0.042	0.217	.422**	.511**	1	.638**	.417**	.392**	.372**	.473**	.482**	.422**	-0.01

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.57	0.041	0.079	0.022	0.881	0.002	0.279	0.112	0.719	0.062	0	0		0	0	0.001	0.001	0	0	0	0.935
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q47	Pearson Correlation	0.209	0.139	0.175	.334**	0.226	.272*	-0.075	.312**	0.118	0.181	.238*	.542**	.638**	1	.337**	.342**	.369**	.260*	.461**	.356**	-0.077
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.072	0.235	0.134	0.003	0.051	0.018	0.521	0.006	0.311	0.12	0.04	0	0		0.003	0.003	0.001	0.025	0	0.002	0.511
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q48	Pearson Correlation	0.203	.307**	.346**	.361**	0.085	.402**	0.17	0.124	0.055	0.007	.264*	.250*	.417**	.337**	1	.503**	0.188	.298**	.260*	.352**	-0.181
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.081	0.007	0.002	0.001	0.468	0	0.144	0.289	0.64	0.951	0.022	0.03	0	0.003		0	0.107	0.009	0.024	0.002	0.121
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Q49	Pearson Correlation	0.097	.230*	.289*	0.21	0.125	0.214	0.209	0.203	0.196	0.101	0.226	0.16	.392**	.342**	.503**	1	.384**	.397**	.294*	0.109	-0.127
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.406	0.047	0.012	0.07	0.283	0.065	0.072	0.08	0.092	0.387	0.052	0.169	0.001	0.003	0		0.001	0	0.01	0.35	0.276
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q50	Pearson Correlation	0.195	.278*	.323**	0.188	0.171	0.192	0.133	.422**	0.217	.312**	0.109	.344**	.372**	.369**	0.188	.384**	1	.282*	.276*	.422**	0.153
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.094	0.016	0.005	0.106	0.143	0.099	0.254	0	0.061	0.006	0.35	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.107	0.001		0.014	0.016	0	0.191
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q51	Pearson Correlation	0.133	0.198	.233*	0.026	0.196	.248*	0.12	0.029	.388**	.296**	.548**	.230*	.473**	.260*	.298**	.397**	.282*	1	0.188	0.059	.257*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.257	0.089	0.045	0.822	0.092	0.032	0.306	0.802	0.001	0.01	0	0.048	0	0.025	0.009	0	0.014		0.107	0.616	0.026
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q52	Pearson Correlation	0.215	.379**	.313**	.483**	0.174	.415**	0.033	0.162	-0.004	.285*	.393**	.389**	.482**	.461**	.260*	.294*	.276*	0.188	1	.259*	-0.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.064	0.001	0.006	0	0.135	0	0.776	0.165	0.972	0.013	0	0.001	0	0	0.024	0.01	0.016	0.107		0.025	0.627
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q53	Pearson Correlation	0.195	0.066	0.207	.241*	0.163	.354**	0.226	0.208	0.005	0.15	0.137	.290*	.422**	.356**	.352**	0.109	.422**	0.059	.259*	1	-0.165
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.094	0.575	0.074	0.038	0.163	0.002	0.051	0.073	0.963	0.198	0.241	0.012	0	0.002	0.002	0.35	0	0.616	0.025		0.157
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
q54	Pearson Correlation	-0.098	-0.002	-0.093	-0.053	0.149	-0.226	-0.037	0.141	.397**	.256*	.238*	0.176	-0.01	-0.077	-0.181	-0.127	0.153	.257*	-0.057	-0.165	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.401	0.987	0.43	0.651	0.202	0.051	0.754	0.227	0	0.027	0.039	0.132	0.935	0.511	0.121	0.276	0.191	0.026	0.627	0.157	
	N	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

here is a positive correlation between the Leave facilities and Medical facilities in the Jersey Dairy at Pearson correlation value of (0.473) and the significant value is (0.000) the null hypothesis is rejected there is a significant relationship between the Employee welfare measures in Jersey Dairy. In Dodla Dairy there is a positive correlation for the Leave facilities and Medical facilities at Pearson correlation value of (0.589) and the significant value (0.000) the null hypothesis is rejected there is a significant relationship between Employee welfare measures and Dodla Diary .

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

Tool wise concluding remarks:

(i) Through Mean: Through mean values of the respondents in the four dairy units there is a slight difference is occurred in the promotion policies and general increase of the salary for the employees. But overall mean value of the four dairy proves that the value are more than 3 and above so it shows that the employees are satisfied with the five variables of the study.

(ii) **Through Cronbach Alpha:** It exhibits the reliability of the values depends on the opinions of the respondents. To this the employees responded are above 0.89 so it proves that excellent reliability value of the Questionnaire.

(iii) **Through ANOVA:** The Hypothesis proves that there is no significant difference in means of opinion of the socio-economic aspects and HRM in the four dairy units. For the first variable of Man power planning and Age of the respondents proves that there is no significant difference in means of opinion of the respondents. It states that according to the age the respondents are recruited in the organization. For second variable of HRD and designation of the respondents proves that there is no significant difference in means of opinion of the respondents, it states that according to the designation and HRD (training and Performance appraisal) influence on the employees performance. For the third variable salary and compensation of the respondents proves that there is no significant difference in means of opinion of the respondents. It states that according to the salary of the respondents are influenced on the compensation of the organization. For the fourth variable Employee welfare measures and gender of the respondents proves that there is no significant difference in means of opinion of the respondents. It states that according to the employee welfare of the respondents are influence and gender of the organization. Because in the employee welfare measures crèches and wash room facilities are influenced on the gender. For the fifth variable working conditions and experience of the respondents proves that there is no significant difference in means of opinion of the respondents. It states that according to the working conditions of the respondents are influence and Experience of the organization. Because in the working conditions of the employees influenced on the experience of the respondents.

(iv) **Through Correlation:** For every organization there should be strong influence on the role of HRM in the four dairy units. Even if the employees are satisfied at the work place due to the HRM practices.

Summary: The study discussed Employee Welfare Measures in the Dairy Industry with reference to selected four Dairy units in Andhra Pradesh. The researcher has used the statistical tools of Mean and Standard Deviation ANOVA and Correlation. Through ANOVA the researcher proves that there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees with the Mean while the Compensation and salary of the hypothesis proves that there is no significant difference in the means of opinion of the employees the four dairy units. And finally the Employee welfare of HRM in the four dairy units of employees' opinions are same. Through correlation the hypothesis proves that there is a significant correlation between the selected variables and parameters of the study in the four dairy units the Employee welfare measures of the dairy units.

Findings:

1) 98.7% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the leave facilities, 80% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the leave facilities, 93.3% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the leave facilities, 93.3% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the leave facilities.
2) 94.7% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Medical facilities, 90% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Medical facilities, 73.3% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the Medical facilities, 93.4% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the Medical facilities.
3) 89.3% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the safety Measures, 986.7% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the safety Measures, 56% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the safety Measures, 81% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the safety Measures.
4) 82.7% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the First Aid Boxes, 82.6% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the First Aid Boxes, 61.4% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the First Aid Boxes, 70% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the First Aid Boxes.
5) 2.7% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Ambulance facility, 2.7% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Ambulance facility, 10.6% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the Ambulance facility, 24% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the Ambulance facility.
6) 98.7% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Drinking water facility, 98.6% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Drinking water facility, 80% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the Drinking water facility, 89.6% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the Drinking water facility.

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

7) 94.7% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Canteen facility, 91.2% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Canteen facility, 70.7% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the Canteen facility, 88% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the Canteen facility.
8) 36% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Rest and Lunch room facility, 34.7% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Rest and Lunch room facility, 42.7% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the Rest and Lunch room facility, 46.6% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the Rest and Lunch room facility.
9) 1.3% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Children and Education facility, 8% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Children and Education facility, 10.7% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the Children and Education facility, 11.7% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the Children and Education facility
10) 1.3% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the supply of uniform, 8% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the supply of uniform, 10.7% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the supply of uniform., 8.7% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the supply of uniform.
11) 1.3% of the respondents in the Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Housing facility, 8% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Housing facility, 10.7% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with the Housing facility10.7% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with the Housing facility.
12) 4% of the respondents in Heritage Dairy satisfied with the Retirement Benefits, 1.3% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy satisfied with the Retirement Benefits, 16.6% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy satisfied with Retirement Benefits, 42.6% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy satisfied with Retirement Benefits.
13) 97.3% of the respondents in Heritage Dairy satisfied with the Dearness Allowance, 97% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy satisfied with the Dearness Allowance, 65.3% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy satisfied with Dearness Allowance, 65.3% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy satisfied with Dearness Allowance.
14) 97.3% of the respondents in Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Conveyance Allowance, 98.7% of the respondents in jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Conveyance Allowance, 72% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy satisfied with Conveyance Allowance, 80% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with Conveyance Allowance.
15) 94.7% of the respondents in Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Sickness Benefit, 86.7% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Sickness Benefit, 57.3% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with Sickness Benefit, 77.3% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with Sickness Benefit.
16) 80% of the respondents in Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Maternity Benefit, 74.7% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Maternity Benefit, 62.7% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with Maternity Benefit, 70% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with Maternity Benefit.
17) 12% of the respondents in Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Disablement Benefit, 17.3% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Disablement Benefit, 17.3% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with Disablement Benefit, 41.3% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with Disablement Benefit.
18) 9.3% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the supply of uniform.9.3% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with Old age Benefit, 29.4% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with Old age Benefit.
19) 97.3 % of the respondents in Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Provident fund Benefit, 100% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Provident fund Benefit, 80% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with Provident fund Benefit, 82.6% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with Provident fund Benefit.
20) 97.3% of the respondents in Heritage Dairy are satisfied with the Gratuity Benefit, 92% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Gratuity Benefit, 88% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with Gratuity Benefit, 86.7% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with Gratuity Benefit.
21) 1.3% of the respondents in Jersey Dairy are satisfied with the Crèches Benefit, 6.6% of the respondents in Thirumala Dairy are satisfied with Crèches Benefit, 21.3% of the respondents in Dodla Dairy are satisfied with Crèches Benefit.

Suggestions

(1) The Employee Welfare structure varies from one dairy unit to another dairy unit. Benefits provided to employees varied even within cases and the information on how much each employee earns is kept confidential between the employer and employee.
(2) Thus, it is not easy for one case to entirely imitate the welfare structure of another case. Benefits and Allowances were used to motivate employees create a value for the dairy unit by striving to achieve the set of goals on dairy

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019

management. Unlike non supervisory employees, valued their interpersonal relationships with managers and autonomy to do their work.

(3) They would also not accept alternative employment offers that provide higher pay without taking into account whether they would have close working relationships with their new employers or job security. This suggests that social capital at work is important for employee retention.

(4) Welfare is one of the important activities of the personnel department in all organizations.

(5) The welfare facilities in dairy units are; provision of house building advance, motor/car/cycle/ advance, marriage loan, festival advance, project allowance and medical facilities etc. but there is no uniform system for extending these facilities. It is, therefore, suggested that the loan should be sanctioned to an employee to the extent he/she is entitled to or to the extent it is possible in view of the financial position.

Conclusion

The study on Employee Welfare Measures in the four dairy units have been carried out by evaluating the employees based on the demographic characteristics first, then source of recruitment motivational factors influenced the employees. The employees were motivated based on different factors at different levels. The study covered the Performance Appraisal System and the career planning and career development measures adopted by the dairy units in giving satisfaction to the employees. The employees have given inconsistent responses to these due to the less popularity of these measures. The promotional avenue giving job satisfaction was found that the top level employees had good avenues, but the assistant manager, senior executives felt that they did not have many avenues to come up. The employees have responded positively by stating that the promotions were carried out impartially. Majority of the employees are satisfied with the promotional policy. The rewards given to the efforts put forward were rated by the employees as quiet low. More variables were given job satisfaction through interpersonal relations, job environment, working condition, salary and benefits at different levels.

Scope For Future Research: The present study on "Employee Welfare Measures in the four dairy units and its impact on performance of dairy units in A.P were based on the opinions of managerial 300 employees only. In the course of the study it was observed that there is a lot of potentiality for future research in the area of cooperatives on:

(1) The type of the leadership,

(2) The commitment of the members to the principles cooperation.

(3) Preventive measures for losses of the societies.

References:

1) Approaches to Social Security, ILO,(1942) Geneva, p.83.
2) Labour Bureau, (1963)"Study of Labour Conditions in Public Sector Undertakings in Coal Mining Industry",
3) Srinivas KT (2012)[1] A Study on Employees Welfare Facilities Adopted at Bosch Limited, Bangalore Research Journal of Management Sciences ISSN 2319–1171 Available online at: www.isca.in, www.isca.me Received 23rd October 2012, revised 7th November 2013, accepted 2nd December 2013 Vol. 2(12), 7-11, December (2013) Res. J. Management Sc International Science Congress Association
4) Dr.K.Lalitha(2014) A Study On Employee Welfare Measures With Reference To It Industry International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences www.ijetmas.com December 2014, Volume 2 Issue 7, ISSN 2349-4476
5) Dr. K. Vijayarani (2015) Employees Welfare Measures Towards Productivity Of Neyveli Lignite Corporation Limited Asia Pacific Journal of Research Vol: I. Issue XXIX, July 2015 ISSN: 2320-5504,
6) Smith, Herman W., (1991), ***Strategies of Social Research*** (3rd ed.,) Orlando, FL, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
7) Burns, RoberB.,M (1994), ***Introduction to Research Method*** (2nd ed.) Melbourne, Longman Cheshire.
8) www.hr.com
9) www.hre-source.com
10) http://human resources.about.com
11) www.hrpao.com
12) www.shrm.org/hrmagazine.com
13) http://www.heritagefoods.in/
14) http://www.tirumalamilk.com/
15) http://www.dodladairy.com/
16) http://www.creamlinedairy.com/

DOI: 10.9756/IAJBM/V6I1/1910015
Received:11 February 2019/Accepted:8 May 2019/Published:18 June 2019