
A STUDY ON LABOUR COMPETENCE: THE ROLE OF DEMONSTRATION IN SME MANUFACTURING UNITS.

P.GANESH

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES, DEPARTMENT OF
SRM INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, RAMAPURAM CAMPUS

Abstract

The main contribution is thus to inspect the effects of LP on both dimensions, i.e. productivity and distribution, whereas most of the studies of related nonfiction are restricted to one of those aspects. All approximations are achieved for a large illustration of manufacturing and service Industry with more than five hundred employees and a restricted sample including only unionized firms [1].

This study evaluated the effect of performance managing practices on employee productivity at the State department of Labour. The performance management practices were comprised of employee's appraisal as well as provision of feedback on employee's performance. The study undertook a descriptive research design, where primary data was collected through structured questionnaires on the targeted population of middle and lower level employees. Respondents was identified and random stratified sampling was undertaken to come up with a sample size of 68 respondents. Questionnaires were answered and returned, which comprised of 67.6% response rate. The study found that there was a strong positive correlation of both employee appraisal and employees performance feedback on employee productivity. The study therefore recommended that organizations to undertake both appraisal for their employees as well as offer feedback on their performance as it increased the productivity of the employees. [2]

Keywords: Task performance, adaptive performance, contextual performance

(1) Introduction

Productivity performance has been blindingly weak, stimulating a lively debate about the causes and significances of low efficiency growth among academics, policy-makers and in the media. While the rate of labour productivity growth has reduced in a large number of countries, this slowdown appears more prominent in the India and the gap between the india and other developed economies remains stubbornly wide. The survey also collected information on business uncertainty by asking firms for forecasts of their expected performance in terms of turnover, employment, expenditure and capital investment for 2017 and 2018. Our descriptive analysis shows higher occurrence of structured organization practices among the services manufacturing than production industries, among foreign-owned firms than domestic firms and

among non-family-owned firms than family-owned firms. We also find greater incidence of controlled performs in dealings with higher levels of employment.

(2) Review of Literature

Profitability is defined as output volume times output unit price, over input volume times input unit costs (Bernolak, 1997), or profitability = productivity + price recovery (Miller, 1984). Van Loggerenberg and Cucchiaro (1981) explain how changes in profitability are caused by changes in productivity, price recovery, or in both of these factors. A significant point to consider is that the profitability of a company can change for reasons that have nothing to do with productivity (Bernolak, 1997). A company can increase its profits and at the same time decrease its productivity because of market mechanism (Grunberg, 2004).

Productivity can be measured at different levels: from broad economy and industry levels to very specific process or employee levels. At the macro level, productivity measures show how a nation or the major sectors of its economy are performing in comparison with their past performance, or in relation to other nations or sectors (Bernolak, 1997). Measuring productivity is a complex statistical process which includes numerous steps that aim at making data comparable over time and across enterprises and countries (O'Mahony&Timmer, 2009). At higher levels of analysis, interest in productivity has predominantly focused on labor productivity; in many cases, productivity is expressed and measured in monetary units per input as this seems to be the only practical way (Stainer, 1997). Performance management (PM) is widely advocated as a way to develop employees (Aguinis, 2013; Cascio, 2014). Broadly speaking, PM can be defined as "identifying, measuring, and developing the performance of individuals and teams and aligning performance with the strategic goals of the organization" (Aguinis, 2013, pp. 2-3).

(3) Exploring Subject and Behavioral Component

An elusive concept regarding the assessment of societal or community well-being from specific evaluation of individual or group cases [11].

The theoretical and practical significance of the study lies in the explanation of the need for added control over the disbursement of financial resources in order to avoid their irrational use below growing insecurity. The research shows that dropping uncertainty through institutional variations will increase the intensity of funding without compromising the dynamic characteristics of the project. The author justifies the limitations and ways of using the developed model.

(4) Analysis on Objective

Hypothesis 1 (H1).

Workers who feel that they are *supported and appreciated by their supervisors* are more likely to feel that they contribute to the organization's productivity.

The effect of the workplace on satisfaction with the job, satisfaction in non-work life domains, and satisfaction with overall life, personal happiness and subjective well-being.

Hypothesis 2 (H2).

Workers who feel that they *are integrated in a good working environment* are more likely than others to feel that they contribute to the organization's productivity.

“Labour Productivity and Employment Support” national project lists 93 tasks. Most of them relate to systemic measures and targeted support to Increase labour productivity while 28 tasks are systemic measures to improve labour market

efficiency.

Hypothesis 3 (H3).

Workers who are *treasured as specialists* are more likely than others to feel that they contribute to the organization's productivity.

It should be noted also that in a previous empirical study no significant association, neither positive nor negative, between work-life balance and productivity was detected.

Hypothesis 4 (H4).

Workers who have the opportunity to enjoy the embracing of *work-life balance practices in their organizations*, are more likely than others to feel that they contribute to the organization's productivity.

Employees expect to develop their skills and get promoted, ensuring a better performance for the organization. In turn, training is an activity aimed at enhancing performance, by ensuring the opportunities for development of skills and encouragement given by the management team.

(5) Methodology

The research methodology was developed using different questionnaires, which were designed taking into consideration a set of eleven selected international benchmarks, namely: (i) Health and well-being at work: a survey of employees, 2014,

Twelve place in and around TamilNadu participated in data collection, by interviewing employees. The sample covers 15 private companies and five public entities or large firms per partner, involving two employees per organization and totaling 514 questionnaires. It was not intended to interview company employee and contract labour to avoid bias in the responses.

A convenience sample procedure based on random selection was used. In each organization, a contact person was identified to ensure completion of the questionnaire, which was afterwards validated by the research team. The questionnaires were applied by personal interviews to ensure a maximum response rate.

Sample Characterization

Analysis :1

H3: Workers who are *respected as professionals* are more likely than others to feel that they contribute to the organization’s productivity.

H4: Workers who have the possibility to enjoy the adoption of *work-life balance practices in their organizations*, are more likely than others to feel that they contribute to the organization’s productivity.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Matrix.

Variables	M	SD	skewness	kurtosis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Feeling towards Productive	0.813	0.399217	-1.517	0.301	1						
Labour Management Support	0.612	0.486185	-0.49	-1.767	0.2722 ***	1					
Skill Development	0.653	0.568093	0.4958241	-0.276	-1.931	0.2161 ***	0.2777 ***	0.3064 ***	0.3299 ***	0.3079 ***	1
Professional Respect	0.695	0.696498	0.460218	-0.857	-1.27	0.2869 ***	0.3878 ***	0.3911 ***	1		
work life balance	0.3735409	0.484215	0.524	-1.732	0.1724 ***	0.2999 ***	0.2662 ***	0.3085 ***	1		

Source: Significance levels: * $p < 0.10$. ** $p < 0.05$. *** $p < 0.0$. SME: Small and Medium-sized Enterprises.

The main reasons for using the two models are as follows:

(i) Estimation of the OLS model is justified by the data analyzed following distribution, considering a dependent variable represented in binary terms, which can determine the probability of the influence of a hypothetical set of independent variables arising from the literature review presented above; the dependent variable takes the value of 1, when the employee states they feel they contribute to productivity; and 0, otherwise; and

(ii) Estimation of the multinomial model can test a representation at level of the same dependent variable, which lets us, first, contrast the empirical evidence with Model 1, and secondly, determine the variability of the probability of influence of the same hypothetical set of independent variables, through comparison of the results between a baseline corresponding to: ‘not contributing to productivity’. ‘contributing to productivity to some extent’ (level 2); and ‘totally contributing to productivity’.

Descriptive Statistics and ANOVAMatrix.

Hypothesis

H1 Workers who feel that they are *supported and appreciated by their supervisors* are more likely to feel that they contribute to the organization’s productivity.

H2 Workers who feel that they *are integrated in a good working environment* are more likely than others to feel that they contribute to the organization's productivity.

H1 & H2

Calculation of One Way ANOVA

X_1	X_1^2	X_2	X_2^2	X_3	X_3^2	X_4	X_4^2	X_5	X_5^2	Total = ΣX_1 + ΣX_2 + ΣX_3 + ΣX_4 + ΣX_5 = 200 +
76	5776	68	4624	46	2116	62	3844	63	3969	
110	12100	78	6084	96	9216	86	7396	64	4096	
10	100	42	1764	41	1681	48	2304	52	2704	
2	4	9	81	11	121	2	4	15	225	
2	4	3	9	6	36	2	4	6	36	
$\Sigma X_1 = 200$	$\Sigma X_1^2 = 17884$	$\Sigma X_2 = 200$	$\Sigma X_2^2 = 12562$	$\Sigma X_3 = 200$	$\Sigma X_3^2 = 13170$	$\Sigma X_4 = 200$	$\Sigma X_4^2 = 13552$	$\Sigma X_5 = 200$	$\Sigma X_5^2 = 11030$	=

$$200 + 200 + 200 + 200 = 1000$$

$$\text{Correction Factor} = \frac{t^2}{rc} = \frac{1000^2}{25} = \frac{10,00,000}{25} = 40,000$$

Total Sum of Square within Samples = Total Sum of Squares – Sum of Squares between Samples

$$= 28198 - 11802 = 16396$$

Degree of Freedom(v_2) = $c(r-1)$

$$= 25-5 \quad v_2 = 20$$

ANOVA TABLE

Sources of variation	Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Squares
Between Samples	11802	4	2951
Within Samples	16396	20	820

Total	28198	24	
--------------	--------------	-----------	--

$F=2951/820$

= 3.59, Calculated value of F is = 3.59, Level of Significance = 5%

The table value of F for $v_1 = 4$ and $v_2 = 20$ at 5% level of Significance = 2.87

RESULT:

Calculated value of F (3.59) is greater than the table value of F (2.87). Hence Null Hypothesis is rejected.

Stastical Finding

Variables	Description
Feeling to Productive	1 if the worker feels they give to the organization's productivity, 0 otherwise.
Labour Management Support	1 for workers feeling they not willing to contribute to organization's productivity; 2 for workers feeling they contribute to organization's productivity to some extent, and 3 for workers feeling they totally contribute to organization's productivity.
Skill Development	1 if the worker feels satisfied with supervisors' support/treatment, 0 otherwise.
Profesional Respect	1 if the worker feels satisfied with the work environment, 0 otherwise.
work life balance	1 if the worker feels respected by the organization both as a professional and individual, 0 otherwise.

SUGEESTIONS

- From the study most of the defendants are given opportunities for decision making. They are happy with the freedom given to them to decide their respective work. This is a healthy sign. The company may take steps to encourage further their employees in decision making.
- Productivity analysis are identified as the three construction equipment management practices that could improve productivity in multistory building projects. Contractors can use the probability-based predictive model to assess the risk of low productivity for specific levels of implementations of construction equipment management practices.

- From the study it is understood that most of the employees were satisfied with the welfare benefits. It is suggested to the management that company may take some more steps to encourage employees by offering them added fringe benefits and welfare benefits so that they are fully satisfied.

Conclusion

1. Success of Labour productive depends on various pillars like 5-S, JishuHozen, Planned Maintenance, Quality maintenance, Kaizen, Office TPM and Safety, Health & Environment.
2. Overall productive Effectiveness has improved from 73% to 89% indicating the improvement in productivity and improvement in management practice.
3. The is the use of a subjective measure of collaborators' commitment to organizational productivity, attempting to provide new implications for organizational management. The results obtained indicate that for workers: feeling their supervisors' support through listening to their concerns and by sensing they take them on board; being integrated in a good work environment; and feeling respected both as professionals and as people; positively influence their feeling of contributing to organizational performance. a significant involvement in work performance , which has also been found to deteriorate their overall work performance
4. The results are particularly relevant given the increased weight of services in the labor market, together with intensified automation and digitalization of collaborators' functions.
5. The findings also contribute to the ongoing debate about the need for more work on the subjective and behavioral components of so-called smart and learning organizations, rather than focusing exclusively on remuneration as the factor stimulating organizational productivity based on the collaborator's contribution.

Reference

1. Pandey M.K., Tripathi P. Examine the relationship between level of aspiration, believes in just world, psychological well-being and quality of work-life. *Indian J. Heal. Well-being*. 2018;**9**:53–59.
2. Schneider B., Hanges P.J., Smith D.B., Salvaggio A.N. Which comes first: Employee attitudes or organizational, financial and market performance? *J. Appl. Psychol.* 2003;**88**:836–851. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.836.
3. Alie, R.E., Beam, H., Carey, T.A. (1998). The use of teams in an undergraduate management program. *Journal of Management Education*, 22(6), 707–719.
4. Borman, W.C., Buck, D.E., Hanson, M.A., Motowidlo, S.J., Stark, S., Drasgow, F. (2001). An examination of the comparative reliability, validity, and accuracy of performance ratings made using computerized adaptive rating scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2), 965–973.
5. Acocella N. and Leoni R. (2010), La riformadellacontrattazione: redistribuzione perversa o produzione di reddito?, *RivistaItalianadegliEconomisti*, vol.15, n.2, pp.237-274

6. Sirgy M., Reilly N.P., Wu J., Efraty D. A work-life identity model of well-being: Towards a research agenda linking Quality-of-Work-Life (QWL) programs with Quality of Life (QOL) *Appl. Res. Qual. Life.* 2008;**3**:181–202. doi: 10.1007/s11482-008-9054-6